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ABSTRACT

This research project, in which social welfare constitutes the central focus of study, is undertaken within the broad field of development studies. The basic concern of the study is to determine the role and the place of social welfare in a post-apartheid South Africa. The study therefore seeks to produce some of the policy-making knowledge and a framework for formulating alternative social policies. With the emergence of the post-apartheid South Africa, social welfare as a system, and social policy in particular, finds itself at a water-shed. For many years social welfare has been practised on a racially-differentiated basis. Social policies were firmly rooted in the prevailing political ideology of apartheid. During its formal inception in the 1930's, the primary objective of social welfare was to solve the Poor White problem.

Currently we have reached a critical turning point in the history of our country. The establishment of an inclusive democracy should have a direct impact on the welfare of all citizens. In this new context we have to deal with mass poverty - the basic human needs of many South Africans not being met - and extreme inequalities. Meanwhile we are saddled with different models of welfare based on the fragmented social policies of the past.

Various themes pertaining to social welfare are examined with the view to proposing some solutions to the dilemma. Theories of development constitute the frame of reference for the analysis and development of alternative social policies. Applying these theoretical foundations, a special study is made of the emergence and structuring of social welfare in South Africa. In an empirical study the views of stakeholders in the field are gathered using qualitative methodology. Theories of development, the Reconstruction and Development Programme, the idea of social welfare as a system to meet human needs, and the views of stakeholders, form the basis for the development of alternative social policies in the post-apartheid South Africa. Using this conceptual framework and analysis of contemporary realities, certain policy proposals are examined for their appropriateness to address post-apartheid challenges. The study demonstrates that a paradigm shift is absolutely necessary in order to deal with emerging realities in South Africa. This paradigm shift entails that social welfare adopt a developmental approach within an integrated policy framework.
### Glossary
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<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABRECSA</td>
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<td>CAFDA</td>
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<td>COSATU</td>
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<td>CUPS</td>
<td>Churches Urban Planning Commission</td>
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<td>GADRA</td>
<td>Grahamstown Area Distress Relief Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP</td>
<td>Gross National Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDASA</td>
<td>Institute for a Democratic Alternative to South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMCs</td>
<td>Joint Management Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACTU</td>
<td>National Council of Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADEL</td>
<td>National Association for Democratic Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMDA</td>
<td>National Medical and Dental Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICRO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECC</td>
<td>National Education Crisis Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASSA</td>
<td>Association for Appropriate Social Services in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACC</td>
<td>South African Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACHED</td>
<td>South African Committee on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALDRU</td>
<td>South African Labour and Development Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA</td>
<td>South African National Tuberculosis Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Structural Adjustment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDF</td>
<td>United Democratic Front</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND

The epoch-making elections of 27 April 1994 were the culmination of a long process of strife and struggle in South Africa. The process unfolded and intensified over many years during which the White minority had full franchise while the bulk of the population fought for full citizenship and a better life. Tremendous effort and courage were required from those who opposed the racially discriminating policy known as apartheid. Moreover, there was by no means unanimity as to how the end of apartheid was to be achieved. How should South African realities be dealt with and how should its society be restructured?

It is not my intention here to describe apartheid or to blame it for every ill. Nonetheless, an understanding of this socio-political context is crucial for post-apartheid social policies. To embark on any form of change requires a thorough knowledge of the past, an understanding of present realities, and a clear vision for the future. It is true that many things had changed before the democratic government came into power, in terms of the scrapping of discriminatory policies and legislation. On the other hand, it is an illusion to think that a system that was so deeply rooted into the societal fabric will disappear over-night. Race attitudes, social customs, and (in many instances) completely different outlooks on life remain. Apartheid was not only a political system to structure the society. That was only one manifestation of it. Apartheid as an ideology was a deeply-rooted value premise, a way of looking at the world and the human beings in it. To formulate new policies and to introduce non-discriminatory legislation will only create the framework within which to work for a new era in South Africa. It should be seen as a beginning, not the end.

Given the country's colonial history and its racial composition, various policies were explored and implemented by successive governments to structure and administer South African society. Of all these policy measures, the apartheid ideology (a system of social engineering), particularly during the second half of the 20th century, had the most devastating effect. An outstanding feature of the system was its institutionalized form of racialism and inequality, maintained and enforced by
legislation and custom. South Africa is probably the only country in the world that, after World War II, made race and colour an organizing principle to structure its society. The advocates of the ideology saw it as a unique solution to a unique problem (Adam 1971: 1). The system formed the basis for the unequal distribution of power and benefits, opportunities, and life chances (Adam & Gilliomee 1979: 32).

Racial criteria also constituted the basis for exclusion from political power, differences in social status, and distribution of economic reward. The system created opportunities for economic exploitation, social inequalities, different standards of living, and the persistence of structural poverty.

Under apartheid the country faced many of the problems of a typical colonial situation: a White minority in control of the political power and economy; unequal urban and rural development; large-scale urban migration and increasing discontent among the Black majority, demanding full participation in government and the economy (Van Zyl Slabbert & Welsh 1979: 1). Whites dominated every aspect of power and influence while the circumstances of the Black majority were being dealt with administratively and arbitrarily without any significant representation on sovereign law-making or governing bodies. The post-apartheid notion implies that the entire society needs to be transformed.

A description of the apartheid ideology provides an analytical understanding of the realities that will be faced in the post-apartheid context. For the purpose of this study, however, the implications for human life as well as for social welfare are of particular significance. Apartheid was not only a technical solution or a way to deal with a "complex racial situation". It was based on a value system and a belief in qualitative differences between "races". It promoted a pattern of thought, belief and behaviour which sees reality, man, events, and the very truth itself from the perspective of the dominant group and revealed itself clearly in terms of dividing moralities and world views. This caused a clash between two irreconcilable outlooks, one that strove for continuous extension of liberation and empowerment, while the other sought to restrict this. The White ruling class was committed to hegemony over the powerless, while the majority struggled for freedom, human dignity, and democracy.
In practice apartheid constituted the basis for the allocation of resources. It revealed itself clearly in areas like social relations, human welfare, education, housing and health services. The system allowed for no common standards of human dignity, welfare, and standards of living. These depended on the particular racial category into which a person was classified. For Blacks the ideology circumscribed their daily life and possibilities. It determined places of residence, jobs, schooling, social and cultural activities, social welfare, leisure and recreation. The ideology implied extreme contradictions and ambiguities between different racial groups. These contradictions were particularly evident in conditions of poverty and powerlessness, juxtaposed with great wealth and power in the same society. The words of Johan Galtung (as quoted in Gelpi) are particularly relevant to the South African situation when he says:

"... The social structure... is made up in such a way that some people are permitted to live full, complete, long, creative lives, with a high level of self-realization whereas others are killed slowly because of wrong nutrition, protein deficiency, inadequate health facilities, deprivation of all kinds of mental stimuli" (Gelpi 1979: 23).

Such contradictions within a common society must eventually become the basis for conflict, and a major issue for the post-apartheid South Africa.

Social welfare in South Africa, like all other societal institutions, reflects the patterns of discrimination and inequalities which exist in the broader society. Thus it preserves and perpetuates the status quo. Ideological considerations rather than welfare considerations determined welfare provisions. Social welfare reflected the inequalities and stratification of the South African society. The system was also diverse and fragmented. Fragmentation occurred first in terms of the social structure based on race, and secondly in terms of services delivered both by the State and that by private welfare agencies. "There is no such thing as equality of welfare services between races in South Africa" (Helm 1975: 4).

As the country moves into a new era, and when we want to change the status quo ante, it is important to contextualize the issues and to reflect on the basic dimensions of the South African society. The country has different levels of welfare, and there is mass poverty in certain sectors. The fact that Blacks have for many years been purposefully excluded from any meaningful
political participation, contributed directly to the differential provision of welfare services and allocation of resources. Whites had almost exclusive control over the instruments of power and over the major resources of the country. A comprehensive plan of political and social separation was followed so as to protect their material interests.

The lack of voting power, and the lack of participation in the administration of the country and in the economy, had obvious implications for the share of material privilege available to Blacks. As Terreblanche noted:

"There can be little doubt that the political 'monopoly' of the Afrikaner-oriented National Party over the last 40 years made an important contribution to the relative improvement of Afrikaner per capita-income" (1988: 4).

This resulted, among other things, in relative wealth and affluence among Whites compared to widespread poverty and a relative absence of social amenities for Blacks. This situation had been created and perpetuated by the political and economic policies of consecutive governments. Policies were aimed at maintaining and strengthening existing divisions and inequalities in society. These policies emphasized cultural differences and a more or less complete social separation of groups or races in society. Cultural and social separation was maintained in such a way that millions were deprived of the right to share in the material privileges enjoyed by Whites. This was particularly evident in mobility, ownership, property rights, civil rights, job allocation, education, and access to the land.

Poverty and inequality are not immutable, and do not exist in a vacuum. They operate within a particular social, economic, and political context. Poverty is a world-wide phenomenon present in virtually all socio-economic and political systems. Poverty in South Africa though is decisively affected by policies of the past. Apartheid as a system kept the poor powerless and impoverished in order that the wealthy might stay in power and safeguard (and add to) their possessions. Poverty is therefore not simply an economic issue, a matter to be sorted out in the sphere of economics. It is a structural problem rooted in an oppressive history and in existing societal institutions. An understanding of this context is crucial in the formulation of social policies for a post-apartheid South Africa.
Social welfare policy in South Africa had in the past seldom aimed to address inequalities or to eradicate poverty. Instead, it entrenched different levels of welfare in terms of policy, planning, and provision. This was particularly evident in terms of per capita welfare spending on the various racial groups. Van der Berg has said that the racial nature of the South African socio-political system ensured that the safety-net for Whites was far more extended than for Blacks. As almost all Whites were engaged in modern-sector employment, such social insurance provisions as exist in South Africa cover all Whites. For the limited numbers falling through this net, benefits under the residual programmes based on need (e.g. social pensions) were much better provided for than for other groups (1992: 13). If one put the per capita welfare spending on Whites, in the period 1949 - 1976 on the index 100, the per capita spending on Coloureds and Asians would rate at 40, while the per capita spending on Blacks would be about 12 (Terreblanche 1988: 11).

Although this "welfare spending" gap narrowed after 1976, Terreblanche estimated that in 1988 the government still spent in per capita terms at least twice more on the welfare services of Whites than on Coloureds and Asians, and more or less six times more on Whites than for Blacks (Ibid). The particular welfare policies followed since the formalization of social welfare in the 1930's contributed to a situation where First-World and Third-World realities co-existed in the same society. [These two terms are here used, not in their original political sense, but in the inaccurate but now almost universal sense that they have acquired.] Welfare's primary objective has been to secure the well-being of Whites and in particular to solve the Poor-White Problem. The system reflected the dominant racial, social, and political thinking of the twenties and thirties, and had (until recently) not changed much. The question now is how to transform this system and to structure the society on a more equal basis.

A critical turning point in the history of South Africa has been reached. The turnabout has arrived. An inclusive democracy will have a direct impact on the welfare of all citizens. This new dispensation is faced with mass poverty in certain sectors of the society where basic needs of countless families and individuals are not being met. If social welfare is to respond appropriately to these challenges, new policies must be formulated, and social welfare provisions be fundamentally transformed.
Although an inclusive democracy creates the political framework within which to address issues of poverty and inequality, it is an illusion to think that a new political dispensation automatically solves all problems. Despite the dramatic political changes, the country still faces the legacies of the past, and questions of how to address these remain. The policies and laws of the past have changed, but most of the value premises, the structure of society with its inequalities, poverty, and illiteracy, are still there. The status quo is likely to continue unless there is purposeful intervention. The question now is what kind of social policies are required to ameliorate the situation? The present study aims to examine the role of social welfare as a system in this regard.

Policy research is a challenging endeavour. It is more than simply carrying out a set of research activities. Activities undertaken in the name of policy research will vary, not only in terms of the problem being addressed, but with the style, creativity, and judgment of the researcher (Majchrzak 1984: 11). Policy research tries to provide answers to a range of questions pertaining to social issues. It can therefore help in the development of a clear vision of the future society. In general four types of research may be identified:

(i) Basic research, which refers to traditional academic research that is generally done in academic departments of universities to contribute to basic knowledge;

(ii) Technical social research, which involves projects that are undertaken to solve specific problems;

(iii) Policy analysis, which is the study of the policy-making process;

(iv) Policy research, which is a process of studying practical problems and discovering solutions for them. (Majchrzak defined policy research as "the process of conducting research on, or analysis of, a fundamental social problem, in order to provide policymakers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem") (Ibid: 12).
Although the four types of research processes might be similar in many respects, Majchrzak says that policy research is the only type of research directed at both action and fundamental problems. Policy research starts with a social problem, evolves through a research process whereby alternative policy strategies and actions for alleviating the problem are developed, and communicates these alternatives to the policymakers. Policy research therefore is a process of studying fundamental social problems, like poverty, in an attempt to create pragmatic courses of action or solutions. It concerns itself with the collection and analysis of data, directed towards finding out what to do. The purpose of policy research is instruction or direction for action to solve social problems.

Majchrzak's views are helpful particularly when relatively stable circumstances obtain. In South Africa's particular situation, more may be required in terms of scope and approach. Our situation is not only about changing policy, it is about changing attitudes and values. Social welfare on an equal basis must be provided for the entire population.

The present chapter (i.e. Chapter One) serves as a general introduction. It aims to provide a general framework for carrying out research by outlining the objectives of the study, by explaining the approach of the study, by setting out the research processes to be followed, by identifying the areas that will be covered, outlining the content of the rest of the chapters forming the body of the work. Chapter One serves as a guide to the study in general, and in particular to the kind of information that will be gathered. Several steps are followed to achieve this objective. The first is to clarify the research questions to be answered. The next step is to state the research objectives and how they will be achieved, applying qualitative research methodologies and developing a theoretical frame of reference. Lastly the line of argument will be given, including areas that will be covered in answering the research question. Each of these steps will require choices in terms of scope and areas to be covered, which will become apparent as the study proceeds.
1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The fundamental political transformation in South Africa has tremendous implications for societal institutions like social welfare. The political change in the country has created expectations for a better life. The question is whether these expectations can be met, and what policy changes are required to alleviate poverty and meet the other needs of people.

The first step in solving a research problem is to formulate it precisely. This enables the researcher to identify the nature of the evidence which he/she should seek. "Establishing the boundaries of concern is an important undertaking: without it, inquiry is likely to lose any sense of order and form" (Heffernan 1979: 4). This is often done by posing a list of specific questions to be answered. Such questions guide the planning of the research, and the categories and units in which data are to be gathered and analyzed.

South Africa is now at the stage of drawing all different groups into a common political, economic, and social structure. To retain the status quo would be politically dangerous. Economic growth will be one of the major tasks for the new government. In addition, meeting the basic needs of people, and the redistribution of resources, will be crucially important. This is an area where social welfare as a system could play an important role. Given its history and inherent shortcomings, the extant welfare system can however not fulfil this important function. The purpose of this study is to examine possible alternatives.

In selecting social welfare policy as a topic for research, the researcher was particularly motivated by the socio-political climate of the present time. The question whether the social scientist should primarily be concerned with social issues and how to solve them, or with personal and intellectual development, is a matter of frequent controversy. Most scientists are of the opinion that "the two interests are likely to coincide to a large degree, unless the scientist is too sheltered and removed from the life of his community and his generation" (Lundberg 1942: 31). Personal interest and societal or community commitment are thus two important factors for selecting a particular problem for research. In the present study the researcher was motivated by both these factors. This needs further clarification.
The point has been made that, historically, South African social welfare was biased in its focus, as it concentrated primarily on the welfare of Whites. Some critics have for instance argued that welfare services to Whites were provided on the basis of a Welfare State, while services to other groups were only available on a residual basis. This trend was particularly evident in the amounts of money spent on welfare for the different racial groups. The system thus perpetuated, even exacerbated, existing inequalities. It must however be said that certain social services, such as old age pensions, were available to all ethnic groups, (although on racially-differentiated scales) and that others, such as unemployment benefit or workmen’s compensation, were available to specified categories of employees which included persons who were not White.

The previous government’s reluctance to address poverty and inequality amongst Blacks was particularly evident during the First Carnegie Inquiry, of the 1930’s, where the emphasis was solely on poverty amongst Whites. Even at the time of the Second Carnegie Inquiry in the early 1980’s, the attitude of the Nationalist government had not really changed. This Inquiry concentrated primarily on poverty amongst Blacks and highlighted its dimensions and causes. The Prime Minister at that time remarked:

"I find it remarkable that a Carnegie investigation of poverty should be carried out in S.A., when the great continent of Africa is dying of hunger, when people are wasting away in their millions and starving little children lack the basic food needed to keep body and soul together. Why is this investigation being held in South Africa? It seems to me that people do not know what has been going on in Africa over the last number of years" (South African Outlook 1984: 89).

The Prime Minister noted further:

"Vanweë politieke botone en ideologiese vooroordele, het die Kommissie ontaard in 'n beswaddering van Suid-Afrika se politieke stelsel" (Hugo 1984: 205).1

The Second Carnegie Report was to a large extent officially ignored, while the government moved in a completely different direction when it issued a Report in 1985 which proposed a modified social welfare policy. This Report was the product of a Working Group set up in 1982 to speed

1 "Because of political overtones and ideological prejudices, the Commission has deteriorated into calumny of South Africa's political system". (Present author's translation)
up the implementation of existing (racially-differentiated) welfare policies and to make recommendations on liaison between the racially-differentiated welfare structures. The Report emphasized the following:

(1) The entrenchment of racially-separate welfare structures

(2) Privatization of welfare services, making communities, families and individuals primarily responsible for their welfare

(3) Devolution of welfare functions to local and regional authorities, with limited State responsibility for social welfare

(4) The establishment of a complicated and costly welfare structure to oversee and implement this racially-differentiated welfare policy.

These proposals met with massive opposition from a wide range of organisations. The opposition of the welfare community emphasised three main and inter-related issues:

(1) the need for one State Department to be responsible for social welfare;

(2) the dismantling of racially-differentiated welfare structures;

(3) the rationalization of all welfare structures at various levels.

These desiderata were in direct contrast with the government's proposed welfare policies which were based on a racially-differentiated Constitution. Despite all the opposition to these policies, the government went ahead with its proposals.

Another controversial issue was the Welfare State debate in South Africa. The State had repeatedly stressed that South Africa was not a Welfare State and would not become one. The principles upon which the South African social welfare policies were based were that every citizen
was responsible for his/her own welfare and that of the family. Only where these efforts fail to secure the welfare of citizens, does the State come to their assistance, in co-operation with private initiative. This position was adopted despite the fact that the residual welfare principle had not been applied consistently in South Africa. At the time of addressing the Poor White problem, the State played a major role in providing job opportunities and assisting poor families to overcome poverty, while welfare services for Blacks were minimal, and left primarily in the hands of traditional social systems, the family, and the churches.

The government could however not really introduce its policy proposals, as contained in the 1985 Report mentioned above, because of the intensification of the political struggle in South Africa and the ensuing political negotiations which led to the democratic elections of 1994.

After 1985, it was becoming clear that the Nationalist government would soon have to back down and give in to the groundswell for change in South Africa. The post-apartheid debate was started and gained momentum when people began preparing for a democratic government with alternative policies. Not much was done in this period with regard to social welfare policy. Notwithstanding the crucial role that social welfare would have to play, 1994 saw the country largely unprepared.

Well before 1994, however, it was clear to me, as it was to many others in the welfare field, that the coming political changes implied massive welfare changes. What were the ideas of those active in this field? What changes did they advocate? What were their present-day frustrations? How clear was their thinking on practicable innovations? What steps, if any, were being taken to meet the future? My study thus started out from the perspective of a futurist policy research, working with possible scenarios. A revision of social policy was being necessitated, and research into policy issues was acquiring new urgency and new significance. I thus decided to select social welfare policy in South Africa as a topic for research and to conduct an inquiry into social welfare policies in a post-apartheid society.
1.3 TIME-FRAME OF THE STUDY

Preparations to undertake the present study started in 1988 when it had become clear that we needed to prepare for post-apartheid reconstruction. I undertook provisional reading, and constructed an interview guide for a field study. Interviews were conducted during 1989. Some respondents at that time had requested explicitly that their names were not to be mentioned. But then came the dramatic political changes which swept the country after 2 February 1990. These created a tremendous problem for the orientation of the research. The project started out from the perspective that the post-apartheid South Africa would emerge some time in the unknown future. However, events had overtaken me. In February 1990, with the then President F.W. de Klerk's unbanning of the ANC and other prohibited political organizations, the legal abolition of apartheid, and the corollaries of all this, my study required a completely different orientation, i.e. of being in the post-apartheid South Africa with all implications thereof. A programme of Reconstruction and Development was proposed at this stage. Although this was not originally to be part of the study, it was clear that it henceforth should be included. My study was nearing completion. Now I had to extend it. And I had to decide on a new cut-off date. I therefore decided that I would cover the period from 1930, when social welfare was structured more formally, to April 1994. This period spans the major years in which apartheid's welfare policies developed, followed by their growing dysfunctional effects, and the ever-insistent reaction and opposition, with new ideas burgeoning.

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Having stated the research problem, the next step is to state the research objectives, i.e. to state clearly what the researcher intends to do. This determines the data to be selected, and what to omit. If the problem is not stated clearly due to a lack of sufficient knowledge or inadequate theory, the researcher may find it difficult to make the research problem concrete and explicit. Progress is then both erratic and uncertain.

Stating the research objectives in policy research is probably never easy, for it is a complex process. Policy research has certain characteristics which differentiate it from other types of
research (Majchrzak 1984). According to Majchrzak, policy research has the following distinctive characteristics.

(i) Policy research is multi-dimensional in focus.
This indicates that public policies attempt to resolve complex social problems that are composed of a number of dimensions, factors, effects, and causes. Although it may not be possible to study all these elements, one should bear them in mind in order to make a selection of the specific elements identified for more focused attention.

(ii) Policy research uses an empirico-inductive research orientation.
Policy research starts with a social problem. It attempts empirically to induce concepts and causal theories as the study of the problem proceeds. In this sense it differs from the traditional hypothesis testing approach in research. The policy researcher therefore does not approach a social problem with a predetermined theory of its causes and effects. "Instead, the researcher engages in an iterative process whereby information and model building are constantly interchanged" (Ibid: 19).

(iii) Policy research incorporates the future as well as the past.
The researcher focuses on those aspects that are open to influence and intervention. This is necessary in order to produce action-oriented, implementable recommendations. We should not only focus on the immediate situation, or how it should be addressed in the future, but should include the history of the problem, the way it was produced, and the forces that have contributed to it.

(iv) Policy research is responsive to study users.
A critical aspect of policy research is the identification of study users. These users may be numerous, varying in expectations, agendas, assumptions, values, and needs. These needs may present conflicting demands on the research process. The question is how should the researcher respond to them?
Policy research explicitly incorporates values. Policy research is value-laden. Many of the decisions in the research effort are driven by numerous and sometimes conflicting values. The values of the researcher as well as those of the study users will influence the statement of the problem, research objectives, formulation of research questions, developing recommendations from the findings, and disseminating the results to selected audiences. In addition, the society-at-large also has certain perceptions or normative values. Paramount, however are the researcher's values which will affect the entire research process, from the general study approach selected to the conclusions and recommendations made. From the outset the various values and their impact on the research process must be clearly understood.

These characteristics indicate to us that policy research poses a tremendous challenge to the researcher, who should be able to consider all aspects of the multi-dimensional social problem, identify and maintain a focus on the most malleable variables, study the social problem without imposing a predefined theory, and consider the effects on both past and future trends. The researcher should explicitly incorporate values into the research process, and be responsive to study users, despite their numerous and sometimes conflicting demands (Ibid: 20).

As has been stated above, the present research was initiated when it became clear that fundamental changes were coming in South Africa. The researcher intended to determine what was actually happening in the broader society and what stakeholders were planning or doing to prepare themselves for the post-apartheid situation. Consequently a policy-oriented research was conducted to determine how social welfare should be transformed in order to address emerging realities. In view of the demands and challenges faced by the social welfare system, as well as the expectations of people, how should social welfare be restructured? The study attempts to highlight the main issues which should be considered when formulating welfare policy. This is a major task, fraught with inherent difficulties, especially when a rational comprehensive approach is taken. Whether we adopt a comprehensive perspective or an incremental approach to policy changes, policy research is necessary if we want to transform social welfare and address poverty and inequality.
The underlying assumption of this study is that, for social welfare to make a meaningful contribution to reconstruction and development, and to address the legacies of apartheid, an appropriate policy framework should be designed. Furthermore, that social welfare should be restructured fundamentally in order to address effectively the needs of the country's citizens. How should one approach such a major task?

This raises a number of questions. For instance, what is social welfare, and, in particular, what is understood by post-apartheid social welfare? What are the origins, functions, and theoretical foundations of social welfare? What is the place of social welfare within the broader national context? These are critical questions that need to be clarified. The research objectives, and what the researcher really means by them, are paramount to the subsequent research methodology and procedures to be followed.

The major objective of this research project is to make some contribution to the reformulating of social welfare policies in a post-apartheid South Africa. Such objective is not only broad and vague, but also complex and difficult. The study therefore aims merely to produce a policymaking framework, not the final answers. It seeks to identify some of the policy principles and their implications for designing alternative social welfare policies. In this way, it is hoped, guidelines may be produced for formulating future social welfare policies.

In order to answer the research question, and to achieve its broad objective, the study had the following specific aims:

(i) To trace and document the theoretical foundations of social welfare as a system to meet human needs in relation to other institutions in society. This will be done by relating social welfare to current development theories

(ii) To study social welfare in South Africa in terms of its historical roots, its structuring, and the forces that shaped it
(iii) To analyze social welfare in South Africa in terms of its appropriateness in addressing contemporary realities and challenges

(iv) To make a special study of the philosophy underlying social welfare in South Africa and to give an overview of attempts to restructure it

(v) To collect the views of stakeholders and other important political role players in the welfare field on the reformulation of social welfare policy and the restructuring of social services in South Africa

(vi) To synthesize the central ideas and issues raised in the study, so as to propose guidelines for the formulation of a new social welfare policy.

1.5 THEORIES AND KEY CONCEPTS

In conducting a study of this magnitude, the researcher should start from a particular point of view, a theoretical frame of reference, which should be clearly stated early in the research process. It means that the researcher should be acquainted with current theories and knowledge relating to his topic. This implies study of relevant theories, and of current literature.

There are several reasons why it is necessary to start with a theoretical frame of reference. It serves as a guide, and helps to focus and direct the study. It also serves as a tool to demarcate the areas to be covered, the data that would be required, and the empirical observations to be made in order to answer the research questions.

To understand the meaning and purpose of social welfare in society, the researcher needed a theory which explained how political and economic processes affected social welfare. Social welfare approaches alone were insufficient in the study of welfare policy. It was therefore considered necessary to go into those theories on which social welfare is grounded. In this respect, theories of development and the role of the State were found to be central. In fact, the researcher realized that social welfare (as a system which responds to human needs) could not be
studied separately from theories of development if we want to make proposals for a post-
apartheid welfare system. Furthermore, such theories are vital if we adopt a developmental perspective of social welfare. An overview of contemporary theories of development is to be found in Chapter Two.

In addition to relevant theories to guide the study, it was also necessary to define its key concepts. Salam-Ansari says that the functional importance of conceptualization is threefold: evolving and directing organized efforts; limiting the scope of inquiry to manageable proportions in a logical, orderly manner; guiding the activities in terms of a systematic methodology (1963: 116).

Three basic concepts are relevant in this research: social welfare as a system to meet human needs; social policy; and the post-apartheid welfare perspective. Although these concepts will be described and defined in the ensuing chapters, it may be necessary here to clarify social policy and the socio-political perspective of the study, starting with a conceptual understanding of apartheid in society and in social welfare. From thence we may proceed to an understanding of post-apartheid social welfare in South Africa. (Social welfare as a system is extensively defined and described in Chapter Three and is therefore not dealt with in 1.5 of the current Chapter.)

1.5.1 Social Policy

Since social policy constitutes the central theme of this study, questions that need to be considered are: What is understood by this concept? Can a distinction be made between social policy, social welfare policy, and economic policy? These key questions are considered in the light of views of experts in this field.

The role of the State appears to be central. States exercise their responsibilities for the welfare of society in two main ways: social policy and economic policy (Weale 1983: 2). Although economic policy should be responsible for distribution of resources, in practice it does not always do so. Consequently, there is a need for an instrument to achieve distributional objectives. This seems to be the role of social policy.

The field of social policy in South Africa is relatively underdeveloped in comparison with Western industrialized countries. In most of such countries, social policy developed
gradually, necessitated by specific needs and challenges. One of the difficulties in defining social policy is that it is an ambiguous concept, with different meanings for different people. There is no clear consensus as to what social policy is, what its boundaries are, or what are appropriate methodologies for analysis. Heffernan's view is significant in this respect:

"To some, social welfare policy implies a set of goals surrounding the ends to be achieved by providing tangible and intangible benefits to various subsets of the population. To others, this policy refers to a highly specific set of procedures designed as a response to very vague ends . . . " (1979: 42).

The general view of social policy is that it constitutes a framework of principles within which decisions are taken to address the issues identified. Titmuss's view is that social policy refers to "the principles that govern action directed towards given ends" (1974: 23). He argues that the concept implies change: changing situations, systems, practices, and behaviour (Ibid). For Titmuss, policy is an action-oriented and problem-oriented concept. Consequently, social policy can be seen as a positive instrument of change; as an unpredictable, incalculable part of the whole political process (Ibid: 26). Marshall agrees with the above views when he says that social policy refers to the "policy of governments with regard to action having a direct impact on the welfare of the citizens, by providing them with services or income. The central core consists, therefore, of social insurance, public (or national) assistance, the health and welfare services, housing policy" (1965: 7).

In practice social policies involve some measure of progressive redistribution of economic as well as non-economic benefits. We may therefore describe social policy as a set of instructions from policy-makers to policy-implementers that spell out both goals and the means for achieving those goals (Nakamura and Smallwood 1980: 31). These instructions can range from precise blueprints to vague guidelines. Social policy does not only set out objectives, it also defines the general boundaries within which implementation will take place.

A distinction is sometimes made between social policy and social welfare policy despite the fact that they are fundamentally the same. The only difference seems to be in their scope. While social policy covers general welfare, social welfare policy focuses more on
individuals and specific target groups. In this way social welfare policy functions as a subset of social policy (Karger & Stoesz 1994: 4). Within this context social welfare policy may be associated with all governmental activities that transfer benefits or social resources to individuals or groups considered needy in order to enhance their life circumstances or expectations (Dubnick & Bardes 1983: 225). From these views it appears that social welfare policy constitutes a set of laws, programmes, and regulations to meet certain specified needs of target groups and to achieve specified objectives. Thus, social policy is defined as a deliberate course of action by society to attain given objectives - a purposive framework to realize goals in view. We may thus conclude that policy is composed of four distinct elements: specific objectives; the means adopted for the attainment of these objectives; the procedure followed to administer the means; and the environment or situation in which this operation takes place (Salam-Ansari 1963: 127).

Having adopted a particular policy, what follows are legislatively enacted or administratively sanctioned procedures for responding to needs and for providing services. Thus, policy implementation encompasses three different dimensions: goals it intends to achieve; procedures in terms of achieving these goals; and consequences, i.e. the anticipated results that can be more or less attributed to the implementation of the procedures. These include analysis of, and definition of, the issues that the policies need to address in their various dimensions. For the policy process to succeed, there needs to be consensus that the situation presents a problem currently or in future. A choice is made from among alternative strategies, and the infra-structure to implement the strategies is developed. The whole process is legitimized by, and finds expression in, appropriate legislation.

Social policies do not operate in a vacuum. We thus need to explore the forces and issues that impact on their analysis and development. Economic and political considerations are central to social policy because policies are generated in the political system and are concerned with the distribution of resources in society. Social policy affects economic policy and economic policy determines the framing of social policy. Consequently, a study of social policy cannot be conducted in isolation from economic policy, and a study of the
society as a whole.

It is also clear that social welfare policy involves a series of political issues and is therefore also described as a political process. DiNitto and Dye emphasize in particular the political nature of welfare policy when they say:

"Social welfare policy is a continuing political struggle over the issues posed by poverty and inequality in society" (1983: 2).

The political nature of social welfare policy seems to be "the conflict over the nature and causes of poverty, and over what, if anything, should be done about it" (Ibid). DiNitto and Dye continue:

"Social welfare policy is political because of disagreements about the nature of problems confronting society, about what should be considered 'benefits' and 'costs', about how to estimate and compare benefits and costs, about the likely consequences of alternative policies, about the importance of one's own needs and aspirations in relation to those of others, and about the ability of government to do anything rationally" (Ibid).

Within this framework DiNitto and Dye conclude that social welfare policy is anything government chooses to do, or not to do, that affects the quality of life of its people (Ibid). On the other hand they say "broadly conceived, social welfare policy includes nearly everything government does from taxation, national defence, and energy conservation, to health, housing, and public assistance".

Another complicating factor is that social policies do not operate in isolation from other policies in society. For Gil, social policy is the entire system of principles and measures which whole societies, not simply their governments, use to allocate and distribute economic resources, statuses, and rights among individuals and groups, and thus to order social relationships (1973). He therefore proposes a comprehensive approach to policy analysis and makes the point that we need to analyze specific policies to uncover their interdependence with other policies, their consistency or lack of consistency with other policies. The point is that different policies need to be synchronized so that they all
operate in harmony in the interest of citizens and in the achievement of broad societal objectives.

What are the functions of social policy, and what are the determining factors that impinge on its development and implementation? It has been said that social policy, particularly welfare policy, attempts to do what the economy fails to achieve in terms of a more equal distribution of resources. Titmuss argues that in terms of the functions that social policies aim to fulfil, some are designed as compensation for socially caused 'diswelfares', while others are seen as an investment in the future. Some intend to maximize personal 'command-over-resources', while others are expected to fulfil integrative functions, to create harmony, and discourage conflict (1968: 130-131). The purpose is to bring about some economic and social equilibrium in terms of economic growth and distribution. Elaborating on these views, Madison says that social policy is generally thought of as a plan of action which can subsequently influence relationships between and within groups toward which it is directed. It can influence the quality of life of a society by serving as a framework to distribute material resources, social rewards, and sanctions (1980: 18). The objectives of social policy may be defined as the elimination of poverty, the maximization of welfare and the pursuit of equality (Rees 1985: 241).

An important question to raise is: Who makes policy and how is it made? In practice the principal actors in policy-making are the people to whom legitimate authority has been assigned. But who are these people? They are the people who occupy positions in governmental institutions that entitle them to determine priorities and make resources available. This normally includes elected officials, legislators, and civil servants. Besides these, the policy process should provide access to interest groups and others from outside government. These outside groups can also exert pressure on the government and influence the design of policies. Policy-making therefore involves a diverse set of authoritative or formal policymakers, who operate within the governmental arena, plus a diverse set of special interest and other interest groups from outside arenas, who press their demands on formal leaders (Titmuss 1968: 32).
In terms of how policies are made, one of two approaches is often adopted; a comprehensive rational approach or an incremental approach. In terms of the comprehensive rational approach, fundamentally alternative policies are designed in the place of existing policies. This approach, although comprehensive, is fraught with risks not foreseen. The result is that many policy-makers adopt an incremental, or reformist, approach to policy formation. The fact that incremental policy formation does not alter too much at a time makes it relatively easier for corrective measures to be taken, and for better results to be achieved. It also poses less of a threat to those who may be affected. Affordability also plays an important role, since the incremental approach takes into account available human and financial resources.

Other policy issues that are often underestimated are values. Personal values and values of society at large play an important role in terms of problem identification, problem analysis, and strategies to deal with the issues. Livingstone highlights the following important criteria to be borne in mind for Developing Countries: economic, political and cultural factors; the family; celebrations; tradition and change; international aid; the interests of the donors; international consultants; and the interests of the recipients (1969: 66-86). In addition to Livingstone's view, Titmuss said that essential background knowledge for policy formulation includes:

"Knowledge of population changes, past and present and predicted for the future; the family as an institution and the position of women, social stratification and the concepts of class, caste, status and mobility, social change and the effects of industrialization, urbanization and social conditions; the political structure; the work ethic and the sociology of industrial relations; minority groups and racial prejudice; social control, conformity, deviance and the uses of sociology to maintain the political status quo" (1974: 15-16).

It is thus clear that a wide range of factors needs to be considered in policy formulation. Six groups of issues are identified by Vogel and Michael:

(i) The costs that the policies would incur,
Various interest groups who may support or oppose the policies,

The implementation of these policies,

The kind of changes that may evolve in the future from the implementation of the policies,

Values and attitudes,

Programme evaluation and assessment of progress (Vogel and Michael 1972).

From the foregoing, we may deduce that social policy is complex and there consequently is a need for continuous dialogue between policy analysts, policy-makers, and the officials responsible for policy implementation.

1.5.2 Apartheid/Post-apartheid Perspectives

An understanding of the societal context in which we try to intervene is an essential precondition for appropriate intervention. For the purposes of this research, we need to describe the ideological basis on which the South African society is structured and the structural constraints and difficulties such basis creates in working towards a more equal and just society.

Some critics would argue that the apartheid system was introduced and established in 1948. This view represents one perspective of apartheid. It is true only if we adopt the "classical" approach to apartheid. Another perspective has been termed the "historical justification perspective". In this case it is argued that apartheid is in fact an old system that evolved in the early days of colonization and has continued ever since (not, of course, without modifications, especially taking modernizing changes into account). Apartheid is basically an old-fashioned colonial regime coerced through the dynamics of industrialization into modernizing its repressive apparatus (Van den Berghe in Beteille
1969: 33). Its adoption in South Africa as official government policy in 1948 should be seen as a logical outcome of such historical processes.

Historical and social events laid a firm basis for apartheid policies and for the present conditions of poverty and inequalities. Some of these are prejudice and discrimination based on race. Although such prejudice and discrimination might be a common feature of many societies, they have been heightened by two factors in South Africa, colonialism and slavery. While slavery was abolished a century-and-a-half ago in South Africa, the racial factor gained in dominance. In South Africa the master-servant relationship in the old Cape Colony, racial wars, and the eventual conquest and domination of Blacks by Whites is crucial to an understanding of present attitudes and conditions. "From the experience of slave-owning and of conquest came the expectation of domination over peoples of colour that still marks much of Afrikanerdom, and indeed most of the White population of South Africa" (Carter and O'Meara 1979: 95). Apartheid can be seen as the outcome of fears of successive generations of Whites driven to adopt a close form of group loyalty, in defence of their European cultural heritage and in the face of the threat of the Black majority. The White ruling class saw the system as the only way to White survival, and to retain the monopoly of power. Afrikaners in particular took their philosophical foundations from the ideal of a people destined to be the bearers of Christian culture and civilization.

With regard to the traditional racial patterns of South Africa, Dr. Malan in 1953 stated in a letter to the Rev. John Piersma of the United Reformed Church:

"It must be appreciated from the outset that apartheid, separation, segregation or differentiation - - whatever the name given to the traditional racial policy of South Africa - - is part and parcel of the South African tradition as practised since the first Dutch settlers at the Cape in 1652, and still supported by the large majority of white South Africans of the main political parties" (Mermelstein 1987: 95).

Dr. Malan's argument was "that a fundamental difference existed between Black and White" and that "the difference in colour is merely the physical manifestation of the
contrast between two irreconcilable ways of life, between barbarism and civilization and between heathenism and Christianity" (South African Institute of Race Relations 1954: 56). Differentiating between Blacks and Whites seems to have been the basic principle on which the apartheid ideology developed. This point is also emphasized by Van Jaarsveld when he says that Whites developed a colour view that originated during the 17th and 18th centuries, based on a distinction between "Christians" and "heathens" in order to protect themselves against the Non-White majority, and to maintain their identity (1979: 5). This was the beginning of the colour line and racial differentiation in South Africa. This tradition was formalized, and in many respects legalized, since 1948 when the National Party came to power. Closely associated with social and racial stratification are ethnic differences in living standards and in local cultures. This has been the case throughout history, and is still a South African reality.

In this study, it will be argued that apartheid in social welfare dates from 1930 with the First Carnegie Inquiry into the Poor-White problem. The point of departure in this Inquiry was narrow and racial. The emphasis was on white poverty and white welfare, not the national welfare of all the inhabitants of the country. Poverty among the majority of the population was to a large extent ignored.

This approach laid the basis of the apartheid social welfare system that evolved. When the findings of the Carnegie Inquiry were discussed at the "Volkskongres" in 1934, it was a one-sided Congress, making proposals for White welfare. In fact the very name "Volkskongres" was indicative of the prevailing and underlying ideology. (Volk must here be translated as Afrikaner nation.) When the Department of Social Welfare was established in 1937, it theoretically had a national responsibility for social welfare, yet the programmes and services that it provided were primarily for the welfare of the White section of the population. This compelled Batson to note:

"It has always struck me as a very happy augury that the telegraphic address of our Union Department of Social Welfare - I suspect who chose it - is the word Volkwel. Social welfare is indivisible. It is the welfare of us all, collectively. It is the antithesis of the search for personal profit . . . It is the antithesis of the search for the advantage of one group, section, or class" (National
Although the Department conveyed the image of a unitary system, welfare provision for Blacks was of a marginal nature and grossly unequal. Voices of protest against this one-sided, racial focus in welfare (and there were such voices) did not make any real impact on the power groups.

During the 1950's a structural division in welfare provision, based on the apartheid ideology, was introduced. Since then, social welfare was provided on a racial basis by various State Departments. This division entrenched inequalities and perpetuated different levels of welfare, nowadays often described in terms of the international concepts of First-World and Third-World communities (see earlier comment on these two terms). The social welfare "reforms" of the 1980's attempted to consolidate such structural divisions and inequalities, with the State at the same time aiming to reduce its institutional welfare responsibilities, as Britain was doing under Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister.

Just as there may be different perspectives of apartheid, so there may be different perspectives of post-apartheid South Africa. The critical question in this regard is the post-apartheid conception of social welfare. Judging by the responses of the welfare community, the impression is gained that what is wanted is restructuring of social welfare on a non-racial, united, and equal basis. What many organizations have in mind is a "social democratic" welfare model, free from racial discrimination. But is this post-apartheid vision embraced by everybody, and is it the vision that should be adopted in social welfare policy of the future? (See Chapter 6 for views expressed by the research respondents.)

The debate about social welfare policies for post-apartheid South Africa can be viewed from more than one perspective. It can be done from a "social democratic" perspective, where the immediate (and may be the only) task is seen to be the restructuring of social welfare on a non-racial, united, and equal basis within a certain period of time. Most of the organizations which spoke up about changes in the government's welfare policies have expressed views along these lines. Another perspective is a fundamental institutional and
societal transformation, where all institutions in society operate democratically in the interest and welfare of all the people. Idealistic as it may seem, this appears to be the post-apartheid perspective of a large number of people and of certain organizations. If this is indeed the dominant post-apartheid perspective, the question is whether it will emerge immediately after "classical" apartheid is abolished. This seems unlikely in terms of contemporary scenarios. The critical question is to what extent the basis for such a system exists within the dominant values in the country. Although this option is not ruled out, it is an objective that will have to go through various stages and processes of transformation -- a "gradualist" transition to a socialist order. If there is indeed to be such a transition (at a time when the world increasingly seems to back away from "socialism") then the transition will in South Africa be more likely to be "gradual", not revolutionary.

The post-apartheid perspective of this study is a restructural perspective, starting from the basic dimensions of South African society, the challenges facing the country, and the views expressed by community organizations. After the formal abolition of apartheid (which however is likely to persist for some time in the beliefs, attitudes, and customs of South Africans), we are not only being faced with critical welfare issues which will have to be addressed. We are also being faced with expectations and basic human needs while pursuing long-term societal objectives that can hardly be achieved without developing a value basis for them. Moreover, in a post-apartheid society, we still retain a racially unequal and fragmented welfare system. Poverty and different levels of welfare amongst the different racial groups remain with us. It might be more realistic to think of transitional phases in terms of an incremental approach. Transitional phase one should have as its first objective the deracialization of social welfare as well as the integration and equalization of different welfare systems. Here, the crucial questions will be, how to do it, over what period of time, and what the economic implications will be. Having addressed these immediate issues, transitional phase two follows, pursuing the longer-term objectives of restructuring social welfare based on different values, and within a new policy framework. The purpose here would be to develop and elaborate the issues, the policy options, and their implications. This study starts with the need to restructure social welfare on a non-racial, united, and equal basis, taking into account the responses and views of relevant
organizations. It then raises the more fundamental issues of societal transformation.

1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Having stated the research objectives, the operational procedures to be employed in order to collect the relevant information must be decided upon. Research methodology should explain, in a logical and systematic way, the path that will be followed in proceeding from premises to conclusions. The process of collecting data, as well as the instruments which will be used in collecting them in the form required, must be systematically determined. In addition, policy research involves skill in the application of different methodological and analytical tools. In the present study, two basic methods were used. The first involved a review of the relevant literature and available documentary evidence. The other was an empirical study, in which the data gathered consisted of opinions and views expressed in face-to-face interviews with respondents.

In the literature review, the following areas were covered:

(i) Theories of development as a frame of reference within which to view and to study social welfare,

(ii) Social welfare as an institution in society, responding to needs of people not met by the economic system;

(iii) An historical overview of the development and establishment of social welfare in South Africa since the 1930's;

(iv) Attempts to reform and to restructure social welfare during the 1970's and 1980's.

This literature review laid the basis and constituted the frame of reference for the empirical study.

As has been said, the second part of the study consisted of an empirical study among community workers and opinion-makers. From the problem statement and the objectives specified, the
qualitative approach appeared appropriate. "Qualitative methods are best used with small numbers of individuals or groups which may well be sufficient for understanding the human perceptions and behaviours which are the main justification for a qualitative approach" (Casley and Kumar 1988: 5). Such approach aims to gather data on numerous aspects of a situation, thereafter constructing a picture of the total. An important assumption of the qualitative paradigm is understanding of the situation from the perspectives of participants. Allan and Skinner emphasize this by stating that "a core feature of qualitative research methods is that satisfactory explanations of social activities require a substantial appreciation of the perspectives, culture, and world-views of the actors involved "(1991: 177-178). Applying qualitative methodology, in-depth interviews were conducted with a variety of organizations on a country-wide scale. The purpose of these interviews was to collect ideas from stakeholders in the field regarding post-apartheid welfare policies. (This process and its findings are discussed in Chapter 6).

1.7 STRUCTURING OF THE STUDY

The different areas covered in this study are identified, as well as the kind of data collected. Clarity about these issues, and a particular line of argument, are both important in guiding the thinking process, and in setting out the form in which data will be collected, analyzed, and finally presented. This is done without predisposing the findings or biasing the study.

The study has the following divisions, which also constitute the several Chapters.

1.7.1 Theoretical Frame of Reference

It was necessary to locate social welfare within an appropriate theoretical framework. This was needed so as to analyze and understand the political, economic, and social context within which social welfare as a system operates.

It is generally accepted that the researcher starts from a particular perspective, or frame of reference, for viewing social reality. A theoretical frame of reference is necessary as a guide to collecting the required information, to making certain
observations, and to the specific questions to be asked. It thus determines the scope of the study. The theoretical frame of reference, or paradigm, is the "mental window through which the researcher views the world" (Bailey 1982: 24). It is this frame of reference that guides the researcher in terms of what he/she sees in the social world, what is selected, and how information is interpreted. It might therefore happen that two persons describing the same phenomenon from two different paradigms, may produce considerably different accounts. Adopting a particular paradigm does not mean that this is the only correct view. It merely represents a school of thought with whom the researcher identifies and starts the research. All data collection requires some presuppositions. "In social science just as in other disciplines, 'facts' do not stand alone but are theoretically informed" (Allan and Skinner 1991: 182).

It is my contention that social welfare and social policy in particular can be studied and understood in terms of development theories. Chapter Two therefore gives an overview of these theories, highlighting the central ideas encompassed in them.

1.7.2 Conceptualization of Social Welfare

Salam-Ansari says the functional importance of conceptualization is threefold:

(i) Evolving and directing organized efforts,
(ii) Limiting the scope of inquiry to manageable proportions in a logical, orderly manner,
(iii) Guiding the activities in terms of a systematic methodology (1963: 116).

Since the main objective of this study is to make proposals for social welfare policy, it is necessary to develop a conceptual understanding of social welfare as a system. Various models of welfare, including the Welfare State, are explored.
This conceptualization of social welfare served as a guide in collecting the data, and in forming the basis of the ensuing analyses and discussions. An overview of the literature in this field is to be found in Chapter Three.

1.7.3 The Establishment and Development of Social Welfare in South Africa

Looking at South Africa in particular, it is necessary to start with an historical overview of social welfare and social care. History is here not just used as background material, but as a means of understanding how current ideas and policies came about. A special study of the South African welfare system and related policies will be made in Chapter Four. The emphasis will be on contextual issues, and the social and political forces that shaped institutionalized welfare in South Africa. The focus will be on the role of the State and the Church in social welfare, the First Carnegie Inquiry, and the debate about White welfare during the 1930's/1940's.

During the period 1948/1960, social welfare was structured on the foundations of the apartheid ideology. Here we need to look at the State's involvement in the establishment of racially-differentiated welfare structures. Furthermore, the issue of partnership between the State and private welfare agencies will be discussed. This section will be concluded by referring to putative reasons for enacting fresh legislation and for the promulgation of the 1978 welfare laws. In this regard the relevant documents and available literature will be consulted.

1.7.4 Government Attempts to Reform Social Welfare in the 1980s

Chapter Five proceeds to a critical issue of debate during the 1980s, i.e. attempts to reform social welfare policies in South Africa. These attempts are critically analyzed in terms of their rationale and underlying philosophies. Particular issues relating to these policies, as well as attempts to embark on development strategies, will be covered. A study is made of the government's social welfare proposals, as
well as its development policies. The relevance of this part of the study is the fact that it sparked the restructuring debate in South Africa.

1.7.5 Views on Post-apartheid Welfare Policies

In studying social welfare for a post-apartheid South Africa, it is essential to consult those constituencies who are directly involved in the welfare field and who will be partly responsible for the implementation of alternative policies. The purpose of Chapter Six is to find out from community organizations what kind of social welfare policies would, in their view, be appropriate. This will be a general synthesis of some of the main welfare ideas amongst community organizations, political organizations, and opinion-makers. In-depth interviews were conducted with certain organizations and individuals, making use of an interview schedule.

1.7.6 Towards a Model for Post-Apartheid Social Welfare

Chapter Seven brings together certain central ideas and theories in order to address the key questions of the study. It juxtaposes theories of development, conceptualization of social welfare, the views of organizations and individuals on social welfare, the solutions offered by the Reconstruction and Development Programme, and the particular welfare issues and needs in a post-apartheid South Africa. The focus is particularly on welfare issues and development strategies. This Chapter sets out to synthesize the theories and views that have emerged, and to assess them in terms of their appropriateness in facing the problems ahead. In this way, data and theory should inform and transform one another and assist us to propose a model for the future. This leads us to our conclusions and proposals for post-apartheid welfare policies.
1.7.7 Restructuring of Social Welfare in South Africa

In conclusion, and in the light of this inquiry, I then propose guidelines and principles for future social welfare policies in South Africa. This is done in full realization that social welfare policies can never be isolated from theories of development and from the prevailing economic and political system. Therefore, the policy guidelines that are proposed take into account dominant values and prevailing political and economic realities in the country, fully appreciating that these are dynamic.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT: AN OVERVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This research project, in which social welfare constitutes the central focus of study, is undertaken within the context of development studies. To understand the meaning and purpose of social welfare, we need a theory which explains how political and economic processes impinge on social welfare. The assumption is that social welfare as a system does not operate in isolation, but should be a central component of development. In this context social welfare is studied as a component, or a division of development. When this is the starting point, we need a knowledge base that goes beyond the confines of a narrow social welfare perspective. It is therefore necessary to develop a broad frame of reference within which the study will be conducted. To develop this frame of reference, the study will review some of the central theories and approaches to development.

It is interesting to note that, since decolonization began, various development models have been applied in an attempt to improve the economic and social welfare of people. Nevertheless poverty, unemployment, and social inequality remain a major challenge in developing countries. Various theories have been advanced to explain the persistence of poverty and social inequality. Theories and philosophies that guide development efforts also exhibit a constant change in emphasis. Furthermore, basic assumptions in terms of economic growth have shifted towards the satisfying of basic human needs, the achievement of equity, and opportunities for equality both within and between nations. More recently, the emphasis has fallen on programmes of structural adjustment.

The intention in this chapter is to review some of these theories and approaches and to determine where we stand in terms of the development debate. This should provide the study with a frame of reference to focus on the South African context and the way in which we could structure and implement development efforts. This broad and general knowledge base of development theories will constitute the framework to study social welfare.
2.2 THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT

On analyzing theories of development, it becomes evident that the over-all purpose of development is to address issues of poverty and inequality. Development is therefore directly concerned with the circumstances of living and improvement of the quality of life. A large body of literature on development issues has emerged since the 1960's, as well as a range of theoretical perspectives. While most theorists seem to agree on the facts of poverty and inequality, there is considerable disagreement about their causes, and consequently the kind of policies and strategies to address them. Despite the controversy around the root causes of the problem, many developing countries have implemented national development plans for improving the rural and industrial sector of the economy. These plans are usually strongly influenced by international aid programmes and agencies that provide capital, technology, and expertise. Furthermore, they are implemented within a particular social, economic and political context, which has an effect on their success, or lack of it.

Furthermore, the advantages and disadvantages that people experience are not only a reflection of processes at work in a particular society, but also a result of the relationship between countries. These are central issues that can affect the impact of development. The importance of this reality is not always fully realized. The implementation of development plans involves political decisions. In advanced as well as developing countries, governmental institutions operate according to political priorities. Different schools of thought dominated the literature on development and change since the late 1950's to the 1970's. During the 1960's the modernization theory was prominent. Another theory, called the dependency or underdevelopment theory, occupied a central place in the development debate in the 1970's. This latter theory draws its ideas from the analyses of the economic system of capitalism developed by Marx. The failure of the modernization theory to resolve poverty and inequality meaningfully led to the emergence of the basic needs approach to development in the 1970s. Currently the emphasis is on the neo-liberal approach and specifically on structural adjustment programmes. This Chapter will attempt to give an overview of these theories and approaches to development.
2.2.1 Industrialization and modernization

The modernization theory emerged during the 1950's and 1960's and draws its ideas from the views of Durkheim and Weber. Durkheim contended that there are two basic types of societies, a traditional and a modern society which have very different forms of social cohesion between their members (Webster 1984: 44). The traditional society is generally characterized by a simple common lifestyle. The society conforms to rigid patterns of traditional norms and beliefs. The modern society emerges through a process of development and modernization. Such a society is characterized by dense population and urbanization. People are competing for scarce resources while the society has to adapt to the new circumstances. Like Durkheim, Weber draws a distinction between traditional and modern societies and sees modernization as a Westernized rational process of development.

Drawing on the ideas of Durkheim and Weber, the theory of modernization was developed. This theory emerged after the process of decolonization of the Third World and departs from the premise that there is a need for sustained development on the Western pattern. Out of these views a tradition-modern dichotomy developed, with the emphasis on the values and norms that operate in these two types of societies and their economic systems.

Based on these theories, there was a heavy emphasis on social and economic development in developing countries. The emphasis was particularly on industrialization on the pattern of the industrialized developed countries. After decolonization, the newly independent states were generally regarded as underdeveloped, which implied that there was a potential that could be realized. The modernization theory believed that poverty should be explained in terms of a backward economy and traditional institutions. It was argued that people are poor "because of their dependence on subsistence agriculture, traditional methods of production and primitive technology, which, coupled with a conservative outlook and natural apathy, had resulted in economic stagnation" (Hardiman & Midgley 1982: 52).
According to this theory the solution to poverty therefore lies primarily in economic growth and modernization of traditional institutions in society. It was assumed that massive capital investment in industrial development and the introduction of modern technology on market principles would create high rates of economic growth, utilization of labour, wage employment and ultimately a reduction in poverty. This was seen as a necessary development in order to address the issue of a growing labour force. Linked to the modernization theory is the ‘trickle down’ assumption, which holds that generating wealth in a society will eventually lead to the distribution of that wealth to all members of society including the poor in the rural areas. To eradicate poverty and inequality, education was applied to "increase the number of skilled workers" and to raise "the level of trained manpower" (World Bank 1980: 12).

It was further suggested that steps should be taken to foster liberal democratic values and institutions such as existed in Western countries. Based on these theories, policies were formulated, development objectives defined, and development plans designed to stimulate rapid economic growth. This has led to massive capital investment by governments. The theory advocated "in particular, the exportation of a vigorous form of capitalism which, unrestricted by government intervention, would rapidly demolish the obstacles to growth and result in widespread prosperity" (Hardiman & Midgley 1982: 53).

As the modernization theory was based on the economic development of the industrialized countries, it was assumed that the developing countries should follow the same road to development as that of the richer nations. Industrialization rather than agriculture was seen as the priority for developing countries. Although developing countries were politically independent, they were still heavily dependent on imported manufactured goods and primary exports to the metropolitan countries. Capital accumulation and import substitution was therefore regarded as a logical way to achieve economic independence from the metropolitan countries.

Another view of development was growth in the per capita income. According to Hope, "Development meant: a rising gross national product, increasing investment in consumption and a rising standard of living" (1992: 335). It is from these views that the modernization theory, based on Western development experiences, has emerged.
However, it did not take long to realize that the strategy did not produce the envisioned results. Coetzee says: "it became clear that economic growth was a necessary but an insufficient precondition for economic development and a clearer distinction was drawn between the concepts of economic growth and development" (1992: 122). The theory worked reasonably well in some countries, in others it did not. Although the GNP per capita had increased, some flaws appeared in the theory that economic growth would "trickle down" and benefit everybody, including the poor. The belief that economic development that increases the Gross National Product (GNP) would simultaneously increase standards of health, welfare, and education, proved to be a false assumption. Therefore, the emphasis shifted more and more to a human development index, which includes issues like life expectancy and literacy rates.

Countries were beginning to challenge the notion that development could be measured purely in terms of growth in the GNP. Webster states that there are problems with using the GNP to measure levels of development. He says that the GNP usually refers to national averages which do not say anything about the distribution of resources among the population. The GNP omits certain activities that have an economic value, and it implies that development can be measured in straightforward quantitative money terms (1984: 27). The basic question confronting countries was how the increased national income was to be distributed so as to improve the living standards and the quality of life of the poor. The solution seems to be economic growth that also includes distribution. Many policy analysts argued that the failure of the modernization approach should be attributed to the strong emphasis on economic growth and development, while the benefits of growth were not distributed so as to include poor individuals and households. Although the national incomes of some countries have increased, and had some results in countries like Taiwan and Korea, this did not solve the problems of poverty and inequality in most of the developing countries. The benefits of growth seem to have gone to those who were already well-off, not the poor. Gil says that "this theory has never really worked, and that whatever benefits result from such industrialization tend to flow away from working people who produce them and who bear a heavy cost, upward, towards privileged, and frequently unproductive, segments of societies" (1976: 87). It was realized that growth alone is not enough; it should be linked with a plan to redistribute the products of growth. A new conceptual framework for public policy is therefore called for in order to ensure success in terms of certain social indicators of development.
Dependence on external capital and technology was another problem. Meier and Steel note in this regard: "But the illusion of reduced dependence on imports was subsequently dispelled by the inability to maintain production when exports fell and imported inputs became scarce" (1989: 7). They continue by saying "Contrary to the intention of the import-substitution strategy, dependence on imports increased rather than decreased for two main reasons: the import-substitution industries tended to be highly dependent on imported capital and inputs, and food imports became increasingly necessary because of the inability of agriculture to keep pace with population growth" (Ibid). The bias of policies toward industrialization also discouraged agricultural investment and production with the result that rural people flooded to urban areas while the smaller traditional sectors of the economy were neglected in rural areas. The notion of modernization, as originally postulated, seems to be virtually defunct. However, some of its underlying assumptions seem to emerge in neo-liberalism and the concurrent structural adjustment programmes, which are discussed in this Chapter.

The potential of modernization and industrialization cannot be disputed. The problem seems to develop a process to distribute the benefits of industrialization to the wider population. Where this is not done, the generation of wealth benefits primarily a minority of elites in powerful positions.

2.2.2 Dependency Theory

Although the modernization theory has not been rejected and is still applicable, social scientists were looking for theories that could explain the persistence of poverty. One of the theories developed was the dependency theory, which is regarded as one of the best-known neo-Marxist development theories. This theory emerged out of the failure of the import substitution strategy adopted in a number of Latin American countries. Towards the end of the 1960's, it became increasingly clear that the import substitution policy was not decreasing dependency on foreign countries. "Foreign companies went behind tariff walls, national industry remained dependent on the import of machinery, and the internal market was too limited (through unequal income distribution) to generate sufficient demand" (Schuurman 1993: 4).
The dependency school adopted a more sociological and political approach to development. It believed that poverty and underdevelopment could be explained in terms of the exploitation of the poor countries by the rich ones. Dependency theorists were arguing that this process led to a growing social, political, and economic marginalization of many of the periphery countries. This is seen as the primary cause of underdevelopment and poverty in the Third World. Hope says: "Dependency theory raised the question of why peripheral industrialization did not have its logical effects on the course of development. It identified the problem of dependence with the assumed hegemony of the stronger over the weaker countries, a relationship that was seen as unilateral and invariably negative, which was held responsible for all the ills of the periphery" (Hope 1992: 336).

This theory implied that we should understand the international political-economic system that accompanied colonization. This has divided the world into centre countries and peripheral countries. Within the global context, the dependency concept indicates that underdevelopment is a historical process, and that it is not a condition necessarily intrinsic to the Third World and, furthermore, that underdevelopment is an inherent consequence of the functioning of the world capitalist system of which the dominant and dependent countries form a part. Development should therefore be understood in terms of a country’s links with a global economic system. According to the dependency school, we should focus on the role of external factors. This view of development had a negative and demoralizing effect on development efforts. Hope holds that "the exclusive focus on dependency to explain underdevelopment encouraged the evolution of a paralysing and self-defeating mythology" (Ibid). Although this theory explains the persistence of poverty, it does not provide a practical solution to the dilemma.

Within this theoretical frame of reference, it was argued that:

(i) Multinational corporations impose a universal consumption pattern without taking local needs into account;

(ii) They use capital-intensive techniques in areas with large labour resources;

(iii) They out-compete national capital, or undertake joint ventures with local capital;
They use a variety of methods to transfer capital out of a country;

They involve themselves in national political and economic affairs via (among others) their relationships with the local bourgeoisie (Schuurman 1993: 5).

Schuurman says further in this respect:

"In short, the contention was that both a penetration of bank and industrial capital, and a consumption ideology that alienated the periphery from itself and made it dependent on the core, led to large-scale marginalization and the non-realization of development potential" (Ibid).

Dependency theory emphasized the international inequality and unequal trade relations between the industrial countries and the Third World. It indicated that poverty cannot only be addressed at the national level. Hardiman and Midgley explained in this regard:

"Dependency theorists view underdevelopment not as an original, passive condition but as the result of a historical process which expropriated the wealth of the subjugated satellite countries...." (1982: 55).

Dependency is created by capitalism and industrialization because the processes often destroy the traditional mode of production.

2.2.3 The Basic Needs Approach

In order to address the issue of growth with distribution, the emphasis shifted at the beginning of the 1970's towards the satisfaction of basic needs as a more appropriate development strategy. It was argued that policies should favour distribution and make provision for the basic needs of the poor. This school of thought suggested State involvement to ensure more equal distribution of the fruits of development. The primary objectives of the basic needs approach are to provide opportunities for full physical, mental and social development of individuals. The idea is to tackle poverty directly by attending to the immediate private consumption requirements of a family and essential public services for the poor such as food, shelter, clothing, education, health, water, sanitation and public transport. "At the heart of this approach lies a desire for social justice and
welfare based on a concern that the material resources of a society should be distributed more
evenly throughout the population" (Webster 1984: 35). This includes all the resources of the
society, including public services such as hospitals and schools, and investment in agricultural or
industrial development (Ibid). In rural areas the approach stresses the need for land reform, and, in urban regions, governmental assistance to small businesses and the informal sector of the
economy. It also encourages greater participation in the economy and the culture of society. "By investing in the poor (that is human capital formation) and meeting their basic consumption requirements the strategy set out to address growth and inequality concurrently" (Coetzee 1992: 122).

The basic needs approach claims that we cannot only emphasize economic development. Basic needs themselves should be the central theme of the development debate. The approach is clearly aimed at improving the welfare of people by providing goods and services needed to eliminate poverty and its manifestations. Lisk says that "planning for basic needs satisfaction should be regarded as a continuous process of economic development and social progress, in view of the dynamic nature of the basic needs approach to development which aims at both absolute and relative improvements in standard of living" (1985: 18).

Among the key organisations in the international arena that promoted the idea of the basic needs approach were the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Labour Organisation. According to this approach the ultimate purpose of development is to provide increasing opportunities to all people for a better life. Furthermore, it is essential to expand and improve facilities for education, health, nutrition, housing and social welfare and to safeguard the environment. This approach suggested a broader and more meaningful conceptualization of development. The idea was also taken up by the World Employment Conference of the International Labour Organisation when it proclaimed "the promotion of employment and the satisfaction of basic needs of each country's population" as a fundamental principle for national development (Ghai et al 1977: ii). Also in academic and policy-oriented research circles, a serious re-appraisal of development strategies took place.
Planning for the satisfaction of basic needs requires policies, programmes and projects that are specifically aimed at the fulfilment of these objectives. Besides the specific programmes and policy framework, education is emphasized as an important element in basic needs performance. It is seen as a central element to provide people with a broad base of knowledge, attitudes, values and skills on which they can build in later life. Education can fulfil an important function in equipping people to provide for other basic needs such as nutrition, safe drinking water, health services and shelter. Education may also improve income performance and the quality and level of income distribution. It is argued that there is a direct relationship between improved education, improved income distribution, basic needs satisfaction and the level of welfare of the individual.

Proponents of the basic needs approach realize that it is not so easy to determine the nature of these basic needs and the quality of provision. The basic needs of people and the type of provision are relative, depending on the culture and values of a particular society. It is suggested that the approach should take into account different types of climate and environmental conditions which incorporate the main components of housing needs. Each dwelling should be assessed against these standards (Sheehan and Hopkins 1979: 9). This implies that needs cannot be isolated from the prevailing socio-economic context and environmental conditions. It also means that, since well-being is directly related to the satisfaction of needs, it must also be seen in the same cultural and societal context. Consequently, it is usually argued that basic needs targets should be country specific and flexible over time, because needs differ between countries. For example, calorie requirements depend on the age, sex, body weight and activity structure of the population, and in some countries it may make sense "to focus first on satisfying basic needs at a fairly rudimentary level and, after that target is achieved, to set more demanding targets, or even to set a sequence of targets at ascending levels" (Ibid: 24). With regard to what constitute basic needs, Lisk also says:

"Definitions of what constitute basic needs are generally country specific; more precisely, core basic needs are likely to vary between regions or communities within the same country" (1985: 23).

In summarising the main thrust of the basic needs-approach, Ghai et al say:

(i) The basic needs-approach means that the meeting of the basic needs of the poor
becomes the core of development planning and policy.

(ii) Basic needs are not confined to material needs only. They also include other dimensions of human needs, such as fundamental human rights and freedoms, participation, self-reliance, etc.,

(iii) Basic needs are not static. They evolve over time in line with the growth of the economy and the aspirations of the people.

(iv) There is general agreement that the core material needs should consist of food, education, health, housing and sanitation.

(v) There are different ways to achieve basic needs objectives, depending on differing cultural traditions and other circumstances of individual countries and regions.

(vi) The need for "structural transformation" is stressed, with special emphasis on the redistribution of assets and incomes.

(vii) The approach recognises and emphasises the distribution of political power as the central factor for the initiation and implementation of basic needs strategies (1977: 14-15).

The satisfaction of basic needs is synonymous with the survival of man. Historically these needs were satisfied primarily by man's own activities through a system of subsistence economy. Since the emergence of the "modern economy", the basic needs of people are satisfied primarily through institutions in society. Employment and money are determining factors to satisfy basic needs and to secure the welfare of human beings. In this way people produce their means of subsistence, material life and well-being. Therefore the relationship between human beings and their environment can be analyzed in material terms. Where needs are not met adequately through economic activities, supplementary structures need to be devised to assist those whose basic needs are not met.

Social welfare as an institution responds to the basic needs of people. It has been derived directly from the prevailing economic system, and represents an alternative to meet basic needs and to distribute material resources. Social welfare can therefore be conceptualized in terms of basic needs and in particular social development. The basic needs of people are met within a specific social context and a specific economic framework. This framework is characterised by material
interests pursued by man, and social processes which have established themselves historically.

It should therefore be clear that we cannot study social welfare as an institution in isolation from other institutions in society. This compels us to adopt a particular approach, a theoretical frame of reference to look at social welfare. It is therefore necessary that the researcher analyses this institution in society from a particular point of view. This helps to place the relevant information in context, to explain social welfare, and to understand it.

2.2.4 Neo-Liberalism

During the 1970's neo-liberalism (also known as the free market ideology) as a theory of development began to enjoy increasing support in certain circles. This view that freer trade is an economically optimal policy from the national as well as the international point of view, is an old economic principle that dates back to Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations in 1776. However, recent international economic and political developments gave rise to the renewed emergence of this development school. The oil crisis at the beginning of the decade and the subsequent restructuring of international capitalism, led to a redefinition of the role of the State. The neo-liberal school of thought questioned the usefulness of explicit development policies in which the State plays a regulatory role. This view laid the basis for a liberal and free market style of development. State interference with the market was considered ineffective, and it was argued that this should decrease. The neo-liberal view is that "the State should primarily endeavour to lower the fiscal deficit through devaluation, deregulation of prices, and decreasing State subsidies" (Schuurman 1993: 11). Consequently, there are attempts to dismantle the Welfare State, and the emergence of a "counter-revolution in development thinking" (Ibid). This approach to development postulated the need for free-market mechanisms and the importance of the private sector to lead economic growth and distribution of resources. Arguments here are that there is accumulating evidence "that in those countries which have low taxes and low levels of government intervention, the quality of life of the people is superior to that in countries where there are high taxes and high levels of government intervention" (Davie 1989:1). Some of the benefits of such social policies, it is said, are high economic growth, rapidly rising real wages, less unemployment, low crime
rates, and higher life expectancy. The emphasis in this model is on competition, the accumulation of private wealth, while the free-market is the mechanism whereby individuals in capitalist societies compete for private wealth. In spite of what proponents of this model of development say, there has been increasing concern in recent years that this "economic model may be inadequate to the task of projecting a humane framework for social welfare activities" (Cummings 1983: 17).

The outcome of neo-liberalism in many Third World Countries was to limit the role of the State, a liberal economy, and a strict monetary policy according to the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. "Emphasis on short-term economic management in response to the crisis replaced a coherent development strategy for the Third Development Decade in the 1980's and led to a neglect of the human development idea of the 1970's" (Braidotti et al 1994: 18). Neo-liberalism is a continuation of the modernization paradigm, but in fact has less to offer because it denies any role for the State in redistributing opportunities and resources. The withdrawal of the State led to increasing impoverishment of low-income groups. In particular neo-liberalism created a frame of reference for proposing and implementing structural adjustment policies in Developing Countries.

2.2.5 Structural Adjustment Programmes

The international debt crisis of the late 1970s has brought a halt to development in the Third World while these countries were forced to divert to structural adjustment programmes. This debt crisis has led to a general shift in the prevailing orthodoxy, away from State involvement towards greater reliance on market solutions and development initiated in the private sector. Two problems necessitate this policy adjustment: the fact that economic growth and development policies with their strong State involvement did not produce the required results; and changes at the macro level of the industrial economies. The intention was to solve the financial crisis, which primarily threatened the First World financial system, and to force corrupt governments to change their policies. Government activity and interventions were now curtailed, with deregulation and privatisation being the order of the day. "Disenchantment with the State as a vehicle for promoting development led to the exploring of possibilities for greater government
decentralization and local mobilization for development" (Hope 1992: 339). According to Coetzee, the factors that have contributed to the introduction of structural adjustment programmes were a lack of sound governance and macro-economic management, increasing debt, overvalued exchange rates, distorted factor prices, and unrealistic tax regimes (1992: 125).

A number of developing countries have experienced serious balance-of-payment problems since the 1980's. These problems were primarily attributed to weak domestic development policies and institutions. During this phase in the development process, the emphasis shifted to economic restructuring and major reforms to address declining living standards and economic decay. Many developing countries had to submit to structural adjustment programmes under pressure from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, also referred to as "Fund Stabilisation Policies". Structural adjustment is characterized by devaluation, increased producer prices and reduced wage bills, wage freeze, decline in real wages and salaries, elimination of subsidies, and increased privatization (Schuurman 1993: 94). The strategic approach is to cut on State spending, to cut back on State employment, and to ensure financial discipline.

These programmes were prescribed to developing countries as conditions to acquire loans and to deal with balance-of-payment problems (Zundrum 1990: 281). Structural adjustment is therefore a reflection of contemporary global distribution of financial and political power. Its primary objective is to stabilize the world financial system. Donor organisations also seem to collaborate with each other in this respect, which narrows the options for poor countries. Mazrui stated in this regard:

"Africa used to be able to play one rich country against another. This has become extremely difficult now because there is considerable concentration and co-ordination among the rich" (Hansen & Twaddle 1991: 351).

These agencies insisted on structural adjustment programmes and political accountability as conditions for aid packages.

The policy changes also reflected growing concern in the ability of the State to address poverty and inequality effectively. According to Meier and Steel, the shift in policy derived from five important and interrelated themes. They say:
"First, despite initial rapid expansion, industry has gone from a leading to a lagging sector. Second, a substantial share of capacity created under infant industry policies exceeds the demand in local markets and appears unlikely to be competent in international markets. Third, the growing gap between industry's imported input requirements and the availability of foreign exchange has further contributed to the under-utilization of capacity. Fourth, unfavourable international economic trends and slowness in adjusting the macro-economic policies associated with import-substitution industrialization strategies have caused export earnings and domestic production to stagnate. And fifth, inefficiencies in resource use and continuing subsidies in public industries have a budgetary drain in a period when resources have become increasingly tight" (1989: 3).

We may pose the question, what is structural adjustment and what is its likely consequences? Will this paradigm shift really produce the anticipated results? Although structural adjustment may be explained in a variety of ways, the most common view of its supporters is that it is "the sustained pursuit of a programme of policy reforms that is designed to reduce economic and financial imbalances arising from domestic or external shocks and to address policy deficiencies that are impeding progress towards accelerated economic growth" (Hansen and Twaddle 1991: 20).

McMahon says "A SAP generally consists of a devaluation of the currency, a reduction of government subsidies to firms, an attempt to get rid of or reduce the anti-export bias of the economy, some liberalization of the labour market so as to reduce real wages, a reduction of the government deficit, and an assortment of other policies which will make the economy more reliant on prices or capitalist markets" (1991: 150). It would thus appear that we are faced here with a control mechanism, not necessarily a developmental approach.

According to the World Bank, structural adjustment is "designed to produce rapid, viable balance of payment" (1983: xx). Although some programmes also include agricultural development, the emphasis is primarily on the restructuring of the industry on free market principles. The rationale in this regard is that "policies designed to restructure the pattern of industrial growth and to revitalize agriculture should stimulate employment, improve income distribution and alleviate poverty" (Ibid: xxi). From the discussions so far, it is clear that adjustment programmes have a narrow economic focus. The programmes seem primarily to emphasize short-term restoration of the balance of payments equilibrium and financial stability. "Their objectives also included improvements in the incentive system and medium to long-term aggregate growth" (Zuckerman
In this way governments are encouraged to reform and to embark on economic restructuring as proposed by international donor agencies.

From the above description it is clear that structural adjustment is primarily concerned with economic restructuring, strategies and reforms, a liberation of the economy from State intervention, and a reliance on the market. Structural adjustment policies say the State should withdraw as the initiator of development in favour of the private sectors of the economy in line with the neo-liberal economic thinking. Individual countries should adapt their industrial policies to their particular conditions and objectives, and to requirements imposed by the donor organizations. Ironically, the assumption is that these policies should be internally developed and controlled, regardless of external circumstances. The question is: How feasible is such a theory?

An important issue is the potential conflict between policies that protect the local market, private enterprise, and the impact of international economic trends and events on the national economy. Furthermore, there seems to be some tension between the supposed free play of the market and governmental intervention in the allocation of resources. If the government, whose primary responsibility is the welfare of the citizens, cannot do this any longer, who should be responsible for such allocations? Meier and Steel say in this regard:

"The premise underlying the current emphasis on industrial restructuring is that effective use of existing resources can both raise production quickly in the short term and lay a stronger foundation for industry to sustain growth in output, employment, and productivity over the long term" (1989: 4).

The "trickle-down" theory is thus implicitly accepted as the answer to the question of the allocation of resources. It is argued that the experience with government interventions to promote industrialization has often been counterproductive and unsuccessful. Perspectives vary therefore from direct government intervention and regulation to a more decentralized economic system based on market principles. There seems to be a need for the State to define clearly its role in the process of development and the allocation of resources.

Central to structural adjustment is the linkage between the industry and other sectors of the economy. However, the concern here is about an adjustment strategy from the viewpoint of the industry, although not in isolation from wider economic, political, and social issues. The
assumption is that industrial adjustment should "be based on a sound strategy of agricultural development to take advantage of dynamic linkages on both the supply and demand sides" (Meier and Steel 1989: 4).

What is required, it is argued, is freer trade as an initial element to encourage more efficient use of scarce resources, investment, and properly functioning markets to set prices and allocate resources. Of equal importance, according to recent structural adjustment programmes, are complementary policy reform to ensure that certain sectors are not adversely affected. Thus it is argued that adjustment is a "complex matter which involves first of all a substantial change in the existing patterns of resource-use to eliminate inefficiencies and establish a structure of production more closely attuned to the prevailing international patterns of relative prices, interest rates, and other conditions. Thereafter it needs a sustained flexibility of policies to enable resources to be allocated at the margin relatively rapidly in response to the evolution of international and other conditions" (World Bank 1989: 4). The focus of policy in structural adjustment is on a "search for more intensive use of capital and greater efficiency of resource use in general" (Ibid: 2).

Structural adjustment programmes suggest that the State withdraws gradually from areas where it is least competent, i.e. production, marketing, distribution responsibilities and the regulation of the private sector. The State should rather concentrate on "creating the enabling environment: political stability, human rights, a sound policy framework aimed at strengthening the working of the markets, and rehabilitation of the economic and social infra-structure needed for development" (Hansen & Twaddle 1991: 40).

It is argued, the State as well as the private sector, have complementary roles to play. The State should provide "much of the vision and direction for the future" as well as "the underlying policy environment and the rehabilitation and maintenance of devastated but critical economic and social infrastructure without which the private sector cannot succeed" (Ibid: 41). The question here is how free is the free market? In reality the economy could be privatized and not be subjected to the free market. The free market can easily be monopolized and controlled by a powerful elite, be they private individuals or politicians. It is not only the State that inhibits market forces to
operate freely. There are private social forces that can create, at times, greater impediments to the market than the State (Ibid: 376 - 377). Hansen & Twaddle propose an interesting concept in this respect, called "market socialism" or "people's capitalism", which promotes the profit principle while retaining a crucial role by the State for redistribution through fiscal mechanisms (Ibid).

However, it should be clear that structural adjustment is nothing but privatization and reducing the State's involvement in the economy and the allocation of resources. What we have here is the impact and power of international economic forces on the national economy. The local economy is strongly influenced by international donor organizations like the IMF and the World Bank. These are realities and obstacles facing development strategies which try to promote the welfare of the local population.

So far it is disputed whether structural adjustment has achieved any meaningful results and what its effects are. However, studies which have been conducted on its effects in a number of countries have concluded "that the adjustment policies themselves have tended to have adverse effects on the lower income groups of these countries, but that in some cases these adverse effects were offset or reduced by other measures such as land reform, educational expansion or employment programmes, that were followed simultaneously to help the poor" (Zundrum 1990: 282).

On the operation of structural adjustment and why it was necessary to introduce it, two perspectives are evident: a narrow perspective and a broader perspective. The narrow view may be described as "aiming essentially at achievement of internal and external macro-economic balances. The primary objectives are to promote a sustainable balance of payments and to reduce budget deficits" (Mills 1989: 5). To a large extent the blame is put on internal policies with scant emphasis on the impact of negative external factors. This view of structural adjustment held by the donor organisations includes introducing price reforms to eliminate or reduce subsidies; reducing central government budgetary deficits; liberalizing external trade; improving exchange rate policies; and providing incentives for the export sector. The broader interpretation views structural adjustment "as a means to address long-term development issues" (Ibid). However,
many countries see external factors in a "commanding role". They consider the decreasing terms of trade, as well as instability in exchange and interest rates, to be major issues. The view is that sub-Saharan African countries urgently need to adjust the structures of their economies to make them less vulnerable to external shocks and to enable them to respond more flexibly to such shocks. Strong adjustment programmes should aim at integrating national and subregional economies, diversifying production and building infrastructure (Ibid).

Structural adjustment is regarded as a short-term stabilization programme while its long-term impact on the structure of the State and society is not really recognized. In reality, and in particular in relation to human needs, adjustment is a long-term process. This has implications, for instance, for social welfare programmes in the short and medium term. Braidotti et al state in this regard:

"Emphasis on debt repayment shifted the priorities for government spending away from the public sector and social services such as health, education, and food subsidies to areas where production for internationally tradeable goods could be stimulated in order to produce goods in exchange for foreign currency" (1994: 18).

There is strong evidence that it is negatively affecting human welfare. (Zuckerman 1989: 2). In this regard Zundrum says:

"While it is claimed that by promoting growth and efficient resource allocation, adjustment programs on the whole play a constructive role in safeguarding the long-term interest of the poor, it is also found that some of the macro-economic policies that aim at restructuring production may aggravate the plight of some vulnerable groups in the short run" (1990: 281).

Zuckerman continues:

"The poverty costs of adjustment are not simply a short-term problem. Adjustment is taking longer and proving far more arduous than originally expected. Ideally, adjustment should spur long-term growth and an improved standard of living for the poor. However, even with growth, the poor would benefit only to the limited extent that trickle down occurs. Adjustment programs therefore need to be designed to increase the productivity of the poor so they will contribute to growth" (Ibid: iii).
The strategy seems to create a sharp decline in living standards for most and a steep rise in the price of food and social services (Cornwell 1992: 2).

Although data to demonstrate that adjustment programmes have a deteriorating effect on social welfare are not readily available, it has become clear that countries with adjustment programmes have reduced public expenditure on social services, cut back on staffing and experienced higher unemployment (Zuckerman: 2). The low-income groups increasingly paid the price for the policy of structural adjustment. Government expenditures for social services are severely reduced with serious consequences for poorer people. They experience a severe decline in health services, welfare services, educational standards and income. Real wages have decreased and social welfare services are not high priorities. There is clear evidence that "poor women in particular had to compensate for the cuts in social services by an increase in their work . . . This situation led to a standstill and even regression in social development in many countries of the South; poverty was increasing, and the natural resource base came under heavy pressure to compensate for the tightening situation" (Braidotti et al 1994: 18). Natural resources are increasingly exploited in Developing Countries for debt repayment while satisfaction of local needs becomes more and more difficult.

Zuckerman mentioned some features of adjustment programmes which particularly affected the distribution of social welfare services. They are:

* Currency devaluation and export promotion measures.
* Liberalization of prices and lifting of subsidies.
* Reduction of public sector staffing either through cutbacks or liquidation of enterprises.
* Cuts in public sector salaries.
* Cuts in and/or increased cost recovery for public social sector expenditures.
* Targeted social sector expenditures to protect and assist the poor (Ibid: 12 - 13).

These measures have a direct impact on prices, basic need satisfaction, employment, and earnings. It is quite clear that structural adjustment programmes have far-reaching effects not only on the socio-economic policies of African countries, but also on their politics (Boachie-Danquah 1992: 244).
Structural adjustment is a strictly prescriptive approach. In Ghana for instance structural adjustment emphasized the reduction or withdrawal of direct State intervention in the productive and distributive sectors of the economy. The role of the State was restricted to the creation of an institutional and policy framework conducive to the mobilization of private enterprise and initiative (Ibid: 245).

In congruence with these views, Boachie-Danquah says that structural adjustment had a devastating effect on social services and that the poor have "generally become poorer, both relatively and absolutely, since the introduction of SAP" (Ibid: 246). In the short run it would seem that the groups that have benefitted from the programme are top executives in public services who are called upon to attend numerous conferences, workshops and seminars and are also engaged as consultants and advisors. Others are top executives in private business who deal with foreign capital, while the poorer sections of the population benefit only marginally.

As the negative effects of structural adjustment accumulates and becomes more evident, it is said: to minimize the effects of adjustment programmes we need to protect the poor during adjustment. The provision of basic services, including social services, should not be neglected. Programmes in education, social welfare, health and nutrition, and family planning are regarded as important foundations for development and for a successful strategy of structural adjustment. This suggests a need for a broadly-based, balanced approach in a programme of structural adjustment. In devising a development strategy, it is further argued that the reasons for past industrial performance and policy be analyzed, that policies be adjusted to provide positive incentives for efficient resource use, and to ensure that a strong supply response is supported by the business environment, infrastructure, and institutions (Meier and Steel 1989: 5). In practice, and in particular the way structural adjustment is implemented, this seems to be a fallacy.

Furthermore, for such a programme to succeed requires a strong commitment from the government, the business sector, and the agricultural sector, as well as the institutional capacity to design and manage the implementation of the programme. One of the root causes of unsuccessful development efforts it is said, has been the lack of capacity in governments and institutions to respond quickly and decisively to national and international challenges.
"Development" it is argued, "depends on the capacity of a society to analyze, adapt, initiate, and manage change" (World Bank 1991: 6). Policy analysis and development management are therefore crucial for development programmes to succeed.

Consequently, capacity building is emphasized as an essential element of development policy. Human and institutional capacity becomes crucial for successful and sustainable development. It is suggested that governments and donor organisations work together in capacity building in diverse ways - through projects to develop human resources, agriculture, education, health, the environment, and so forth. All these activities require the ability to analyze and formulate responsive policies and to implement them. Rigorous policy analysis coupled with professional management are regarded as crucial elements to support progress in virtually every other sector. Capacity building requires a new partnership between the major parties involved in the development field "to build over the long-term a critical mass of professional policy analysts and economic managers who will be able to manage the development process and to ensure the more effective utilization of already trained African analysts and managers " (Ibid: 5).

In addition to management skills and capacity building, a sense of ownership and community participation is also emphasized. Community participation in this regard is defined "as an active process by which beneficiary/client groups influence the direction and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self reliance or other values they cherish" (Paul 1987: 2). In relation to capacity building and community participation, action planning is also mentioned as crucial. "Action planning supplements conventional planning and implementation approaches, and strengthens the institutional capacity within a developing country to efficiently and effectively plan and manage implementation of their [sic] development strategies " (Silverman 1986). Action planning, it is said, improves capacity, and local ownership of development projects is ensured because it involves officials and beneficiaries in the process of planning and decision-making, effective organisations and teams are created, systems and procedures for implementation are established, and management capacities are institutionalized.
Structural adjustment with its basis in neo-liberal thinking has in the case of most African countries not had the beneficial results promised. From a developmental perspective it is clear that South Africa should take all precautions to avoid being put in a situation where it has to accept a structural adjustment programme.

2.3 CONCLUSIONS

Development theory at the moment finds itself in a dilemma. During the 1980's scholars began to talk increasingly about an "impasse in development theory". While the vacuum existed, many Third World countries experienced extreme economic difficulties. It is recognised that applied development theories and development policies have in the main failed to improve living standards and the quality of life in developing countries. Attempts to modernize post-colonial societies did not bring the promised improvement in the living conditions of people. "Instead, the development process contributed to the growth of poverty, to an increase in economic and gender inequalities, and to the degradation of the environment which further diminishes the means of livelihood of poor people, particularly women" (Braidotti et al. 1994: 1). Notwithstanding the averaged improvement in life expectancy, child mortality, and literacy rates - debt problems, problems such as unemployment, housing, human rights, poverty and landlessness - are increasing at alarming rates (Schuurman 1993: 9). The impasse emerged when it was realized that:

(i) The gap between the rich and the poor countries continued to widen and that the Developing Countries were unable to narrow the gap whatever strategy was followed;

(ii) Developing Countries became pre-occupied with short-term policies during the 1980's in order to survive;

(iii) Economic growth was having a catastrophic effect on the environment;

(iv) Socialism as a viable political means of solving the problem of underdevelopment was declining;
(v) The world market operated as an over-arching whole, and that individual countries could not approach development policies oriented at the national level;

(vi) The Third World was not a homogeneous entity explained by global theories - - a growing recognition of differentiation within the Third World;

(vii) The advancement of post-modernism within the social sciences (Schuurman 1993: 10-11).

This failure could be ascribed to various factors. Actors in the development arena analyze the problem from different angles, and consequently suggest different solutions. Some emphasize the development of effective policies, others the need for a new kind of science, while some stress the acceptance of other epistemologies and other ways of producing knowledge (Braidotti et al 1994: 13). On the level of epistemology, feminist critics of science make suggestions for transformation in the production of knowledge which they consider indispensable for sustainable development styles conceived in holistic terms (Ibid). Hope mentions the legacy of development planning, an approach to economic development that concentrated investment decisions in the hands of the State and negated the role of the market mechanism. Development policies, he says, particularly in Africa and the Caribbean, were based on socialist ideology which was regarded as the automatic alternative to colonialist policies after independence (1992: 345). Schuurman who seemed to agree with Braidotti argued that "major factors contributing to this impasse were post-modern criticism of theory formation in social sciences, the growing awareness that the emphasis on economic growth - awarded a central role in development theory - resulted in an insupportable burden on the natural environment, and loss of the Socialist paradigm as the link between theory and development praxis" (1993: 1).

Thus, there is a critical need to look at strategies beyond the development theory impasse. Contrary to what neo-liberalism would have us believe, it would appear that development management has a great part to play in the development effort. More recently it has become clear that development is not the result simply of applying theories, models, or strategies, but that development should be managed. Managing development has a direct impact on the nature and
structure of the change effected through the development process. Despite the fact that management in the developing countries is hampered by a great many factors which require major administrative reform, the role of development management will always be a critical one in development.

A balanced perspective may be a more appropriate approach to development, where market solutions to development are coupled with improved government policy and regulatory intervention of the market. The underlying conditions of unemployment and poverty can be remedied only through the balanced operation of private initiative and government intervention (Weitz 1986). These two driving forces may be found to be critical for balanced economic growth and development. Such a theory of development calls for co-ordinated planning to maximize the growth of the agricultural, industrial, and service sectors. We should not rely on one orientation alone. Consequently, there is a need to explore the dangers of the market-oriented approach as well as new forms of government intervention.

In search for alternatives to development, the concept of an "alternative normativist" approach is emphasized (Braidotti et al 1994: 108). This view propagates a more holistic understanding of human well-being by emphasizing the role of self-reliance, alternative lifestyles, culture, and material as well as non-material human needs. The notion of economic activity and growth as the central basis for the satisfaction of human needs is seen as secondary. However criticism against the "alternative normativist" approaches to alternative development revolves around the fact that they operate from "the assumption of a universal validity of their alternative norms and values and thus reproduce the dangers inherent in all types of universalisms, including that of the dominant development model" (Ibid). Thus, there exists a need for a development model that is comprehensive and integrated.

This overview provides a general theoretical framework for the analysis and understanding of development issues. The question that needs to be answered now is: Where does social welfare, as a system, fit into this broad framework, and what are its functions? In the chapter that follows, the place and functions of social welfare as a social institution in society are examined.
CHAPTER THREE

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF SOCIAL WELFARE AS A SYSTEM TO MEET HUMAN NEEDS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter examined various theories to eradicate problems of unemployment, poverty, and inequalities. Central to this discourse was economic development to improve the quality of life and to secure the welfare of citizens. In practice these theories proved to be unsuccessful in achieving these objectives. As this particular study concentrates on social welfare as a system, there is a need for conceptual clarity of social welfare in relation to issues of development, as well as its place in society. This chapter aims to develop a conceptual understanding of social welfare. Social welfare policy can hardly be meaningfully understood without a prior understanding of the concept social welfare itself.

Defining social welfare is not an easy task. The concept is very complex and is defined in different ways and in a number of terms. Working definitions of the key concepts involved not only serve as tools, but also as guides in the research process. "Science", Doby says, "is a form of inquiry which has as its objectives the description of particular phenomena in the world of our experience and the establishment of general principles which will allow for the explanation and prediction of these phenomena" (1954: 21). The nature and function of concepts in the scientific endeavour is to assist us to interpret what we observe and to make theoretical sense out of our observations. "Conception, in filling the deficiency in perception, not only provides a point of departure or view and releases activity, but directs such activity with varying degrees of effectiveness" (Ibid: 26).

Moreover, the conceptual point of view with which a researcher begins a study will largely determine the type of data to be selected for analysis and explanation. The conceptual framework explains and specifies to the researcher the main dimensions to be studied - the key factors and variables - and what will be left out (Miles and Huberman 1984: 28).

This chapter covers various broad topical areas; definitions or conceptual understanding of social welfare, the origins and establishment of social welfare, current policy issues, and future trends. The aim is to spell out in broad terms what social welfare in general is, and to determine how it
manifests and operates in various societal contexts. Moreover, since social welfare as a system operates within the context of social realities, and economic and political processes, this chapter also focuses on societal values, economic structures, government policies, and models of welfare. Special attention is paid to economic and political constraints underlying social welfare policies, programmes and activities. Crucial questions here are the motivations that bring systems of social welfare into being and maintain them, the underlying reasons of governments to engage in welfare activities, and the basic philosophies that mould social welfare policies and practice, thus shaping the system of social welfare in society.

3.2 DEFINING SOCIAL WELFARE: A CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING

There appears to be no universally agreed-upon definition of social welfare. Different terms are used to describe it, such as: "social services", "social welfare", "social work", "social administration", "human services", and "human service administration". These terminologies indicate to us that social welfare "tends to take on somewhat different meanings in different political and cultural context" (Macarov 1978: 24). Another reason for the differential use of the concept seems to be that social welfare is directly linked to a country's economic system as well as to the stage of its economic development.

With regard to the differential use of the concept, Púsic said: "Whatever social welfare may signify at a given moment in a given country it almost certainly does not have the same significance in another country or even in the same country at a different point in time along the endless line of social change" (1972: 10). The reason for this seems to be that social welfare programmes are designed in relation to social problems and needs that vary in time and place. Another reason is the scope and purpose of social welfare in society. To better understand the purpose of social welfare and to come to a clearer definition of the concept, we need to trace the origins and historical development of social welfare.
3.2.1 Historical origins of social welfare

Social welfare is in fact an old concept which emerged in early human communities. In early stages it was seen as charity, but later changed to a kind of minimum level in the standard of living of members of a particular society. The early forms of social security or welfare can be traced back to the family and its various extensions. The family fulfilled various functions. It was not only a unit of production and consumption, but provided education, health care, and welfare. It also cared for those who could not provide for themselves. With the emergence of industrialization and urbanization, most of these functions of the family changed. In this regard, Pusic noted: "The place where people worked became divorced from the place where they lived. The required level of education began to transcend the educational possibilities of the urban family. With the development of medicine, health services had to be put on a professional basis. Recreation became an industry in its own right. In an industrial and urban society the common risks of existence were expanding at the same time as the capability of the nuclear family to cope with them grew smaller" (Ibid: 55).

When we look at the origins and emergence of institutional social welfare, it is necessary to determine how and why it was introduced, as well as its purpose in society. In this regard Macarov (1978) mentioned five major motivations for its inception. These are: mutual aid, religious commitments, the desire for political advantage, economic considerations, and ideological factors. He says that these "motivations co-exist and intermingle; one may strengthen, another weaken it, or have little relationship to it" (Ibid: 43). It would therefore appear that social welfare has its roots in more than one factor.

Historically the philosophy of social welfare was based on two central ideas, charity and philanthropy. Both these concepts refer to donations of money or property to a person or group in need. Charity originated in ancient Judaism and was incorporated into Christianity. Philanthropy originated in the ancient Greek city-states particularly Athens, and was part of the concept of citizenship and civic duty (Handel 1982: 54). These ideas were later taken over by the Romans. During the first three centuries the Roman
emperors gave free food to the people as a way of maintaining control over them (Ibid). Based on their Calvinistic traditions, the non-conformist churches later actively organized aid to those in distress.

Government involvement in social welfare in Europe started in the 12th century. In 1349 the Statute of Labourers in England prohibited alms to the able-bodied. This was the beginning of government power to regulate social assistance. During this period the first hospitals and almshouses were established. In 1531 begging by the able-bodied was prohibited in England. This later lead to the promulgation of the Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1551 - 1601. One is justified to state that, besides mutual aid in the pre-industrial societies and religious considerations, the traditional basis from where institutional as well as statutory social welfare has emerged, are the Elizabethan Poor Laws. These Laws laid the foundations of institutionalized social welfare and continue to influence it to this day.

The Poor Laws were based on three principles:

* State responsibility for social welfare,
* Limitations of this responsibility only to those who are unable to care for themselves,
* Administration and delivery of welfare assistance through local units.

One important concept flowing from these Poor Laws was the distinction between those who could not take care of themselves, called the "deserving poor", and those who were in need, but who could look after themselves if the opportunity existed and if they wanted to. They were called the "undeserving poor". The criterion used to make this distinction was physical ability, not structural constraints.

Out of these early forms of services to the needy evolved a system of public welfare by the State, by charitable philanthropic welfare services, by the church, and later by voluntary organizations. Charity and philanthropy constitute a mode of social welfare that is characterized by the effort of social welfare on the principles of voluntarism - - that is, voluntary concern for people in need. Another distinct character of this mode of welfare
is that, for the most part, it has not sought to change the basic inequalities in society. Welfare was seen as charity and correction, while the existence of the rich and the poor was taken for granted. The rich were perceived to have duties to the poor, duties that derive from religion and human concern.

Thus, the history of social welfare in most Western countries is a history of the Poor Laws and private charities. It is also clear that "the development of social welfare is a complex tangle of events, involving many indignities imposed on people in the name of 'improvement' and 'reform', as well as also involving new concepts and ideas that were more certainly improvements" (Handel 1982: 8). The Industrial Revolution introduced a new dimension to social welfare and to the meeting of the needs of people. Industrialization disrupted functions previously performed by the family and mutual aid patterns in preindustrial societies, and caused the introduction of modern systems of welfare.

The next important period in the development of social welfare after the Poor Laws was the introduction of the first compulsory social-insurance system by Austria in 1854, followed by Germany when comprehensive plans for social-insurance were introduced by Bismarck between 1882 and 1889 (Macarov 1978: 99). Germany also made provision for compulsory insurance against illness, accidents, and old age. Social security as a system providing for human needs gradually spread throughout Europe and other parts of the world.

This brief overview of the history of social welfare brings us nearer to an understanding of the concept. However, it still leaves us with the question of how social welfare is defined today. Despite the difficulty in defining the concept, authors in various countries and at different occasions as well as international bodies have attempted to define social welfare.
3.2.2 On Defining Social Welfare

The human being's right to welfare is clearly stated in the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 22 says: "Everyone, as a member of society, has a right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality". Article 25 says: "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and the necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control" (International Council on Social Welfare 1971: 4). In terms of these views social welfare caters for those who fall through the net of economic provision, those who are unemployed, and those who are unable to participate in economic activities due to physical disabilities.

Although these ideals existed since the inception of the United Nations Organization after World War II, it was only in the late 1960's that the idea was taken further and attempts made to realize it. In 1967 an International Expert Meeting on Social Welfare Organization and Administration, held under the auspices of the United Nations in Geneva, defined social welfare, and spelled out its objectives as follows: "Social welfare as an organized function is regarded as a body of activities designed to enable individuals, families, groups and communities to cope with the social problems of changing conditions. But in addition to, and extending beyond the range of its responsibilities for specific services, social welfare has a further function within the broad area of a country's social development. In this larger sense, social welfare should play a major role in contributing to the effective mobilization and deployment of the human and material resources of the country to deal successfully with the social requirements of change, thereby participating in nation-building" (Ibid: 105).
Notwithstanding the traditional association of social welfare with charitable, remedial, ameliorative and preventive services, the United Nations' definitions in this regard spell out the role of governments and other responsible institutions to orientate social welfare policies and services to developmental purposes, thereby advancing the over-all development process. In contrast to the traditional remedial and rehabilitative function of social welfare, providing assistance to the least-privileged members of society, "developmental welfare address itself to all segments of the population by strengthening social policies and institutions and making them part of balanced development" (United Nations 1983: 8). This emphasis on developmental social welfare does not mean that social welfare services for specific sectors (such as families and children, youth, the aged, disabled persons, not to mention the wider issues of prevention of crime and drug abuse) should be neglected. In all these areas social welfare has important functions to perform, both remedial, and preventive. In terms of this perspective, social welfare should adopt a dual approach, a short-term remedial, ameliorative approach, and a long-term developmental approach. The developmental approach means that "the over-all focus is on enabling individuals and groups to function most effectively in their families and community and to contribute as best they could to the broader processes of development" (Ibid). This idea was taken a step further in 1968 when the United Nations' International Conference of Ministers responsible for social welfare described social welfare as "an essential element of development. It counts among its goals the enhancement of the well-being of people by raising their levels of living, ensuring social justice and the equitable distribution of national wealth, and enriching the capacities of all people to contribute to and benefit from development" (United Nations 1986: 4).

These are broad and general definitions and are problematic when it comes to specific situations in particular countries. More specific definitions make the concept more applicable to certain contexts. In 1965 Edmund Smith said: "Social welfare, as a concept, is a related system of social institutions in any society, a system unified by common values, goals and operational principles; those institutional aspects of social life which express the collective concern of the society for the well-being of its members as individuals and in family and community groups" (Smith 1965: 17). Smith says an analysis of social welfare
requires an integrative study appropriate to it. This is necessary "because social welfare deals with social effects and their believed causes, and with social acts and their believed consequences, and, because both causes and consequences are multiple and overdetermined, the analysis of a social welfare question or problem quickly passes outside the bounds of any one academic discipline" (Ibid: 8). This indicates to us that social welfare is an interdisciplinary subject, an integrated field of study that can be viewed from different academic perspectives. It can be studied from the perspective of social work, sociology, political science, public policy and administration, or economics. The result is that readings and literature on this topic are both numerous and wide. One view is that social welfare serves a residual function because it deals with those needs that are not met by the other social institutions. But on the other hand Smith says "social welfare cannot avoid having an institutional function; it rounds out the social system, and its very existence and the ways in which it carries out its defined tasks cannot help but affect all the other social institutions" (Ibid: 118).

Most definitions of social welfare try to include the whole population and emphasize the community and social development aspects of social welfare. The 1971 edition of the Encyclopedia of Social Work defines social welfare as generally denoting "the full range of organized activities of voluntary and government agencies that seek to prevent, alleviate, or to improve the well-being of individuals, groups or communities" (National Association of Social Workers 1971: 1446). A later edition of the Encyclopedia says, "Social welfare is an organized effort to ensure a basic standard of decency in relation to the physical and mental well-being of the citizenry" (National Association of Social Workers 1977: 1502). It becomes evident that social welfare concerns a state of well-being.

These are vague and general definitions. Not one of them specifically mentions economic assistance despite the fact that the general notion of welfare appears to concentrate on economic assistance given to the poor and the needy. Some definitions of social welfare combine economic assistance and social services and benefits. Friedlander states for instance that social welfare is "a system of laws, programmes, benefits and services which
strengthen or assure provision for meeting of social needs recognized as basic for the welfare of the population and for the functioning of the social order” (1980, 4). In addition to economic security, Handel also emphasises the ideals of welfare and ways of implementing them. He defines social welfare as “a set of ideas and a set of activities and organizations for carrying out these ideas, all of which have taken shape over many centuries to provide people with income and other social benefits in ways that safeguard their dignity” (1982: 13). The United States Committee Report at the 1974 International Conference on Social Welfare considers the term to include: “The wide range of services designed to attain ways of life acceptable to individuals and the community, sometimes thought of collectively as the social aspects of development, and including services designed to strengthen the individual confronted with economic, physical, mental, or social disabilities, together with those aimed at influencing the remedy of conditions leading to dependency” (Heffernan 1979: 6).

Views on social welfare range from a narrow and restricted conception to a broad and comprehensive one. In terms of the narrow conception, social welfare operates as an institution in society that attends to the needs of those members of society not provided for or accommodated by the normal systems of the family or the market. In this sense “social welfare includes those non-profit functions of society, public or voluntary, that are clearly aimed at alleviating distress and poverty, or ameliorating the conditions of the casualties of society” (Dolgoff et al 1993: 96). Social welfare is seen as “an activity or a cluster of activities aimed at helping people under certain types of social stress to regain their balance, their self-reliance, by removing the causes — material, psychological and other — of their predicament” (Pusic 1972: 9). In this case social welfare operates as a service to assist people in social difficulties, helping them survive and function as human beings. Services include social security, physical rehabilitation, crime prevention, alcohol and drug abuse, care of the aged and of special groups of children.

Social welfare in its broader definition embraces all those activities that cater for the well-being of man, a concept which covers a whole range of governmental and institutional functions. Some of the definitions covering a broad perspective describe social welfare as
“the attempts made by governments and voluntary organizations to help families and individuals by maintaining incomes at an acceptable level, by providing medical care and public health services, by furthering adequate housing and community development, by providing services to facilitate social adjustment, and by furnishing facilities for recreation” (Encyclopaedia Britannica 1973: 773). In this instance social welfare is regarded as a “system of general measures -- legislative, planning, economic -- intended to promote a more equitable or more desirable redistribution of the national income” (Púsic 1972: 9).

Societies have programmes which seek to prevent, alleviate, or contribute to the solution of identified social problems. This view refers to collective responsibility to meet the universal needs of the entire population, and includes areas like education, health services, employment, housing, income security, and other preventive and development services. The aim here is to maintain a high level of self-reliance and to meet the needs of everybody in the interest of the whole society.

Definitions of social welfare in South Africa seem to have a narrow social work perspective. However, during its inception in the 1930's, it had a broad scope. This was confirmed by Coetzee when he stated in the early 1950's:

“Maatskaplike sorg sluit in al daardie aktiwiteite wat gerig is op die bereiking van die hoogste moontlike selfstandigheid en natuurlike behoeftebevrediging van elke lid van die samelewing en die beswil van die gemeenskap as geheel ... “ (Pieterse 1976: 33)

In 1954 Van Zyl also gave a broad perspective when he said:

“Maatskaplike sorg dek die hele terrein van die gemeenskapslewe en bestaan uit maatreëls getref en fasiliteite wat daar gestel word om die maatskaplike lewe gesond en sterk te maak en dit so te hou. Dit sluit dinge soos gesondheidsorg, werksverskaffing, woningsvoorsiening, onderwys, ens. in” (Ibid)

---

1 "Social welfare includes all those activities geared towards achieving the highest possible form of independence and natural fulfilment of the needs of each member of society and those of the community at large". (Present author’s translation)

2 "Social welfare covers the broad spectrum of community life and consists of measures and facilities to strengthen and maintain community life. It includes aspects such as health care, provision of employment, housing, education, etc.". (Present author’s translation)
In terms of the National Welfare Act, definitions of social welfare in South Africa had a narrow and restricted focus (Republic of South Africa 1978). The Act says "social welfare services are organized activities, measures or programmes in connection with:

* social work,
* the prevention and treatment of social pathological conditions in the community or in groups of persons or in families or individuals;
* the promotion, protection or stability of family or marital life;
* the welfare of the aged or physically or mentally handicapped persons;
* the welfare of children;
* the prevention of alcoholism or dependence upon dependence-producing substance, or the treatment of persons who are dependent upon alcohol or any other dependence-producing substances;
* the provision of housing to indigent persons or persons in need;
* any corrective service;
* social relief" (Republic of South Africa 1978: 5).

Another feature of social welfare is that the concept is studied and defined from the perspective of the developed industrialized countries. In relation to developing countries, Livingstone says: "There is a certain vagueness about the meaning to be given to social welfare' (1969: 51). The only definition that seems to bridge the gap between the various country-specific definitions, and that can also include social welfare provisions in the Third World, is the United Nations' description of the concept which describes social welfare as "a wide range of socially sponsored activities and programmes directed towards community and individual well-being" (Ibid).

In the Western developed countries social welfare is particularly "concerned with the translation of government policies regarding the provision of assistance to socially disadvantaged individuals or groups into specific programmes for the provision of such services" (Conyers 1982: 9). Whereas the government plays a central role in social welfare in industrialized countries, in the developing countries the family and the
community tend to take care of the needy. However, with increasing urbanization and the breakdown of traditional social structures, the need for welfare by the government is growing fast.

In developing countries there is also the tendency to focus more on covering "a wide range of activities which are often referred to as "community development" or sometimes "social development". In many of the developing countries, "social welfare workers have been encouraged to engage more in community development activities in rural areas. Community development has tended to be established in place of more conventional welfare work" (Ibid: 10).

In connection with social welfare in developing countries, Hardiman and Midgley say: "The term is used to connote a general state of well-being among people, to designate social services such as health, education, housing and social security, to refer to fiscal and other measures which are intended to have an effect on social conditions, and to describe the activities of Ministries of social welfare" (1982: 238). Welfare services adopt a very strong residual approach in developing countries. "When these services were established in developing countries, there was general agreement that State intervention in social affairs should be limited to matters which could neither be ignored nor left to the private market" (Ibid). Policies followed in this regard held that social welfare expenditure should be kept to the minimum and only limited to those in real need and who cannot provide for themselves.

It is important here to note how international events had impinged upon the development of social welfare in developing countries. During the era of colonial rule the emphasis was primarily on the welfare and well-being of the colonists with a residual approach to the welfare of the indigenous people. After World War II, with the emergence of the Welfare State in the industrialized parts of the world, there were improvements in the provision of welfare services to the indigenous population. Notwithstanding these improvements, welfare services in Third World Countries remained residual and replaced the "incremental social policy model" and the "developmentalist" approach (Ibid: 239). After these
countries obtained their independence, a strong emphasis was placed on development, industrialization and education. Although efforts attempted to transfer the idea of a Welfare State to the Third World, these did not succeed because the resources were inadequate. Most of the inhabitants in these countries were still at the level of basic needs not being met adequately. Out of this realization developed the idea of the basic needs approach. International Aid Organisations played a major role in devising programmes and guiding development to deal with a variety of social needs and problems.

This overview of social welfare indicates to us that there are basically three perceptions of social welfare.

(i) Welfare is seen as a broad and general concept, or the well-being of everybody. This is the general perception of welfare by the public, i.e. a collective name for a number of organized activities and services performed by a network of agencies whether by the government or private initiative. These services are primarily associated with the activities of social workers and what are known as welfare agencies. In terms of this generalized conception, social welfare could mean all the things human beings do to ensure their well-being. Such a concept is too vague and difficult to work with in a systematic research endeavour.

(ii) Another concept of social welfare is that it is regarded as an institution in society administering specific types of governmental programmes through transfer of payments. This concept represents the narrow perception. Social welfare operates as a separate system in society responding to certain basic needs of those in need and who are not catered for by the economic institutions in society. This conception is often associated with two key functions, social security and social work. An important feature of this definition is that social welfare is seen as a separate system with a catch-up function of those who have "fallen through" the net of provision and self-sufficiency in society. This function is often assigned to a particular State department responsible for welfare services. Although it is clear that there would be a need for such a system, it should however not operate in
isolation from the other systems in society. Moreover, it should have a limited and a short-term function and should not become the "dumping ground" for the failure of other key institutions responsible for the basic needs of people.

(iii) A third conception is that social welfare is seen as "the commitment by governments to enhance the well-being of their citizens" (Osborn 1970: 17). This approach secures the welfare of people "through direct manipulation of wage rates and employment patterns. What is central here is the overall goal rather than the choice of means" (Ibid). In this instance, the societal goal as well as all institutions concerned with the basic needs of individuals are focussed on the welfare of the citizens.

From the above, it seems sensible to approach social welfare from a basic needs perspective. But basic needs satisfaction is directly connected to the economic system of a country. It is therefore assumed that human beings should satisfy their basic needs through economic activity or through the way the economic system operates. When normal economic structures for meeting needs have failed, or when the economic system does not provide for the needs of all people, or does not accommodate everyone, then social welfare as a supplementary system comes into play. Social welfare is thus an alternative way to respond to human needs. It can be regarded as "all the organized social arrangements which have as their direct and primary objective the well-being of people in a social context" (International Council on Social Welfare 1971: 4). This covers a broad range of "services which are concerned with various aspects of people's lives - - their income, security, health, housing, education, cultural traditions, and so on" (Ibid). Basically social welfare is primarily concerned with achieving some minimum standard of well-being for vulnerable groups. Therefore, the nature and magnitude of welfare provision is directly related to the economic system of a country. The way the economy is structured and operates is crucial in satisfying the needs of people.

In a private market economy or a capitalist system, the economy operates to a large extent autonomously, regulated by market principles. In this instance the economic system
produces the surplus resources that the government collects by way of tax contributions to distribute through a system of social welfare. Ideally the economy should be structured and regulated in such a way that it accommodates everybody and that it makes provision for all human needs. This would require an economic policy and values where the interests of people and their needs are the central concern. Where such values are integrated into the economic system, it would not be necessary for governmental intervention or regulation. However, if the economy is unwilling or unable to operate in such a way that it satisfies the needs and the interests of the people, then it is the obligation of the government as well as the workers to intervene, or to introduce social welfare provision as an alternative system to meet human needs. The best way to deal with this dilemma is to couple human needs and humanity with national economic planning and active public participation.

3.3 THE FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Our analysis of the definitions concluded that social welfare should be regarded as a planned system to satisfy basic human needs, and to secure the quality of life and well-being of people. It constitutes a mechanism by which governments transfer income to citizens who cannot assure an adequate income for themselves by their regular economic activity. It serves as a means of redistribution of income and prevention of economic deprivation and poverty, while the economy forms the productive base to provide the surplus resources to be distributed. Welfare services support, supplement, and substitute for functions traditionally performed by the family in preindustrialized societies. They protect individuals and families from such contingencies as unemployment, illness, death of breadwinner, and other income problems. In some instances the social welfare system provides for minimum wages or wage supplementation for the working poor to ensure a minimum level of economic well-being.

Social welfare is thus an attempt by society to deal with some of the consequences of the Industrial Revolution, such as economic deprivation or insecurity, family disorganization, and the decline of the community. In its broad perspective it includes a wide variety of social provisions, such as medical care, housing, meals, education, that contribute to social development and the
welfare of some or all of the population. The more positive view of social welfare is that it has
to do with human and social development. It operates within the context of national development
as a constructive and essential force in the progress of the whole society. This view of social
welfare requires a democratic and social philosophy as well as an effort to create a process for
renewing social institutions to reflect a commitment to human well-being (Romanyszyn 1971: 379).
Social welfare as social development is based on the recognition that all citizens in an
industrial society may require a variety of socially provided goods and services to develop their
capacity to participate in society and to achieve and to maintain a desirable standard of well-being
(Ibid: 380). This view represents a concept of welfare committed to continuing renewal, so as
to promote the fullest development of man. Furthermore, it requires an ideological commitment,
and the political will to initiate social transformation.

In addition, social welfare may also adopt a social interventionist approach that includes provision
and processes directly concerned with the treatment and prevention of social problems, the
development of human resources, and improvement in the quality of life. In this case it includes
social services to individuals and families as well as efforts to strengthen or modify social
institutions. To fulfil its functions, social welfare requires public programmes in terms of specific
benefits, and measures to identify the people who are entitled to these benefits. In practice these
programmes respond in particular to problems of poverty, income insecurity, unemployment, ill
health, mental illness, juvenile delinquency, developmental disabilities, family discord and
disruptions.

Welfare programmes may also serve a useful ideological function in society. A close relationship
exists between social welfare, the economy, the prevailing political ideology and the values of
society. Piven and Cloward contend that morality is not the determining influence in shaping
social welfare. Public welfare, they argue, has clear economic and political functions (1971).
There is also consensus that the programmes of any welfare system reflect the dominant values
of a society. According to Vic George and Paul Wilding, it is impossible to understand the nature
and functions of social policy without an analysis of dominant social values as well as the social,
economic, and political systems in which social policy operates (1976). They argue that social
value systems, theories of society, of the State, of social problems and social policy are
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interrelated (Ibid). A well-documented notion of social welfare is that it has been designed not to help the needy and the poor, but to direct and control their behaviour. Critics argue in this regard that it was not progressive ideas that shaped social policy. The changes and reforms that occurred were designed by the upper classes to manipulate and to co-opt those below them. "The poor are controlled by shaping their world view, by buying them off with short or long-term, but inadequate, benefits, and when necessary, by using repressive force" (Trattner 1983: 6). This enables the elite to prevent serious disruption of society, preserve the capitalist system, and maintain its social and economic advantage (Ibid). Piven and Cloward hold that public welfare programmes and institutions of welfare have not been and are not philanthropic or benevolent in nature. Rather, they are intended to maintain social and political tranquillity and to force the poor into the labour market (1971). Moreover, they argue that the assistance is given only when the poor are driven by deprivation to resort to violence. In their view, social services are provided out of concern for the stability of the social and economic order and the self-interest of the élite who control them. They say:

"Relief arrangements are initiated or expanded during the occasional outbreaks of civil disorder produced by mass unemployment, and are then abolished or contracted when political stability is restored. Expensive relief policies are designed to mute civil disorder, and restrictive ones to reinforce work norms. In other words, relief policies are cyclical-liberal or restrictive depending on the problems of regulation in the larger society with which the government must contend" (1971: xiii).

In terms of this perspective, social welfare has served two main functions throughout history, a political function and an economic function. The political function is to secure social control and to maintain the status quo. When there is disruption or political unrest "the public welfare system is expanded to soothe the discontent" (Hefferman 1979: 39) It assists the individual to adapt and to be satisfied. The economic function is to control the supply of labour. Welfare programmes are available to maintain low wages in the labour market. In this way the State maintains, for the benefit of employers, a ready supply of cheap labour (Ibid; 23). For this reason a study of social welfare must also include government policy and the dominant social values of society.
3.4 SOCIAL WELFARE, SOCIAL VALUES AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES

In many countries social welfare is a government-sponsored system, as it is the function of the government to secure the well-being of its citizens. Social welfare policies, we have seen, do not develop in a vacuum. They are shaped by both the economic structure and the political system of a country. Johnson and Schwartz clearly argue that the response any society makes to human needs reflects that society's values, political structures and philosophies, economic base, and ecological and demographic makeup (Johnson & Schwartz 1994). Social welfare as an institution is firmly grounded in the economic, political, and social context of society, and can be understood only in that context. A study of social welfare in South Africa should take particularly cognizance of this reality. Heffernan says in this regard:

"Articulated values which are codified into a specific public program do not develop in a vacuum but are shaped by both the economic context and the political structures in which the social welfare choices are made" (1979: 7).

In a comparable study of social welfare programmes in a number of industrialized countries, Bette Fishbein says:

"Social welfare policies in any country are closely linked to its basic socio-political structure and are not easily adapted to a different structure" (1975: 1).

This seems to be the case, as problems vary from country to country, as do the people, economic factors, and the resources of the country. The time of inception, the values of the society, and the challenges faced are important factors for the kind of welfare policy adopted. The two central concepts shaping social policy are political power and economic realities. According to Heffernan, political power has to do with the authoritative allocation of values within a social system while the economy has to do with the way goods, resources, and services are utilized in a social system (1979: 8). In a discussion of the politics and economics of social welfare, Heffernan highlights in particular the continuous conflict between political power and economic scarcity. Because social welfare systems and social policy are inextricably linked, in practice this means that social welfare programmes are based on government policy.
The involvement and functions of the government should be seen in historical context. Many of the challenges faced by governments can be traced back to the Industrial Revolution and its consequences. Industrialization of the economy has led to an increasing dependence on wages paid, employment opportunities, increasing demand for public services and the inability of voluntary effort to solve major social and economic problems. Industrialization and the “modern economy” create a risk to income security. Work and employment opportunities are important now for income and security. A lack of employment opportunities has serious income and economic implications. In reality it could mean success for some and failure for others. This creates a clear distinction in the circumstances of those at work and those out of work. In a certain sense there is a dualism, or contradiction, in industrialization. Although it raised the quality of life for many people, it also created social problems like poverty, overcrowding, unemployment and family disorganization. With industrialization, the local community and the family ceased to be economically self-sufficient. They could therefore no longer care for the needy as in the pre-industrial community. “The industrial society uproots people, destroys traditional institutions, promotes individual freedom while creating new forms of dependencies, and requires for its own survival a variety of social provisions and services that carry functions previously performed by the family and by patterns of mutual aid in agricultural economies” (Romanyshyn 1971: 155).

The quest for social security and social justice came as a response to the economic insecurity and inequalities which are characteristics of industrial capitalism. These issues have compelled many a government to take an active role in social welfare by introducing a variety of services in order for the industrial economy to survive. It is thus clear that industrialization played a major role in shaping the institutions of welfare. As Romanyshyn says:

“Welfare programs developed as a series of compromises between the conflicting values inherent in democratic capitalism ... economic individualism and free enterprise on the one hand, and security, equality and humanitarianism on the other” (1971: 39-40).

The modern industrial economy operates on market principles that do not accommodate everybody. This places some people in a position of need. Institutions of social welfare are therefore basically responsive and corrective to the changes and failures of the market system.
Social welfare operates in relation to the market, "providing support towards its more effective operation and supplementing or replacing the market allocation of goods and services to assure some measure of security or equity in economic distribution" (Ibid: 156). In a capitalist economy, social welfare does not replace the market, and the market does not replace welfare. The two operate side by side, the one complementing the other. "Social welfare as an institution is an attempt to regulate the market system to meet the needs of democratic capitalism for a stable and expanding economy and the need for a greater social balance between the private and the public sector" (Ibid: 154). Again it is clear that the purpose of social welfare is not only to deal with economic insecurity and the decline of the community that accompanied industrialization and urbanization, but to serve as a mechanism of social control and to protect the economy. "Its purpose is to cope with the economic and social dislocations created by the Industrial Revolution . . . partly out of regard for democratic and humanitarian mores and partly to stabilize and maintain the capitalist system" (Ibid: 81).

In most industrialized societies, economic policies and social welfare policies operate separately. There is a tendency to regard social welfare as an alternative way to respond to human needs while economic issues are regarded as a separate policy domain. Gil noted in this regard:

"Implied in this conceptual separation of economic policies from social policies is a view of the economy, and of economic development and growth as ends in their own rights, rather than as means for the attainment of social ends" (Gil 1973: 9).

The assumption is that economic growth will result in the gradual disappearance of poverty and poverty-related problems. Gil continues by saying:

"The fact that social policies are viewed separately from economic policies deprives social policy from its most potent tools, and consigns to social policies the function of dealing merely in a reactive and ameliorative fashion with the fall-out problems of economic policies" (Ibid).

Social welfare is conceived as a societal response to specific needs and social problems, rather than an element of a comprehensive system shaping the overall quality of life and the living conditions of people. As a consequence of this separation and fragmentation, welfare services perpetuate the very needs and problems which they are expected to solve. Gil says:

"It should be stressed in this context that a comprehensive conception of social policies reveals them to be the dynamic source of all social problems, for these
problems are rooted in the fabric of a society which in turn derives from, and is constantly maintained by, its system of social policies. Social policies are therefore not merely solutions of social problems but are also their powerful underlying causes” (1973: 10).

Government intervention may take many forms. The most important function of the government is to make policy and to control legislation. Specific policies govern specified domains of society or its subunits. Most policies, although not all, are codified in legislation. In accordance with these general policy perceptions, social policies are policies which deliberately pertain to the quality of life, circumstances of living, and human relations (Ibid; 13). The overall quality of life, the circumstances of living of individuals and groups, and the nature of all intra-societal human relations constitute the common domain and focus of all social policies. Gil says:

"Social policies tend to, but need not, be codified in formal legal instruments. All extant social policies of a given society constitute an interrelated, yet not necessarily internally logical, consistent, social policy system which is, at any point in time, in a state of dynamic equilibrium" (1973: 24).

These propositions do not evolve at random, but tend to follow regular patterns which develop over time out of continuous interaction between natural forces, man-designed principles and courses of action, and chance events (Ibid: 13). These man-designed principles and courses of action which interact with natural forces and circumstances of living and human relations among members of a society, are, by definition, its social policies, according to Gil.

Economic factors are thus central aspects of social policies. They are important determinants of the quality of life, of the circumstances of living, and of human relationships. Policies dealing with economic issues cannot operate in isolation from social policies, for they are important means toward attaining societal objectives in the social policy domain. Thus social welfare as a system operates within the context of public policy in general, but in particular within the framework of economic policy. It may be in the form of factory legislation, industrial accidents, unemployment benefits, protection of women and children in the industry, minimum wage laws, zoning and building codes, and regulations regarding pure food and drugs (Romanyslyn 1971: 158). Mishra says social policy has to do with those social arrangements, patterns, and mechanisms that distribute resources in accordance with some criterion of need (1981: x). It represents
arrangements concerning needs, ends, and means to meet the needs. Social policy is the State's way of fulfilling its political responsibility to make provision for the welfare of its citizens. The aim of social policy therefore is to promote the well-being of all or part of the population, reflected in socially sponsored programmes and activities not provided for through the family or the market system. In this way social welfare becomes the concrete activities of social policy, and, like all other social institutions, is rooted in the society of which it is a part.

Government policy and legislation are however not the only determining factors in social welfare. The particular society and the social realities it faces play an equally important role. In order to understand social policy, it is necessary that we understand the wider social context of society. Ideas about social welfare and how to achieve its goals arise in the context of a particular situation. Social welfare is best understood in the context of the prevailing organization of society and in the process of social change. Gil says:

"The dominant beliefs, values and ideologies of society, and the customs and traditions derived from them, exert a significant influence on all decisions concerning the development, provision, and distribution of resources. Consequently, any specific configuration to distribute resources, goods, and services to those individuals and groups in need, and the resulting systems of policies, tend to reflect the dominant value positions of a society concerning such policy-relevant dimensions as individualism - collectivism, competition - cooperation, inequality - equality" (Gil 1973: 27).

Gil continues by saying:

"Thus a society which stresses individualism, pursuit of self-interest, and competitiveness, and which has come to consider inequality of circumstances of living and of rights as a 'natural' order of human existence will tend to preserve structural inequalities through its process of status allocation and rights distribution, while a society which stresses collective values and co-operation and which is truly committed to the notion that all men are intrinsically of equal worth, will tend to develop a system of social policies which assures to all its members equal access to all statuses, and equal rights to material, symbolic, life-sustaining, and life-enhancing resources, goods, and services" (Ibid: 28).

Although it is not easy to change beliefs, values, ideologies, customs and traditions, and though they tend to be shaped and guarded by cultural and political élites mainly from among the more
powerful and privileged strata, they are not fixed or static in any human society (Ibid). There is consequently always a potential for change in the beliefs, values and ideologies of societies and in their social policies. However, it should be emphasized that significant changes in a society's system of social policies are not likely to occur without thorough changes in its dominant beliefs, values, and ideologies. In this respect Gil says the mere shift in the balance of power or change of government does not mean a fundamental change in social policies. He elaborates:

"Because of this, violent or non-violent revolutions which merely shift the balance of power among competing social groups but do not modify the dominant value premises of society are unlikely to be followed by significant changes in the key processes of social policies. Rather, they tend to develop systems of social policies similar in basic principles and dimensions to the ones before the revolutions" (Ibid).

When we think about society and social welfare, we need to identify the principal elements of that society, and to review its development, so when social welfare policies and programmes are introduced, these factors should be considered.

As social welfare services are based on ideas, values, and ideologies, there are various perceptions of the way social services should operate. One view is that social welfare services should be special services for the poor. The other view is that social welfare programmes should be developed to meet universal needs of the population. A strong argument for universal programmes is that special services tend to isolate the poor from society and also tend to be inferior in quality. Universal programmes are also free from the stigma attached to welfare and integrate the poor into society. However, whether social welfare should be special or universal remains an issue in many societies.

Another issue about social welfare is whether it is a citizen's right, or it is charity. The notion of citizenship right to welfare benefits involves citizens' rights to economic security, education, and access to the benefits and obligations that accompany full participation in society (Romanyshyn 1971: 34 - 35). In terms of this perception the individual would claim social rights on the same basis as he/she could claim civil rights and political rights. The notion of such rights is implicit in the concept of the welfare State. In terms of these views there seem to be various models and approaches to social welfare.
It is generally accepted that a human being must work and earn his/her livelihood to survive. In a money economy, loss or lack of the usual financial resources inevitably leads to hardship and deprivation. Accordingly, people who lack an adequate income, temporarily or permanently, have a right to economic assistance. Economic structures and welfare models are therefore closely connected in all societies. The economic structure - work and income - primarily determine the welfare of those actively participating in it, but at the same time the system must produce enough to redistribute an income through a system of social welfare to those who are not accommodated or who are incapable of participating. The inability to find a decently paid job has a profound and lasting impact on personal well-being, family stability, and the cost of social welfare. In this instance, social welfare, and in particular social security, is concerned with those groups who are unable to support themselves through the market because of their age, or the nature of their handicap, i.e. the aged, children, the blind, the permanently or totally disabled, and the unemployed. Social welfare programmes therefore form an integral part of the institutional framework of every country's economic system. The central issue always seems to be how to coordinate economic and welfare policies so as to achieve the desired results. In this regard policymakers are faced with the critical question of how to maintain a balance between production and work ethos on the one hand and welfare dependency on the other.

Based on these realities, various arrangements through which needs may be met exist in almost all societies. In industrial countries the emphasis is more on effective social insurance programmes, whereas in developing countries there is a greater interest in community development, child and youth welfare services, recreation and education (Friedlander 1975: 155). Although a mixed system of social welfare provision exists in most countries, the most widely used categorization of models of welfare is that developed by Wilensky and Lebeaux in 1965. They identified two models of welfare, the residual and institutional models. These models constitute according to them two distinctive approaches to social welfare and social work. The residual model is associated with the values of economic individualism and free enterprise while the institutional model is associated with the values of security, equality, and humanitarianism. In
most of the Western industrialized societies, the trend of welfare developed from a residual approach to an institutional pattern. However, there seems to be also a third model of welfare which is called the structural model. This model of welfare is based on a Marxist analysis of the capitalist system and its eventual supersession by welfare as a central social value. In terms of this analysis of welfare, we may distinguish a continuum of welfare, ranging from the residual model at the one end to the structural model at the other. The institutional model represents a mix - - a compromise between the residual and the structural model. With regard to the residual and institutional models of social welfare, Pinker says: "As social policies tend to develop over time in a largely piecemeal manner, a few welfare systems are unequivocally institutional or residual in character, although there are times in every nation's history when governments make radical attempts to change its established pattern" (Bean 1985: 187). Despite similarities in service delivery, these three models of welfare differ significantly. This is largely due to the different economic and political structures in which they operate. As these concepts seem to be central to the practice of social welfare, we will look at them in more detail.

3.5.1 The Residual Model

The residual concept is based on the assumption that social obligation extends only to meeting the emergency needs of that portion of the population that is regarded as incapable of meeting its own needs through the traditional means of the market and the family (Romanyshyn; 1971, 33). The model operates on the principle of failure of the market system and the family. Social welfare programmes come into play only when the family and the market fail to provide for the needs of families or individuals. This model adopts a negative approach to welfare and provides assistance and services mainly to the low-income groups and the poor. According to this view, social welfare is seen "as a privilege to be earned, an undeserved charity" (Macarov 1978: 138). Romanyshyn puts it very strongly when he says that "the residual view accepts the poor as incompetent second-class members of society for whom second-class services may be provided" (1971: 33). He continues by saying that "residual welfare services tend to be characterized by colonial attitudes toward the poor, crisis intervention, and a character defect view of the needy" (Ibid: 34). Welfare services under the residual system are aimed at relieving destitution. There are no clearly defined and accepted national minimum standards towards which the social system
is directed. The only minimum standard of welfare is the prevention of starvation and destitution. Welfare services are regarded as charity with a stigma attached to it (Mishra 1981: 152). Mishra says, "The idea of social right or entitlement to a basic minimum level of living is absent. The relationship between the donor and the recipient is vertical and hierarchical rather than horizontal and equalitarian" (Ibid). In this case social welfare is seen as residual, having a temporary and substitute function attending primarily to emergencies. This approach to welfare is consistent with the "ideology of individual responsibility and by-your-own-bootstrap progress is readily apparent" (Weinberger 1974: 24). Linked to this model are the following characteristics:

* to make assistance as unpleasant as possible,
* to require work in exchange for assistance,
* to keep the level of relief payments low,
* to prevent the "undeserving" from obtaining assistance,
* to return to employment if possible.

The residual model thus represents a negative view of social welfare. Traditionally this was the way in which social welfare services were introduced and provided. This concept of welfare, derived from the tradition of the Poor Laws, and still operates in some industrialized countries and Third World countries.

3.5.2 The Institutional Model

The institutional model, also called the developmental or social democratic model, represents a more advanced system of social welfare. This model does not imply an abnormality or failure. Institutional welfare is proactive rather than reactive, creative rather than corrective, and assertive rather than responsive (Heffernan 1979: 273). It is a needs-based distribution of resources in which social welfare is seen as a normal and necessary function of society in a positive way. In terms of this view, social welfare is regarded "as part of the institutionalized ongoing activities of society" (Macarov 1978: 138). Social welfare services function in co-operation with other social institutions and are seen as the "deserved" right of everybody in society. The system operates along with the market and the family as "a system of laws, programs, benefits and
services which strengthen or assure provisions for meeting social needs recognised as being basic for the welfare of the social order" (Friedlander and Roberts 1974: 4). In this case social welfare serves a developmental and preventive function.

This approach recognizes that social problems are rooted in individuals as well as in the social order. The emphasis is therefore on planned social change, social and community development, the provision of essential resources that support and enhance social functioning, as well as personal adjustment services such as counselling and therapy. Romanyshyn says it provides citizens "with the essential supportive resources", it equalizes opportunities, and it redresses "class-related inequalities in the distribution of income and power" (1971: 33). This view of social welfare is part of the quest for equality and the people's right to an equitable share in the benefits and obligations of society.

The institutional conception of social welfare developed out of the conviction that the State has a special role and function in promoting the welfare of its citizens and exercising control over them. Although the idea gained special momentum during and after World War II, the role of the State emerged over a period of time, as noted by Ritter:

"The serious economic depression of the 1870's shook the beliefs in the self-regulating capacity of the market and the ability of the individual to protect himself by his own devices against poverty, economic hardship, and exploitation" (1983: 1).

According to Mishra, the essence of the institutional approach is to be found in three interrelated ideas, the idea of social rights or entitlement; the concept of universality, and the idea of a national minimum standard (1987: 151-152). In terms of these ideas, citizens are entitled to a range of benefits and services which are seen as rights of citizenship. This view stresses the role of specifically designed policies in the development of social welfare. Basic services are available to all citizens irrespective of income, occupation, or status. To provide for such services, taxes and contributions are paid by everybody. All pay and all receive benefits. In this way social welfare constitutes a form of nationwide assistance to all. This system of social welfare serves the purpose of social integration and stability. It tends to reduce instability and maintain order in society. It sets out to meet basic needs at a reasonable
minimum standard and is revealed in respect of income, access to medical care, education, housing, child care, and care of the disabled and the aged. This system of welfare represents an enormous, varied and complex institution that affects the lives of millions of people. Changes in such social welfare policy, whether positive or negative, have ramifications for many people.

These two models of welfare lie on a continuum of welfare provision and development. They are also indicative of the ideological functions of social welfare. Ideologically the residual conception focuses attention on the failure of the individual in an essentially just society, while the institutional model focuses attention on the failure of the society to respond to individual needs (Heffernan 1979: 17). In most societies, social welfare developed from a paternalistic residual approach to a liberal institutional approach, and ultimately to its most advanced form of social democratic welfare provision. Some aspects of the institutional model currently find expression in the modern Welfare State as in most of the industrialized Western European countries.

3.5.2.1 The Welfare State

The institutional model of social welfare is applied in practice in the Welfare State. Welfare States are those countries in which the government takes positive steps to establish minimum living standards (Bean 1985: 32). The idea of the Welfare State is that the government takes responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. The government is directly concerned with the redistribution of income, the creation of human resources and the improvement of both the physical and social environment. Protected minimum standards of income, nutrition, health, housing and education are assured to every citizen as a political right, and not as a privilege or charity (Wilensky 1975: 1).

The vision of a more humane society, and government-protected living standards, was developed during World War II and was introduced in most Western European countries after the war. In Great Britain, the Beveridge Report of 1942 proposed comprehensive provision of social benefits, and (with modifications) it eventually became law. The Labour Government which came to power in 1945 adopted many of the measures based on the Beveridge Report and considered basic components of a Welfare State to be the
following.

(i) a system of family allowances, providing each family with a regular monthly allowance towards the cost of the upbringing of children for second and subsequent children, regardless of the parent’s income,

(ii) a National Health Service, which pays a large share of the costs of medical care for all citizens,

(iii) a National Insurance Act that provides workers and their families with several forms of benefits in return for a single weekly contribution by the workers. These are:

* sickness benefits;
* unemployment benefits;
* retirement pensions;
* maternity benefits;
* widow’s benefits;
* guardian allowances should children become orphaned, and
* death benefits to cover funeral expenses.

The Welfare State adopts a social, rather than a moral, explanation of meeting needs. The outstanding feature of the system is minimum living standards. Equal welfare is regarded as the central function of the government. It is the right of every citizen to have at least the minimum provisions essential for well-being and effective functioning in society. Because the Welfare State was introduced immediately after the war, it is also linked to the idea of national integration and uniting the nation (Mishra 1981: 154). The need for a stable work force and the idea of one nation form the basis of the Welfare State. The national integration of the nation has both a political and a social dimension. Therefore, the creation of social welfare institutions has been important. The ideas of citizenship of a national community, universality of provision, and basic minimum standards are interrelated, and forms the basis on which the institutional form of social welfare become
Another view of the emergence of the Welfare State is that it came about as a compromise between economic growth and the quest for socialism. The Marxist view is that the welfare State is functional to capitalism. It is regarded as a mechanism of social control, curbing the development of revolutionary socialism (Mishra; 1981, 82). This was particularly evident in Bismarck's social policy characterized by a comprehensive programme of social security. (Bismarck's social policies are sometimes regarded as the beginning of the welfare State in Western Societies.) According to Mishra, Bismarck's aim was "to crush revolutionary socialism - - a growing political force in Germany - - and to win over the German workers to his policy of State paternalism" (Ibid). According to this view, many social welfare programmes operate to maintain societal homeostasis, and prevent significant changes in the very areas with which those services are concerned. The Marxian perspective is that the Welfare State is more of an extension and consolidation of capitalism than its negation. Moreover, the argument is that problems such as poverty and inequality of incomes are an integral part of the capitalist system and cannot be solved within the framework of capitalism. In this way, social welfare, and in particular the Welfare State, are essentially devices for social control, not systems of income distribution. Ernest Mandel noted in this regard:

"It is obvious that what we have here is a measure with political and social aims, a lubrication of the social mechanism intended to avoid an explosion, and not an economic evolution which, in some way or other, contradicts the relative impoverishment of the proletariat (1968: 338).

In the Marxist view, social services contribute to the efficient and smooth working of the capitalist economy. However, it is argued that the Welfare State has a stabilizing as well as a destabilizing effect on the capitalist social structure. Attempts to overcome the economic and social contradictions of capitalism through social services only lead to new contradictions.
The cost of the Welfare State is a matter of great concern and continuing debate. Programmes are modified from time to time to respond to new conditions and needs. Lately, the concept has been attacked from opposing viewpoints. The conservatives see it as a form of socialism, while the radicals say that the Welfare State does not do enough to secure a high level of well-being for many citizens. The two elements of the Welfare State that are in dispute are the concepts emphasizing a minimum to everybody, and the reduction of inequality.

3.5.3 The Structural Model

The structural model is the socialist concept of welfare. It is a collectivist view of social welfare based on the principle of equalitarianism. The notion of welfare in this situation is the distribution of resources according to needs. The Marxist view is that this form of equal distribution of resources is possible only after private ownership of the means of production has been abolished and the production and distribution of all resources brought under communal or State control. The State acts on behalf of the whole community, and allocates income and resources to all in accordance with egalitarian principles. The market, the family, and private ownership cease to be the basic institutions through which incomes and resources are distributed. The individual is subordinated to the collective. The State, acting in the name of the collective, assumes full responsibility for meeting needs (Mishra 1981: 42). This form of distribution of resources and State social services is considered as a normal and dominant value system of society (Ibid). The State assumes total responsibility in meeting needs, while non-statutory agencies have a marginal role in welfare. In contrast to the residual and the institutional models, the structural conception of social services is that they are an expression of the basic values of society, and are central to a basic minimum of civilized existence under the auspices of the State (Ibid: 135). The social ideology underlying this view of welfare regards the satisfaction of needs on the basis of equality as the main aim of production and distribution.

The structural model is based on Marxian philosophy. The idea is not simply to develop a generous system of social welfare, but to establish a welfare society. Marx perceived welfare as a social norm based on the values of solidarity and co-operation. In practice it means that welfare
manifests itself in the social recognition of human need and in the organization of production and distribution in accordance with the criteria of need (Ibid; 70). This view of welfare stands in contrast to the capitalist mode of production where these same processes of production and distribution generate and reproduce wealth and poverty simultaneously. For Marx these core institutions of capitalism and the underlying values constitute the very antithesis of a welfare society. Private ownership of the means of production, production for profit, private property, and competition rather than co-operation and solidarity lie at the root of capitalist social organization. The values and norms of welfare are in conflict with the principle of capitalism and make meaningful progress impossible. As a social system capitalism is inimical to welfare. For the institutionalization of welfare as a central social value, it is necessary that the production be governed by social criteria, and the distribution by human needs (Ibid; 71). This would require a total transformation of capitalism and the market system, to be replaced by communal control established over the conditions of work and living. In other words, a socialist society. Under socialism, need becomes the central value governing production and distribution.

The Marxist view is that the scope of welfare within a capitalist society remains limited. Invariably it exists in a distorted and contradictory form. Although the prospects for reform in a capitalist society remain limited, welfare can begin to be established partially through the collective action of the workers. However, welfare can be fully established as a regulative and distributive norm only after the means of production have been socialized and the market-private property system abolished (Ibid: 74).

These features of welfare are largely ideal-typical, as it is clear that there is a gap between the ideal and the reality. The model is still in its primary stage of development, on its way to a more advanced stage of a socialist society. So far few societies, if any, can claim to operate on this model of meeting human needs. "The reality of social welfare in the Soviet Union, a society structured on this philosophy, differs significantly in practice from the model" (Ibid: 132 - 162).
3.6  STRUCTURES AND PROVISION OF SOCIAL WELFARE

The implementation of welfare services in society basically involves programmes introduced by the State as well as those of voluntary agencies. Public welfare involves the taking on of obligations to the needy by the public authority of the State. This, we have seen, developed gradually out of charity and voluntary services. Even today the distinctions between charity and welfare are not absolute. Public welfare services are provided in terms of a specific set of government-sponsored programmes through departmental structures responsible for social welfare. These programmes may include a variety of services depending on the specific welfare model pursued by the State. In some countries, Departments of Social Welfare operate as separate autonomous units, while in other instances they are combined with departments like education, health, or community development. Regarding the functions of social welfare departments in developing countries, Hardiman and Midgley say that, although there are differences in the services provided by these departments, they share common characteristics of which two are important; their activities are closely associated with professional social work, and secondly, they are primarily remedial in character (1982: 237). Social welfare services are largely remedial and directed at needy and vulnerable sectors such as orphaned, neglected or abused children, juvenile delinquents, the aged, the widowed, and the handicapped. Such departments are mostly responsible for welfare provisions such as public assistance, probation, family maintenance, adoption and foster care. These services have a strong urban bias, while problems of poverty and deprivation in the rural areas persist.

In addition to public welfare services by governments through their appropriate departments, the voluntary sector also plays an important role. Its organizations are formed by voluntary acts of decision and are able, in varying degrees, to make decisions about what they do independently of governments (International Council on Social Welfare 1983: 5). Two of the fundamental principles that underpin voluntary organizations are freedom of association and freedom of expression. However, in some instances, like in South Africa, they operate in partnership with the government.
Voluntary organizations fulfil various functions in society. Some of these are vanguard and innovative activities such as service provider, advocate, and value guardian (Ibid: 9). Innovative functions include responses to social needs and the application of existing techniques that have not been applied in particular circumstances. The service function takes up most of the time and resources of voluntary organizations. For many it is the sole reason for their existence. The scope of their services is very wide. This is exactly why they are so essential in society. Their services may range from feeding schemes to counselling and therapeutic services. In the economically less-developed countries, voluntary organizations are primarily occupied with basic needs. These include needs of income, food, shelter, water and jobs. In the more developed countries where a reasonable level of income exists, services are more concerned with personal adjustment and facilitating access to government, health, housing and welfare services (Ibid: 10).

Filling gaps or inadequacies in welfare services is one of the most important roles of voluntary organizations. This function may be temporary and demonstrative to identify gaps in service provision. Herman Stein says "they offer help for all kinds of citizen participation. Sometimes they are altruistic, sometimes not, but they provide us with the hope of influencing our environment and sometimes our fate. They offer services that governments cannot or do not provide, or do not provide as well" (Ibid: 38). In addition to the gap-filling function, strong claims are made about the important advocacy, social action, or social reform function of voluntary organizations. However, voluntary agencies are vulnerable and restricted in their functions as most of them are dependent on contributions from the public and/or government subsidy. This fear of reduction in funding can also be a useful excuse for not participating in influencing and advocacy activities.

In many countries governments see the voluntary sector as supplementary to State services. This means they provide similar services but in areas where government services are not available because of lack of funds or other reasons. In other instances, voluntary agencies complement the services of the government. The government may also delegate or leave the provision of entire services to the voluntary sector, while financial support is provided.

Stein identifies three broad functions for voluntary agencies in relation to their activities in society; a repair and maintenance function, a development function, and a change function (Ibid: 39). The
maintenance function refers to sustaining social stability and cohesion, through providing services, including emergency relief in accordance with prevailing social values and institutions, and strengthening such values and institutions. In this respect voluntary agencies fulfil a systems-maintenance function. The developmental function may signify policy promotion to enhance the well-being of the more deprived and vulnerable segments of the population. Stimulation and development of human resources may be a strong focus. The social change function is possible within democratic societies where popular dissent is tolerated. In such instances, voluntary agencies oriented to change frequently begin as, or become part of, social movements. The targets for change may include policies and practices of governments. Change activities of voluntary agencies are non-violent but confrontational toward systems change.

In many countries the profession of social work functions as an integral part of the structure and service programme of social welfare. Sometimes its central function is to carry out social welfare activities. Currently social work adopts a strong therapeutic and professional approach, and operates with other service professionals within the social welfare network. However, it should be noted that social work as a profession has the closest association with welfare. Historically social work has been dedicated to the amelioration of social problems and the conditions of the poor. That is the case notwithstanding the fact that in practice it is very much restricted to individual needs and problems. Social work is not an effective means of social reform or correcting the conditions that give rise to poverty.

In relation to social welfare it may be said that social work stands between the individual, and social institutions and resources. In this respect social work fulfils a dual function. It assists the individual to utilize social institutions, and it seeks to modify or change social institutions to meet the needs of people. However, the general notion of social work is that its functions in society are mainly to maintain social stability and to meet the short-term needs of people. In this process it applies knowledge and skills in social casework, group work, and community work for problem-solving and adjustment.

Within the context of social welfare, social workers should not only be equipped for direct intervention and services to individuals, families and groups, but also with skills in systems
intervention. Both of these functions require a sophisticated understanding of society and the way social systems operate. Social work's traditional regard for both the individual and society, as well as its roots in both social theories and values, could make it a strategic profession to reform social institutions in order to meet human needs more effectively. However, for social workers to fulfil such functions, the necessary training would be required.

3.7 CURRENT DEBATES AND ISSUES IN SOCIAL WELFARE

Throughout history the subject of social welfare and in particular public assistance has been a controversial issue. Some of the issues being debated today have been under discussion since the inception of social welfare. Questions posed in this respect include some of the following: Should the poor be helped or punished? Who is to blame for the plight of the poor? Do the poor have the same rights as other people? Who should pay for the social services? Who should decide on the provision and allocation of social services? What is the effect of receiving welfare on the incentive to work? Who should be helped? These issues linger on despite the fact that for many countries social welfare is not a high priority. Resources of governments go primarily to defence and to prestigious projects, leaving little for social welfare service.

The public dislike and distrust of people on welfare was indicated in 1977 in America in a nationwide opinion poll. On a question whether most people who receive money from welfare could get along without it if they tried, only 31% said that people really needed help, compared to 54% who said they could get along without it (Handel 1982: 4). In response to another question, 58% said they did not approve of most government-sponsored welfare programmes (Ibid). The debate about public welfare is about the issue whether the government can assure every citizen of a decent income and standard of living. In practice public assistance programmes mean that the government collects income taxes from individuals and business, and pays out some of that money as benefits to those who do not have income from work, or ownership of property. This creates an intense debate on the aims of social policy and the relationship between social policy and economic policy. There seems to be an ongoing conflict between these two concepts. The crucial issue is how to alleviate poverty and also promote the incentive to work. There is an inherent contradiction between work and social welfare. Welfare provision is necessary in any
capitalist economic system. On the other hand, welfare to the extent that it makes the conditions to people secure, creates disincentives to work in the kind of way and at the level of intensity required by the economy. Therefore governments are not too keen to make public assistance too attractive and freely available. They want able-bodied people to support themselves through work.

The concept of need has also become an issue. People increasingly nowadays are defining need as a need for equality rather than simply a need for subsistence. This brings us to the conflict between the view that social policies ought to be inclusive, meeting an agreed range of needs or states of dependency, without reference to the cause of the need or dependency. There should be no discrimination between deserving and undeserving cases, judged according to whether the need or state of dependency could have been avoided through personal forethought and self-help. The counter argument is that needs are open-ended, and if they are seen as the basis of welfare rights, it is difficult to draw a line. One of the dilemmas of social welfare programmes is that they tend to increase continuously.

Currently, the major issue in social welfare is the debate about the Welfare State. The idea of the Welfare State is treated with scepticism in many countries. Amongst social scientists there seems to be general consensus that the Welfare State is under attack. This attack, it is said, is directed against the Welfare State as an institution in society. Since the 1970's, the belief that the Welfare State has grown too extensive has become more and more acceptable in Western economies (Bean; 1985, 100). Much of the current debates about the Welfare State turn on the issue of whether more generous social benefits for people discourage self-reliance, work effort, and economic productivity.

The argument put forward now is that in a modern economy distribution of income should be left to "market forces". The philosophy proclaimed economic incentives in the form of tax cuts, from which all would benefit in the form of greater enterprise and employment (Loney 1987). This view is based on two arguments. The first is that public expenditure should be restrained in order to promote development of the private sector. This, it is said, would ultimately provide the wealth to pay for essential services. In other words, if you free the economy from any restrictions, it will
lead to economic growth. This would have a "trickling-down" effect which would benefit everybody, also the poor. The second argument is that public services could be made to operate more efficiently by introducing commercial practices and market principles. On the basis of these arguments, three main methods are now advocated:

(i) social services could be privatized by contracting them out to private firms or simply leaving them to the market to provide;

(ii) cash limits could be imposed by central government on social welfare spending bodies like the National Health Services and local government;

(iii) the demand for social services could be shifted by means of charges for services used by the public (Bean 1985: 47).

The idea is to shift the balance of social service provision from the public sector towards the market sector. This, it is claimed, would extend personal freedom, increase individual responsibility, and enhance consumer choice (Ibid).

On analysing the arguments, it would seem that the concern is with economic policies and not with social policies. The debate focuses on narrow economic objectives that emphasize market principles, not the distribution of resources according to need. The difficulties in sustaining growth and in securing increased productivity in the economy has convinced many governments that the Welfare State is a brake on economic growth. "It is difficult to comprehend how the market forces can solve the welfare problem, as the modern Welfare State is a direct consequence of capitalism. It is exactly created as a compensation for the various types of market failure recognized by economists" (Bean 1985: 99). The contradiction about privatisation of social services is the fact that it was introduced precisely because the market could not distribute the social goods, neither could it accommodate everybody in obtaining an income. It is acknowledged that "there exist circumstances which inevitably prohibit the free market mechanism within the economy from delivering the socially optimal solution and there will accordingly be a case for government intervention" (Ibid). If the market cannot regulate itself and the needs of people are not adequately met, then it is the duty of the State to intervene in certain strategic social as well as economic policy areas.
The debate about the privatisation of welfare services starts from the dichotomy "that collective provision is potentially more egalitarian, socially responsible, and democratic than services provided by the private market" (Le Grand and Robinson 1984: 19). The case for the public provision of social services by the State is that it does the following:

(i) "Promotes social purpose rather than individual self-interest, social integration rather than individualistic differentiation;
(ii) Collective control [sic] of social services, through a democratically elected government;
(iii) Collective services can distribute resources according to need, that is, according to 'social' as opposed to 'economic' priorities;
(iv) Public control is needed to provide regulated, standardised and efficient services;
(v) Public social services can counteract the natural tendency of capitalist enterprise to increase inequalities in the distribution of resources, status and power. The State can guarantee minimum incomes and standards of provision, and it is the only institution that can ensure the application of distribitional justice throughout society" (Ibid: 20 - 21).

The real reason for the failure of the Welfare State seems to be the nature of the economy on which it is built. In trying to answer the question as to what has led to the critique of the Welfare State in Britain, Plant says "it is the constrained economic environment within a capitalist economy. This creates problems in providing the resources for the extension of welfare rights. This is a real dilemma, because many defenders of the Welfare State had previously argued that the Welfare State was necessary to secure the legitimacy of capitalism as it dealt with the inevitable side-effects of capitalism - - poverty and inequality (Bean 1985: 5). "A Welfare State in a constrained economy has two contradictory imperatives. The first is welfare expenditure which is necessary to secure legitimacy and the second is to secure the conditions of capital accumulation necessary for capitalist development" (Ibid). The social policy debate, and in particular the issue of privatisation, adopts the view that:

"Although the intention of creating a secure and fair society was certainly laudable at the outset, it seems to some that the initial seed of the welfare state has matured into a sprawling giant which smothers human initiative, inhibits individual freedom and choice, imposes intolerable tax burdens, and is pure and simply inefficient" (Ibid: 100).
Because of this dilemma it is now said that welfare provision needs to be reappraised and the market principle must be introduced in circumstances where it is more appropriate. Whether this change of direction will solve the problems faced, remains an open question. Experience has taught us that accumulation of wealth does not solve problems of inequality, poverty, deprivation, and underdevelopment. People remain poor despite an increase in the gross national product. The rich get richer while the situation of the poor remains more or less the same, or even falls back. Economic growth should be accompanied by direct policy intervention attacking poverty and providing for economic redistribution to improve the quality of life. In addition to such firm policy commitments, other systems of provision for need may be explored. In this respect Spiegel and Wagner are of the opinion that a new paradigm of service provision should be adopted. They see an increasing emphasis on service delivery, together with an increasing role for alternative mechanisms for delivering these services (1986: 124). They say social policy in the future will rely more on social services than on income transfer strategies, since the current expansion of income transfers cannot continue much longer at the present rate. This trend, they say, is already beginning to take shape in some countries. As potential alternative systems for the cost-effective provision of human services, self-help groups, alternative services, and (re)activated natural social networks take on increasing importance (Ibid). However, it should be emphasized that such programmes can only operate as an extension of social welfare, not as a substitute. The State has a particular function to secure the welfare of its citizens.

3.8 CONCLUSIONS

The major theme of this chapter has been the place of social welfare as a social institution in society to address human needs. In pursuing this theme, we have traced its historical traditions as it emerged from private charities and the English Poor Laws. The Industrial Revolution introduced a new dimension into social welfare and was one of the most important factors shaping contemporary systems of social welfare. Notwithstanding difficulties in describing the concept, we have seen that it might be defined either in a narrow and restricted way, covering areas like social security benefits and services to the poor and the disabled, or in a broad and comprehensive way covering collective provision, income security, education, health, housing, and other
preventive and development services.

We may conclude that social welfare is a system to meet basic human needs and to secure a minimum standard of well-being to individuals and families. The structure of social welfare consists basically of three major sections; the economic base producing the resources, the policy determining section which is the political function of the State, and the service delivery or distributing and infra-structural section handled by specific government departments and voluntary organizations.

Historically, social welfare developed progressively through various stages. It started from paternalistic relief and curative social policies, to a liberal phase characterised by social security benefits and social insurance. The next logical phase of advancement seems to be a social democratic era characterized by protective and co-operative social policies. However, the present trend seems to be to reverse this, and to turn the clock back to voluntary and private welfare efforts. According to Romanyszyn, this takes us back to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a period characterised by a moral view of the needy and which insisted on minimum government effort and "free play" of the market forces (Romanyszyn 1971: 36). However, the point is made that laissez-faire did not mean the absence of government, but the use of government to create the conditions for economic initiative and development of the economy (Ibid).

The overview revealed that social welfare is an institutional provision to support, supplement, or substitute functions traditionally performed by the family and mutual aid patterns in pre-industrial societies. In terms of the convergence theory, social welfare is a logical necessity of industrialization. It deals with the adverse consequences of industrialization and urbanization. Besides the classical functions of social welfare, it also has clear political and economic functions. Priven and Cloward in particular argue that it is a mechanism to regulate and control the poor (1971). For this reason we need to understand the social, political, and economic system within which it operates. Social policies are shaped by the economic structure and the political system of a country. Social welfare is directly linked to the dominant social values and beliefs of society. In terms of these values, various models of welfare have been designed to meet human needs.
These models, we said, lie on a continuum of welfare provisions ranging between capitalism on the one side to socialism on the other side. The welfare state as a system to meet human needs was introduced as a compromise between capitalism and socialism.

Social welfare and in particular the Welfare State finds itself presently in a crisis. Contemporary issues in social welfare are the increase of social benefits, lack of economic growth, and the inability of the economy to provide the goods to be distributed by the welfare system. Critics of the welfare State have come to the conclusion that the Welfare State as an institution is a barrier to economic recovery and growth. It should therefore be dismantled and to allow the market to grow and to distribute resources. To deal with the issue, some Western countries are attempting to dismantle the Welfare State as an institution and have introduced policies for the privatization of welfare and the introduction of market principles to distribute welfare resources. Underlying these issues and concerns of welfare is the nature of the economy and patterns of social welfare.

This overview of social welfare has indicated that the distribution of resources and human well-being do not occur automatically. They result from political decisions that reflect values and the distribution of power. There seems to be a need to look for alternatives that would require a new image of man, and social possibilities that transcend both the market mentality and our current methods of social intervention (Romanyshyn 1971: 155). The structure of the market society, its values and business ideology, its distribution of power and privilege, set limits to its welfare function. We have seen that the values applying in the market system are self-interests, individual competition, and a profit-oriented price system. The market produces not only goods and resources, it also creates values. "It helps to structure not only buying and selling, but our image of man and society, and our vision of alternate possibilities" (Ibid: 157).

The above discussion indicates to us that new directions in social welfare should take into account theories of development as well as the realities of our time. These are the nature of the economy, the nature of man, the needs of people as human beings, and the obligations of the State towards its citizens. Fundamental changes in dominant social and political values, and in the prevailing systems of the political relations, are necessary to solve the problems of the unjust distribution of resources and facilities, and to bring about social justice. The basic question seems to be our
starting point and what is regarded to be more important. It is argued here that the human person and his needs should be our starting point. I have in mind a humanitarian model concerned with providing basic necessities and privileges to individuals by virtue of the fact that they are human beings (Kellner 1976: 67). Humanity and the basic needs of people should not be subjected to any conditions. If this is our basic point of departure, then the political model of regulating and planning for welfare objectives, as well as the economic base, should operate in the interest of humanity as a whole and the needs of people. Instead of only transferring the welfare function to the market, the State should look at various theories of development, social policies, and economic models as possible solutions, and how the economy can operate in the interest of all citizens and their needs.
CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIAL WELFARE AND APARTHEID: AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The value of an historical perspective is that it assists us to analyze and understand present conditions. History may be an important intellectual fulcrum for the futures researcher because it can help him/her to determine the crucial initial conditions and decision points for controlling the future. The development of social policy needs to be informed by knowledge from the past and understanding of contemporary issues. In this way the researcher can make a contribution to plan for the future.

In the previous chapter a comprehensive overview was given of social welfare as a system to meet human needs. Social welfare, we have seen, operates as a supplement to the economic system to meet human needs and alleviate poverty. This chapter aims to give an historical overview of social welfare in South Africa with special emphasis on the central issue of the study viz. apartheid in social welfare and its implications in formulating post-apartheid welfare policies. A special study will be made of the emergence and structuring of social welfare.

In this historical overview, a study is made of socio-economic and political forces that have contributed and shaped the social welfare system in South Africa. The issue of the Poor White Problem, Afrikaner Nationalism, and the so-called guardianship principle will be examined. The hypothesis is that sectoral and racial issues have had a determining effect on the introduction and establishment of social welfare in South Africa. The major concern, when social welfare measures were first introduced, was the welfare and security of the White population group. The longterm national welfare of the entire population was subordinated to short-term group and racial interests, reflecting the dominant thinking of that time. Besides the role of the State in social welfare, a partnership was ab initio forged with non-governmental organizations, and in particular with the churches to assist the State in rendering welfare services. To a large extent, such agencies had little option but to operate within the ideological framework of the government.
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The chapter next looks at apartheid policies and structures in social welfare. The focus here will be on the consolidation of the apartheid ideology and the establishment of racially-differentiated welfare services during the 1940's and 1950's. An analysis and understanding of these processes and policies is crucially important when considering post-apartheid welfare policies. The particular role of the State through legislation as well as social policy and planning will be examined. The chapter concludes by discussing the social and political forces that have opposed apartheid and the response of the State to such forces.

4.2 THE SHAPING OF SOCIAL WELFARE IN SOUTH AFRICA

The history of institutionalized social welfare in South Africa is appropriately traced back to the 1930's. The crucial issue which led to the inception and formalization of social welfare on a scale comparable to many Western societies, was the concern with White welfare, heightened by the First Carnegie Inquiry into the Poor White Problem. The approach to welfare at that time was a racial and sectionalistic one. The point of departure was White poverty and welfare, not the national welfare of all the people in the country. This perspective formed the basis on which welfare services evolved and were structured.

A question comes to mind immediately: Why the concern with the Poor White issue while the plight of other racial groups were in many respects worse than that of the Poor Whites? This question may be approached from more than one perspective. However, I want to contend that the answers are to be found in some of the following ideological positions of that time:

(i) White hegemony and concern for the European settlers in a displaced colonial environment,

(ii) A commitment to White supremacy,

(iii) The guardianship relationship to "Non-Whites",

(iv) Afrikaner Nationalism,
(v) The concern of the Dutch Reformed Church for its own flock.

These ideologies and values gave content to the emerging social welfare policies.

Taking the 1930's as the point of departure for a study of social welfare policy in South Africa, it is important to focus on the views and activities of this period. It is also necessary to discover what the position was before that period and what has happened since then. In terms of this periodization, three stages in the development of social welfare may be identified:

(i) the period before the 1930's,

(ii) the period between 1930 and 1950,

(iii) the period between 1951 and 1980.

Most authors recording the history of social welfare in South Africa adopt a periodization paradigm. Pieterse divides the development of social welfare into three periods; the pre-professional period, the transitional period, and the professional period (1976: 35). He says the pre-professional period is the period between 1652 and approximately 1930. The transitional period runs from 1931 - 1950, and the professional period from 1951. Although his main concern is with a professional social work paradigm, his periodization clearly identifies three significant stages in the development of social welfare.

Pieterse is not alone in identifying "periods" in the development of social welfare. In an historical survey of the field of social work in South Africa, the Reverend P. du Toit, a former Commissioner of Social Welfare, distinguished four periods: the Pioneer or Family period, the Church Welfare period, the Private Agency period, and the State Welfare period (Union of South Africa 1940: 14). These periods or stages, he points out, cannot be sharply demarcated, since one flows imperceptibly into the other and the characteristics of all four are blended in present-day social welfare.
Using a similar approach, Theron and Stulting divide the development of social welfare into six periods; the family period, the period of Church involvement, the emergence of voluntary agencies, the Carnegie Inquiry and the "Volkskongres", the training and employment of social workers, the establishment of the Department of Social Welfare (1961). Potgieter goes one better. He identifies seven periods: the period before unification (1652-1910), the period 1910-1919, the period 1920-1929, the period 1930-1939, the period 1940-1949, the period 1950-1959, and the period 1960-1969 (1973).

For the purpose of this study the development of social welfare will be studied and analyzed in terms of the period before the 1930's, the period between 1930 and 1950, and the period after 1951.

4.2.1 The Period before 1930

The period before 1930 and in particular during the nineteenth century, can be described as the era of religion and voluntarism. During this period, basically four institutions were involved in social welfare services: the family, the Church, voluntary agencies, and to some extent the State in terms of legislation. These institutions operated to a large extent in isolation from one another. Services provided were of a minimal nature. A system of co-ordinated welfare services was non-existent because governmental authorities were not really concerned with social welfare. People were primarily responsible for their own welfare. South Africa differed from other colonial situations in the sense that it was never a single colony, and was an independent country after 1910.

4.2.1.1 The Role of the Family

The period before 1930 may be regarded as the traditional family period. It may also be described as the pioneer period where each family or group of families had to provide for their own needs. It was characterized by a communally-based social order, in which the family in its various extensions fulfilled all the welfare functions. This basically meant that there were no organized welfare services. The family was primarily responsible for welfare services to its members.
Consequently, the family, supported by its communal ties and personal networks, performed all functions that were assigned to welfare agencies after industrialization and urbanization. The basic principle on which social welfare operated was mutual aid and charity.

The role of the family in social welfare should be seen against the background of the distribution of the population at that time. During this period the majority of people lived in rural areas where they made a living by way of a subsistence economy and agriculture. Subsistence and mutual aid patterns formed the basis of meeting needs and caring for one another. This form of charity and provision was possible because the needs of families were simple, the country was vast and sparsely populated. As a result self-help was the only possible way out. "In those days there was no strongly marked dividing line between wealthy and poor, capitalist and labourer, employer and employee; there was no great wealth nor marked poverty. Mutual personal aid in the social field was thus certain and sufficient" (Union of South Africa 1940: 15).

With the discovery of gold and diamonds, events changed dramatically in South Africa. People migrated to urban areas where different social patterns, needs, and problems developed. In the rural areas the situation also changed. The Anglo-Boer War ruined the infrastructure in rural areas and devastation prevailed. The situation worsened as a consequence of the drought and depression in the late 1920's. This contributed to rural poverty and migration to urban areas.

4.2.1.2 The Role of the Dutch Reformed Church

The most powerful religious body during this period was the Dutch Reformed Church. During the early history, this Church played a very important part in social welfare, particularly in the case of White Afrikaners. People were looking to the church for support and assistance. The role of the church should be seen in historical context. Helm noted in this regard:

"South Africa had inherited from its European inputs the traditional role of religious institutions in the welfare field. From its Anglo-Saxon cultural traditions came the notions of voluntary association. Hence we might expect both the churches and the leading voluntary welfare workers to occupy central positions in the search for solutions" (1985: 5).
Pieterse says that during this period the church fulfilled a dual function: it provided certain specific services and, secondly, it investigated and studied the relevant circumstances so as to meet various needs, to solve certain problems, and to bring them to the attention of the Government (1976: 37). In terms of specific services, the following could be mentioned:

(a) Care for neglected and orphaned children.

These children were placed in foster care, while institutions for orphans were started later. The first of such institutions was inaugurated in 1815.

(b) Schools of Industry.

Towards the end of the 19th century, the Dutch Reformed Church assisted the children of Poor Whites in order to prepare them for life tasks. The Church started schools of industry for white boys and girls. The "Arme Jongens Inrichting" was the first institution of this kind. Between 1894 and 1922, twelve of these schools were in operation (Ibid: 38).

(c) School hostels.

After 1916 a system of school hostels was introduced by the Church and the State in order to ensure that White children in remote rural areas could attend school in a nearby town.

(d) The establishment of rural settlements.

Many of the services provided by the Church were to assist poor Whites in the rural areas. For this purpose settlements were started to combat impoverishment and devastation in rural areas. At one stage 5,000 poor Whites were cared for in these settlements (Ibid).

(e) Old age homes and institutions for unmarried mothers.
It was the Church which laid the foundation for these services. In 1882 a home for dependent aged women was started and one for men in 1886.

(f) Institutions for special care.

Institutions were started for children who required special care, like the blind, the deaf and epileptic. It was however the Catholic Church that pioneered care for the blind and the deaf. The Anglican Church, the Wesleyan Methodists (and others) all made their contributions by establishing children's homes, and schools for Europeans as well as for other population groups.

With regard to the church's second function in social welfare, i.e. investigation and studying of conditions, conferences were organized to highlight social issues. These issues were brought to the attention of the authorities while pressure was exerted on them to act. In 1893 the Church organized the first conference on the Poor White issue at Stellenbosch. At this conference the need for a scientific inquiry into the problem was emphasized. A second conference on the issue was held in 1916 at Cradock and a third one in 1923 in Bloemfontein. These conferences were the forerunners of the First Carnegie Inquiry into the Poor White Problem.

Although it might be claimed that the Dutch Reformed Church initiated most social welfare services in the case of Whites, other Churches were also involved in similar efforts, though on a more limited scale. It is also important to remember that the Dutch Reformed Church was one of the largest organizations among Whites in rural areas where many of the problems were experienced. Missionaries were primarily responsible for welfare services to indigenous groups by providing medical services and education. Social welfare services were regarded as an integral part of their Christian mission. The authorities, we have seen, were not much concerned with social welfare. The little that they did was generally restricted to "Europeans" and to protect the colonial community. The authorities adopted a residual colonial approach to social welfare which was based on the philosophy of the British Poor Laws.

An outstanding feature during this period was the spirit of charity of the Christian and other Churches which provided the incentive to the introduction and extension of welfare work in South
Africa. The first thing however which churches thought of when they contemplated social welfare was the establishment of institutions. It was only after the publication of the Carnegie Report on the Poor White Problem, that churches began to amend their methods and new associations were established with the object of social rehabilitation, giving advice and guidance with a view to preventive work, investigating causes, and treating the causal conditions from which poverty and degeneration sprang.

Besides a separate missionary approach practised by some churches, the Anglican Church, the Methodist Church and the Roman Catholic Church rendered services to all population groups. Poverty among Blacks, although most of them lived in the shadow of Whites and worked for them, was seldom made an issue. Nevertheless, in Cape Town alone, there were before 1900, 6 voluntary agencies serving "Non-Whites" only and 13 serving both Whites and "Non-Whites" (Helm 1962: 41).

4.2.1.3 The Role of Voluntary Welfare Organizations

During this early period, Women's Organizations and Child Welfare Agencies were the only significant welfare organizations in South Africa. These voluntary services increased towards the end of the 19th century because of the Poor White Problem and the situation created by the Anglo-Boer War. "As a result of the destruction, impoverization, and the suffering, especially of women folk and children, consequent upon the ravages of the Boer War, interested women constituted themselves into committees at various centres to give assistance to those in need and to deal generally with the problems which arose" (Union of South Africa 1940: 16). Women's Committees were started at different places all over the country. These Committees were the forerunners of the four big "Afrikaanse Vroueverenigings" for White Afrikaners. These organizations rendered welfare services to families, with special emphasis on the youth. They were particularly active in rural areas.

Although some voluntary or charitable organizations had been initiated during the 1800's, "it was the war-torn start of the twentieth century that truly ushered in the era of the voluntary associations in welfare work" (Helm 1985: 4). After Unification in 1910 the country experienced
rapid growth in the number and variety of its welfare organizations. "One of the characteristics of voluntary agencies is their ability to adapt themselves readily to changing social circumstances. Hence, in flexing to a society's needs, they mirror the social thinking of their time, and embody its social values" (Ibid). The development of voluntary agencies gained momentum after the publication of the Carnegie Report. In its first Report covering the period 1937 - 1939, the Department of Social Welfare reported that a total of 782 national and local voluntary societies concerned with social welfare were operational in South Africa (Union of South Africa 1940: 19).

With the migration of people to urban areas, other voluntary services also came into being. The first significant organization in this respect was the Child Welfare Organization. Information concerning the death rate of children led to legislation to protect children and the establishment of the Society for the Protection of Child Life in 1908 in Cape Town and the Children's Aid Society in 1909 in Johannesburg. These Societies were the forerunners of the present Child and Family Welfare Organizations co-ordinated by the National Council for Child Welfare. Before 1930 three other national councils were established. They were the South African National Council for Mental Health in 1920, the S.A. National Council for the Blind in 1929, and the S.A. National Council for the Deaf also in 1929.

4.2.1.4 The Role of the State

Up to the 1930's the State had a limited role in social welfare. The earliest form of social services by governmental authorities, was to place those in need of care in the care of a private person to look after them. For this service a monthly allowance was paid (Potgieter 1973: 27). Otherwise the State was primarily responsible for legislation, the introduction of probation services, and in some instances it took over services that were initiated by the Church.

(a) Legislation

The first South African legislation containing sections relating to children in need of care was adopted in the Cape Colony in 1856, viz. the "Meesters en Diensboden Wet, 1856" (The Masters
and Servants Act). According to this Act, a magistrate could decide to place a neglected child in the care of a family member or a capable person. In this way the child was booked-in with this family or person. The Masters and Servants Act did not only apply to children. The Act was in a sense an extension of the master-servant relationship that existed during the period of slavery (Mermelstein 1987: 51). Breaking a labour contract was a criminal offence and punishable by imprisonment. The Act was repeatedly improved and strengthened. Legislation adopted in 1889 made the booked-in system also applicable to juvenile offenders and in 1894 provision was made for children in need of care to be sent to an institution. In 1879 legislation was adopted to make provision for the establishment and control of reformatories. In terms of this legislation juvenile offenders could now also be committed to reformatories.

Legislation with regard to children passed in 1895 laid down that parents were legally responsible for the maintenance of their children. In 1901 the first comprehensive children's legislation was passed in Natal. This legislation made provision for placing children in need of care in the care of a welfare organization or a State institution. They could also be booked-in or placed in the care of a capable person.

After Unification in 1910, much of the legislation pertaining to children was consolidated under the "Gevangenissen en Verbetergestichten Wet 1911". This Act was administered by the Department of Prisons. Children's legislation was now part of the legislation for adult offenders and alcoholics. It was only in 1913 that the first national separate legislation for children, the "Wet ter Bescherming van Kinderen, 1913", was introduced. Initially this Act was also administered by the Department of Prisons. However, in 1917 its administration was transferred to the Department of Union Education. This legislation was amended in 1923 to make provision for the adoption of children. The final piece of welfare legislation adopted in the "pre-professional period" was the Act on Work Colonies, Act No. 20 of 1927. The Act made provision for the treatment and rehabilitation of persons with alcohol-related problems and who undermined social discipline by their lack of diligence.

The first signs of concern for a system of social welfare by the State was evident in 1916 with the appointment of the "Armzorg en Hulptoelagen Kommissie" (Jeppe-Commission). This
Commission proposed the establishment of central Boards for the control and co-ordination of welfare services. Furthermore, the Commission recommended that a section be created in the Department of Internal Affairs to co-ordinate the services of all the proposed Boards. In addition it was also indicated that there was a real need for a department to assume responsibility for social welfare. These proposals were not implemented.

When the Nationalist Party came to power in 1924, the Department of Labour was created to deal with poverty. The issue of poverty was regarded as an issue of employment that should be addressed by creating job opportunities. The Department established close links with the public and made a special study of labour issues and unemployment.

(b) Transfer of Services initiated by the Churches.

One of the welfare functions of the churches and voluntary welfare agencies was to identify needs and to initiate services that should be provided by the State. In 1925, the schools of industry, initiated by the Dutch Reformed Church, were transferred to the State. The State also accepted responsibility to pay an allowance to widowed mothers to enable them to care for their children. Unemployment bureaux and placement in employment were also taken over by the State.

(c) Probation Services

In 1913, at the request of the Director of Prisons, the "Hulpvereniging ten behoewe van Gevangenes" accepted responsibility for probation services. In that same year the Department of Justice appointed the first probation officer. Probation services were transferred to the Department of Union Education in 1935 and to the Department of Social Welfare in 1937.

Although apartheid was not official policy at this stage, social and racial patterns were in existence which laid the basis for apartheid in social welfare. The various racial groups that make up South Africa's population have never enjoyed the same social status. One thing was evident throughout history, "the White group is . . generally considered socially superior to Non-White groups, and within the Non-White groups the African group as inferior to the others" (Helm
Discrimination against indigenous people constituted an integral part of the South African society since the earliest days of colonialism.

Various political and social forces became operational after the Anglo-Boer War, followed by Unification in 1910. The termination of the war in 1902 was the beginning of Afrikaner Nationalism - "a burning nationalism and a determination to become the rulers of their land - one day" (Wilkens and Strydom 1978: 38). African Nationalism on the other hand was growing under the African National Congress, founded in 1912. The internal political situation was in turmoil because of Louis Botha's government's decision to join Britain in World War I, which led to the Rebellion in 1914, some citizens of the two former Boer Republics taking up arms. In these circumstances the Afrikaner Broederbond was born in 1918 to work for Afrikaner Nationalism and a Republic ruled by Afrikaners (Ibid). A situation prevailed where various forces were in operation from divergent angles. The Whites who were in power were faced with internal political divisions and impoverishment, while Blacks were left out of all political arrangements. This was the political situation at the end of the "pre-professional period" which had an impact on the development of social welfare. These factors seriously contributed to the development of Afrikaner Nationalism and created the framework for the policy of apartheid.

4.2.2 The Period between 1930 - 1950

If the nineteenth century was the era of religion and voluntarism, then the period 1900 to 1937 may be seen as a continuation of such philanthropy, but combined now with a growing demand for State participation. Until 1930, as we have seen, the State's contribution to social welfare consisted mainly of legislation confined to the protection of children and to institutional care. The only other organized services that existed were assistance to indigent or dependent groups by means of various forms of poor relief, medical care, and grants to mothers and children in terms of the Children's Protection Act of 1913. Poor relief was provided by the Provinces, charitable organizations, and churches. Medical care was provided by the Central Government and Provincial Administrations.
The years 1937 to 1951 may, broadly speaking, be described as the time of dual control, with the State assuming ever-growing statutory powers curtailing the freedom of voluntary effort. Institutionalized social welfare in South Africa was introduced during the period 1930 - 1950. Before this period social welfare was of a marginal nature and primarily based on voluntary efforts. In contrast to these early activities, the 1930s were characterized by massive State and community involvement in social welfare. The State was in a sense "forced" by the Dutch Reformed Church, voluntary organizations, and certain academics to accept its responsibility in this regard.

The most significant event that started the new era in social welfare was the First Carnegie Inquiry into the Poor White Problem.

(a) The Carnegie Inquiry and the "Volkskongres" of 1934

When the President and the Secretary of the Carnegie Foundation in New York visited South Africa in 1927, the Dutch Reformed Church and various voluntary organizations requested them to assist with a comprehensive inquiry into the Poor White issue in the country, ignoring the plight of other population groups.

The request was granted and the Foundation funded the inquiry. Two Sociologists, Drs. Kenyon L. Butterfield and C.W. Coulter were sent on behalf of the Foundation to assist in the research. The Carnegie Inquiry was in the first place a fact-finding commission whose aim was "to make a correct diagnosis of the national evil of Poor Whiteism" (National Conference on the Poor White Problem 1934: 3).

The Report of the Inquiry was published in five volumes between 1931 and 1932. The following were some of the most important recommendations:

- the active participation of the client in the helping process,
- the importance of case studies,
- self-help as a principle,
* reducing direct material assistance,
* the establishment of a Department of Sociology at a university,
* better co-ordination between welfare bodies,
* central bureaux of information,
* revision of all social legislation and the establishment of a government bureau of social welfare.

The Report adopted a new approach to the person in need. It also highlighted the importance of scientific knowledge in helping people. It emphasized the fact that social assistance should be co-ordinated in society and that it should not necessarily be material assistance.

Although the Report was received very favourably, no immediate action was taken. In fact there was a silence of 18 months. It was only when the public press agitated for a representative conference to consider the findings of the Commission, and if possible to base on them a broad programme of action, that something was done (Ibid). The Dutch Reformed Church took a leading role by nominating three committees to study the Report and to convene a conference. These efforts ushered in two decades of "Great Welfare Conferences" in South Africa, the "Volkskongres" in Kimberley in October 1934 being the first one.

The purpose of the "Volkskongres" in Kimberley was to make definite proposals for a "nationwide" policy for attacking the poverty problem amongst Whites. An outstanding feature was the commitment and human compassion with which the problem was tackled. It was seen as a major challenge - - a matter for the nation (volksaak). This commitment was summarized by the Rev. J.R. Alberlyn when he said:

"What may well be expected of this Conference is that all the great social institutions of the country: the State, education, the Churches, other philanthropic bodies, indeed that all the citizens, each in his own sphere of labour, but acting in co-ordination with the rest, will in future present a united front to the common enemies of pauperism, misery, and degradation (National Conference on the Poor White Problem 1934: 5)."

At the opening of the Conference the partnership and co-operation between the government and the Dutch Reformed Church was evident. The government was represented by its Minister of
Labour and Industries. He and a representative of the Church delivered the opening addresses. The Conference agreed upon the following broad objectives:

- that a Department of Social Welfare be established,
- the training and employment of social workers,
- the introduction of vocational courses for voluntary workers,
- that a wide range of community activities be provided,
- that preventive, developmental, and after-care services be introduced.

Besides the above broad policy strategies to combat poverty, a wide range of specific areas relating to social welfare were covered. The Conference decided on the following specific activities to eradicate poverty:

- combatting poverty and reorganizing welfare work,
- the improvement of housing conditions in cities, towns and villages,
- the development of a rural health and nursing service,
- the development of opportunities for recreation and amusement for the poorer classes,
- the subsidising of social work,
- indoor relief and care for the aged,
- services for child welfare and juvenile delinquency,
- measures for increasing male employment in existing urban employment,
- the creation of new opportunities for work, and measures for the provision of a more rational placement in employment,
- employment and care of female employees,
- the provision of temporary employment,
- temporary care of the unemployed by means of unemployment and health insurance,
- increase of employment in rural areas by the general improvement of agriculture,
- special provision of employment in rural areas for the European Poor,
- compulsory measures for adults: Church settlements and labour colonies,
the place of the Church as social institution in national life,
* the Christian ideal of social work,
* the Poor White problem as a psychological and educational one,
* the school system and the syllabus,
* health education,
* vocational guidance, vocational training and adult education,
* the social implications of the Christian Gospel.

It was recognized that the two main institutions that could play a crucial role to eradicate poverty
were the State and the Church.

After the Conference a Continuation Committee under the chairmanship of Dr H. F. Verwoerd
(later to become Prime Minister) was established. Verwoerd wrote to the Prime Minister (then
General Hertzog) saying that:

"The State should establish a Department that could provide the country with
policy and guidance in connection with social welfare problems and by means of
which the government could administer all the welfare activities at present
distributed among several departments. Then at least there would clearly be one
organ responsible for the State's share in welfare work, and the philanthropic
societies . . . would be aware of a single responsible authority with whom they
should co-operate" (Translated and quoted in Helm 1962: 69).

This and other appeals led in 1935 to a Commissioner of Social Welfare being appointed in the
State Department of Labour.

The Carnegie Inquiry and the "Volkskongres" introduced a new chapter in the development of
social welfare in South Africa. The leading role of the government in resolving the Poor White
Problem was emphasized over and over (Ibid: 6). The government thus came under pressure to
take a more active role in social welfare. It was in fact "forced by the church and voluntary
agencies to establish the Department of Social Welfare in 1937" (Theron 1977: 253). Although
the Department might have been established primarily to attend to the needs of poor Whites, it
assumed responsibility for State welfare services to all population groups (Theron 1982: 159).
In addition to the role of the State, all societal institutions had a commitment to solve the problem. This was recognized by the Rev. Wim Nicol when he said:

"Niemand kan teenoor hierdie volksroeping onverskillig staan nie" (National Conference on the Poor White Problem 1934: 5)\(^1\)

At the same time welfare services to other racial groups remained a peripheral issue.

After the Carnegie Inquiry and the "Volkskongres", a range of processes and activities emerged in the welfare field which laid the basis of social welfare in South Africa. In this regard the following activities may be identified:

* official State involvement in social welfare,
* additional social inquiries,
* further welfare conferences,
* social welfare debates and publications,
* increased private initiative in social welfare.

(b) The role of the State in social welfare:

The government's commitment to social welfare was demonstrated with the establishment of the Department of Social Welfare in 1937. From the start it was made clear that the government wished the new State Department to "supplement, not supplant, private programmes of philanthropy with collective social security measures underpinned by the public purse" (Union Department of Social Welfare 1940: 4). The Department was to provide the country with a policy and with guidance in connection with social welfare problems. The Department's functions were described in the following broad terms:

* to assist persons or families that are maladjusted in society,
* to make a study of conditions which may cause or lead to maladjustment and to

---

\(^1\)"Nobody can be indifferent to this call of the nation". (Present author's translation)
provide the appropriate treatment,

* to co-ordinate the work of the Department with that of other State authorities rendering social welfare services,

* to co-ordinate the work of voluntary welfare organizations, as well as all local welfare work of both voluntary agencies and official authorities, including Municipalities.

In the 1943 Report of the Department of Social Welfare, the Secretary summarized the functions of the Department as follows:

* maintenance - - to grant assistance in money or in kind to the economically depressed group,

* reconstruction - - to readjust the socially maladjusted individual, and to rehabilitate the socially and economically handicapped individual or family,

* prevention - - to treat conditions which may produce or may contribute to social problems,

* co-ordination - - to correlate and co-ordinate private charitable and rehabilitative efforts, and to co-ordinate the State's social welfare endeavours through various departments aiming at social rehabilitation,

* research - - to study social conditions or particular social welfare problems, for example, by conducting inspections and surveys (Union of South Africa 1943: 1).

Many of the welfare functions previously undertaken by other State departments or the churches were transferred to the new Department of Social Welfare. This Department was now responsible for a range of services. Some of these were:
With the establishment of the Department of Social Welfare, a clear official line of involvement in social welfare emerged. Besides the services rendered directly by the Department, certain

* Social Work services. Such services included probation; prevention of neglect, ill-treatment, and exploitation of children; care of children who were destitute or in need of care; adoption; and creches and clubs.

* Public Assistance. This scheme provided for persons of low income or in needy circumstances. Included were poor relief, grants to persons suffering from physical or mental disabilities, pensions for the blind, maintenance grants to mothers, State-aided national feeding schemes, homes for the aged poor, and legal aid bureaux. The primary objective with the State-aided feeding scheme was to divert surplus products as much as possible to inland consumption.

* Settlements. These were for the aged, for physically disabled persons, as well as for the "digging community".

* State-operated welfare services. These incorporated specialized training and employment facilities, Work Colonies, the physical training of battalions whereby young men were put into employment for six to twelve months with the purpose to train and discipline them, a training camp for Coloured boys at Kraaifontein, a training centre for girls in Pretoria called the "Kappie Kommando", welfare services at the Public Works Department Camps, and a fishing scheme at Velddrift.

* Welfare services based on housing. The Rent Control Board operated under this scheme, administering the Rent Act, Subsidization of Rents, and Hostels for low-paid workers.

* Other services by the Department were to assist the European poor with housing and employment, and to pay subsidies to voluntary welfare agencies.

With the establishment of the Department of Social Welfare, a clear official line of involvement in social welfare emerged. Besides the services rendered directly by the Department, certain
legislation was administered and enacted to shape social welfare policy in South Africa. The Department also used its Annual Reports to announce the State's policy visions in social welfare.

Regarding legislation, the Department administered four Acts; the Children's Act of 1937, the Rent Act of 1920, the Work Colonies Act of 1927, and the Blind Persons Act of 1936. Old age pensions (paid to Whites and Coloured aged persons since 1928) and War Veterans' Pensions (since 1941), were administered by the Commissioner of Pensions. Old age pensions to Africans and Indians were only paid since 1944. Apart from these non-contributory social security schemes, two contributing schemes were introduced. The Unemployment Insurance Act was introduced in 1937, providing for insurance contributions from the worker, the employer, and the State. In 1941 the Workmen's Compensation Act was introduced, requiring contributions from the employer only. The latter two schemes were administered by the Department of Labour.

Another important phase in the development of social welfare in South Africa was the post-war assessment and reconstruction in 1943. During this period South Africa was part of the Commonwealth and joined Britain's side in World War II. In line with social welfare measures in England after the War, an analysis was made of policies, and of social and economic circumstances, including social security measures. The post-war citizenship drive was to ensure the welfare and protection of those who returned from the war, their dependants, their homes, and their children. This was not to be by way of State dole, but by employment, or by assistance against the contingencies of sickness or any other economic handicap. For this purpose the government appointed a Commission under the Chairmanship of Dr. J.J. van Eck to investigate and to report on existing social services and social security measures, and to recommend a system for the future. However, in 1945 Parliament rejected the idea of a national contributory security scheme.

State involvement during this period (1930 - 1950) culminated in the enactment of Act 40 of 1947, viz. the Welfare Organizations Act. This Act made provision for the establishment of the first Welfare Organizations Board to oversee the registration of welfare organizations. The purpose of the Act was to co-ordinate voluntary welfare services on a national basis and to give guidance in regard to welfare matters to organizations. It was envisaged by the Minister of Social
Welfare that the Board would serve as link between the government and the Department of Social Welfare on the one hand, and the public on the other. In this way the Board was to serve as forum for debate and discussion of welfare matters and welfare policy.

(c) Other Inquiries

In 1937 a Commission was appointed by the government to investigate the needs and problems of the "Coloured Population" of the Union. In the same way the needs of "Natives" were investigated. These inquiries were done separately, indicating the underlying ideology. The philosophy behind this approach was to meet "the specific needs of members of a community forming a group on their own". The ultimate separation of welfare services should be seen in the way in which the problem of poverty was approached, researched, and studied as background. It was done separately. The problems of Whites were studied first, than Coloureds, and lastly Africans.

Another inquiry was the Social Survey of Cape Town conducted from the University of Cape Town between 1936 and 1942. This survey included all ethnic groups and had an urban focus. The following areas were covered in this survey:

* The growth of the population of greater Cape Town,
* The Ethnic Distribution of the population of greater Cape Town,
* The Poverty Datum Line,
* The distribution of poverty among "Coloured" Households in Cape Town,
* The distribution of "European" Households in Cape Town,
* The Occupational Class of "European" male voters in Cape Town.

A third inquiry during this period was undertaken by the Department of Social Welfare in 1950 into the training and employment of Social Workers.
(d) Other Welfare Conferences

The impression often exists that the only major Conference on Social Welfare was the "Volkskongres" in Kimberley in 1934. The "Volkskongres" was only one of a series of Conferences. In 1936 a National Conference on Social Work was held in Johannesburg and a second one in 1944. A third Conference on Social Work was held in 1951 in Cape Town. In 1944 the S.A. National Conference on the Post-War Planning of Social Welfare Work was held at Wits. In 1942 the Social Survey Conference was held in Cape Town. The purpose of the latter Conference was to disseminate the findings of the Social Survey of Cape Town, to discuss the implementation of the findings of the Survey for the future of all sections of the urban population of the Union, and to propose appropriate lines of policy for Post-War reconstruction. During this Conference discussions focused upon labour, health, social welfare, and the tasks of local and provincial government to deal with the social problems highlighted in the Survey. The Conference dealt with the following subjects:

* The State and the health of the Urban Population,
* The State and the Urban Worker,
* The Social Services and the Urban Population,
* The responsibilities of Provincial and Local Authorities.

Within this framework papers were delivered on labour, health, social welfare, slums and housing, education, and the social responsibility of Provincial and municipal governments. Almost all resolutions adopted on wages and poverty, social services, education and health were directed at the government to address these issues.

(e) Private Initiative in Social Welfare

Although some services originally initiated by the churches and Voluntary Organizations were transferred to the State, services and structures by non-governmental organizations expanded after the Carnegie Inquiry. Several other churches which were hitherto not extensively involved in social services started their own social welfare programmes. Voluntary agencies also started to
employ social workers and to specialize in certain service areas. This period was also characterized by co-ordination of welfare services and increasing State intervention in the activities of Voluntary Agencies. In terms of the Welfare Organizations Act of 1947, all Voluntary Agencies had to register and comply with certain prescribed requirements. The Act also made provision for a National Council on Welfare Organizations and for Regional Welfare Boards.

The training and employment of social workers can be identified as another important development during this period. In 1924 the University of Cape Town started with the training of social workers, offering a two-year Diploma. The University of Pretoria began a Bachelors' Degree programme in 1929, while other universities followed suit. Various State Departments began to employ social workers, of which the Department of Railways and Harbours was the first. It was only in the early 1950's that all professional social work activities of the central government were transferred to the Department of Social Welfare.

Social Welfare Debates

The virtually exclusive concern with White welfare, particularly by the State, started a critical debate about poverty and the welfare of other racial groups in South Africa. Although it was admitted from the beginning that this one-sided approach was morally wrong, it was justified in various ways.

At the 1936 National Welfare Conference on Social Work, Batson and Verwoerd, two men who were to be very influential both in social policy and social work education in South Africa, clashed on ideological grounds. Their different ways of thinking were to represent two divergent approaches to welfare questions of the apartheid era. "Batson wanted an open system, flexible in the experimental period the country and its universities were embarking upon. Verwoerd, the architect of Grand Apartheid, had a fixed blue-print in mind" (Helm 1985: 7).

It was clear at an early stage during the period of the "Big Conferences" that a major shift in policy was taking place. Following on the clash between Verwoerd and Batson in 1936, the government wanted the National Conference in 1951 at the University of Cape Town to be...
restricted to Whites. At this Conference the case for and against apartheid in welfare services, voluntary as well as State, was clearly stated. The then Minister of Social Welfare, Dr. Karl Bremer, opened the Conference by stating:

"There may be disputes as to methods, but this I say: there may not, shall not, cannot be any dispute applying welfare measures to all sections of the population . . . if one part of the body is affected, the whole body is soon ill . . . Therefore we shall not be able to get by, even should we wish to, we shall not be able to get by, unless we treat the difficulties, the problems, of every section of the population . . . so that the body politic may remain sound" (National Conference on Social Work 1951 as quoted and translated by Helm 1962: 37).

Responding to Karl Bremer's statement, Prof. Batson said:

"In a country like ours, to conceive of European social welfare is no more possible than to conceive of European causes of poverty, or of European social maladjustment. And to talk of European poverty has no more meaning than to talk of European tuberculosis or European diphtheria. So long as we live on the same earth, our social problems will be in a large measure common to us all. And, if we are to achieve anything that may be rightly called social welfare, some body of persons must concern itself with the needs of us all" (Ibid).

The rationale for separate conferences and separate welfare services was that cultural differences should be taken into account in social welfare. The point was made that "Non-Whites" were "different", and that "their culture", their life differs, and their attitudes of mind are not the same as that of Whites. On this basis it was argued that other population groups should have social workers from their own group, their own schools, and universities.

Welfare services for "Non-Whites" were seen and treated differently from the outset. Besides the fact that local authorities (not the central Government) were responsible for welfare services to Blacks, they were also financed differently. Pollak said in this regard:

"From 1923, when the Urban Areas Act made it essential to utilize the profits of municipally monopolized sale of Kaffir Beer for financing African welfare, expanding housing, recreational and welfare services have been increasingly provided for Africans. But this is one of our South African paradoxes -- the economically most under-privileged thereby largely pay for their own services" (1960: 4).
Since its inception social welfare was based on racial discrimination. This was particularly evident in terms of availability, the terms on which it was available, the scales of benefits, as well as the effective utilization of the services. In this regard Batson said:

"Ethnic discrimination in social services of the Union is the rule rather than the exception, and does not excite much comment" (Batson 1940: 10).

He continues by saying:

"There are fewer social services available to the Non-Europeans than to the European, and many of those that are available are far from adequate. This is true both of private and State services" (Ibid).

Social services were thus not directed to where they were most needed. A survey in 1938 by the Union Department of Social Welfare among the country's major welfare organizations revealed that 75% of the 400 organizations investigated restricted themselves to work among Europeans, and 8% to work among Non-Europeans (Batson 1940: 11). It was also discovered that voluntary organizations were not keen to extend their involvement to other population groups. Helm stated in this regard:

"For reasons of ideology, locality, historical precedent, or practical convenience, some voluntary welfare agencies in Cape Town confine their services to particular ethnic groups and others do not" (1962: 38).

In terms of this differentiation the number of voluntary welfare agencies that rendered services to Whites and "Non-Whites" in Cape Town in 1960, were as follows:

- Whites ............... 93
- "Non-Whites" only .... 68

This position prevailed despite the fact that "hardly any of the Whites, but a quarter of the Asiatics, a third of the Coloured people, and about half the Africans, of Cape Town are in poverty" (Helm 1962: 38).
Batson came out very strongly against these discriminatory practices when he said:

"If the object of a system of social services is in the first place to assure to everybody the basic conditions for human existence, ethnic discrimination within the services is reasonable only on one of the following suppositions:

(i) that society does not recognize the human claims of all its members,
(ii) that ethnic differences co-incide with differences of human needs,
(iii) that ethnic differences co-incide with differences in the availability of private resources" (Batson 1940: 17).

Batson continues by saying:

"Some of the regulations of our social services appear to assume that the Non-European family is better adapted to bearing and sharing economic strain than the correspondingly - situated European family" (Ibid 1940: 18).

The discrimination debate in social welfare continued. Some were attacking it, and others trying to rationalize it. General Smuts stated in 1936 at the National Conference on Social Work:

"I am sure that we have very much, almost criminally, neglected our duty to the Non-European people of this country... We shall fail, and fail profoundly, unless in this matter of social service we give every care and attention to the cause, the hard cause, the pitiable cause of the African, the Coloured person and the Indian in South Africa. Like the learned man in the Bible, we pass by and look the other way, and that has been our habitual attitude except in regard to the missionary. The time has come when we as a European community shall realize our duty and discharge it faithfully" (National Conference on Social Work 1936: 13).

As examples of the conflicting views of the time, the following two quotations from the 1936 Conference are cited:

"The burden of poverty and poor health is carried by the Non-European poor no less than by the White poor, and has resulted in a great amount of social welfare activity on their behalf, as in the case of the White poor" (Ibid: 387).

On the other hand:

"The poverty of the White poor has driven the State to measures which have
increased the Non-European's burden of poverty and thrown into relief his lack of resources” (Ibid).

Was the focus on the Poor White Problem a deliberate one at this Conference? It was stated by Ds. W.M. Nicol in his word of welcome:-

"Ons sou graag wou voel dat ons verder kan kyk as ons eie volk. Die Christelike godsdienis is in sy wese onselfsugtig en verlang om die hand uit te stek buitekant sy eie familie en buitekant sy eie volk. Met ons in Suid-Afrika is dit in buitengewone mate die geval. Ons groot roeping as volk is tog teenoor die naturelle rasse. Maar vandag word ons feitlik verplig om ons aandag te beperk by die behoeftes van ons eie mense. Immers dit sal onmoontlik wees om die helpende hand vir ander te reik as ons self aan die sak is. Ons hele optrede as kerk word beïnvloed deur die feit dat so 'n groot deel van ons mense aan die armblankees behoort" (National Conference on the Poor White Problem 1934: 12)²

With regard to Blacks in particular, it was said:

"Vereers moet dit vir elkeen duidelik wees dat ons maar min aan die oplossing van die naturelle-vraagstukke kan doen voordat ons koers kry met die oplossing van die armblanke-vraagstuk" (Ibid)³

The philosophy behind these arguments was that Whites were regarded as the guardians of Blacks. The guardianship of the European race over the indigenous people - - that was the policy in the country. This principle was stated by General Smuts in 1946, when he said:

"That was the policy, it is the policy, and it will remain the policy of the country, viz. the guardianship of the European population in regard to the other portions of the population who are not yet so developed that they can look after their own interests" (Lewsen 1988: 210-211).

Although it was the policy at that time, Smuts saw guardianship as a process and said that political

²"We would like to feel that we do not only serve our own nation. Christianity is in itself unselfish and cares for groupings outside its own family and nation. In the South African context this is even more so. Our major mission as a nation is towards the indigenous peoples. However, right now we are forced to restrict ourselves to the needs of our own people. It would be virtually impossible to help others if our own situation is deteriorating. Our actions as a Church are influenced by the fact that such a large number of our people are poor Whites". (Present author’s translation)

³"It should be clear to everyone that we cannot do much to solve the Native Question unless we first solve the Poor White Problem". (Present author’s translation)
rights should be granted gradually to that portion of the population that developed under the guardianship of the Whites. Should political rights not be awarded to Blacks in due course, the country will face serious problems in future. Smuts said further:

"Guardianship does not aim only at advancing the interest of the guardian, but also the interests of the people over whom guardianship is exercised, and that is an essential portion of the whole concept" (Ibid).

Although Smuts sounded these warnings and encouraged Whites to act justly, the guardianship principle had implications for the provision of welfare services. In terms of this principle, White poverty is to be solved first so that Whites will then be in a position to fulfil their guardianship role towards the Non-Europeans. The dilemma with guardianship is its paternalism and in this case its racialistic basis. Another aspect of the guardianship idea was that Whites were the bearers of civilization in South Africa. They should therefore be helped first, in order to assist the Non-Europeans later. It was stated for instance:

"As ons in breë trekke erken dat die blankes die Draers van die Beskawing in Suid-Afrika is terwyl die naturelle oor die algemeen die is wat lee hande uitsteek na die voordele van die beskawing, dan moet ons instem dat hoe sterker die blanke op hulle voete staan hoe beter kans het hulle om die naturel op sy beurt te help" (National Conference on the Poor White Problem 1934: 12-13)\(^4\)

In order to address the one-sided focus in welfare, a Committee of Experts was appointed to serve as a liaison between the Poor White Problem and the position of the other population groups to ensure that the efforts to eradicate the Poor White Problem did not affect them detrimentally. The approach was clear: First address poverty among Whites and only then among Blacks. In this regard it was said:

"Die yweraars vir die onmiddellijke oplossing van die naturelle-vraagstuk sou dus verstandig handel om saam met ons alles wat moontlik is te doen om die oplossing van die armblanke-vraagstuk te bespoedig"(Ibid: 13)\(^5\)

\(^4\)"If we broadly agree that the Whites are responsible for the spreading of civilization in South Africa while the natives are generally the ones who empty-handed receive the benefits of civilization, then we must agree that the well-being of the indigenous peoples depends on the strength of the white group". (Present author's translation)

\(^5\)"The advocates for the immediate solution of the Native Question would be wise to do everything possible first to solve the Poor White Problem". (Present author's translation)
Racial discrimination and neglect of welfare provision to the Non-Europeans persisted throughout this period and should be seen as one of the reasons why welfare services were formally separated along racial lines. In its Third Annual Report, the Welfare Organizations Board admitted in 1950 that the amounts for pensions, and grants, and social services for Non-Europeans was negligible. The Report said:

"To attempt to outline the volume and scope of the welfare provision which would be necessary to meet the needs of this huge and largely poverty-stricken section of the community, would be an impossible task, but it is felt that an amount equivalent to at least 50 per cent of the sum which is expended upon Europeans should be made available for this purpose" (Union of South Africa 1951: 35-36).

There was resistance, especially from the side of the official opposition, the National Party, to extend social security to Non-Europeans (Lewsen 1988: 214-215). But the Nationalist even attempted to exclude Africans from social security benefits. This was particularly evident with the Unemployment Insurance Bill where African workers were excluded from the scope of the scheme.

The focus on the Poor White Problem should also be seen against the differential levels of social and economic advancement between Blacks and Whites "with unequal and varying economic resources and power" (Pollak 1960: 1). In this regard Europeans were in a privileged position. Pollak says:

"It is understandable that their efforts and energies were first directed to the growing needs of their own group" (Ibid).

Since Blacks were historically on a wage and income basis much lower than the Europeans, their level of socio-economic advancement was also lower. This did not only form the basis of their exclusion from the poverty investigation and welfare provision, but provided the basis on which social security benefits were structured. In 1942 the Social Security Action Committee suggested a separate social security system based on race as part of the post-war reconstruction. The argument for this separation was based on the earning and contributory capacity of the various racial groups (Sullivan 1942). Various levels of benefits were considered. It was for instance
suggested that in the case of Old Age Benefits, Europeans should get 96 pounds p.a., Coloureds 48 pounds, and Asians 18 pounds. With regard to "the native population" no definite proposals were made. It was suggested that a separate Native Medical and Security Fund be established to be administered by the Social Security Commissioners. No fixed amount was suggested. The amount to be paid was to be at the discretion of the welfare officer.

Towards the end of the transitional period, it was clear that social welfare in South Africa had strong features of a Welfare State benefitting primarily Whites. The period also ends with the coming into power of the Nationalist government in 1948. This government was pre-occupied with Afrikaner Nationalism and racial separation. In practice this would mean a concern with the interests of Afrikaners and further separation of Whites from "Non-Whites". This was clearly evident in the structuring of welfare services, and in so far as that secure jobs in State employment were almost exclusively allocated to Whites.

4.2.3 The Professional Period

After 1951 the country moved into an era of increasing authoritarianism. "The statutorily controlled social work of volunteers has largely been supplanted by social work done by the bureaucracy itself, which sees itself as a law unto itself" (Helm 1985: 10). The period has also (euphemistically) been called the period of consolidation and specialization (Pieterse 1976: 53). During this period the South African welfare system, which now had features of both a residual and an institutional model, was established, based on a partnership agreement between the State and the voluntary sector. This period focused very strongly on the profession of social work and social workers as the operational staff in social welfare. The new government introduced social welfare policies based on the philosophy of separate welfare services for the various racial groups.

In practice no new social welfare programmes were started. The focus was more on the consolidation of social policy and the planning of separate welfare services. The relationship between the Department of Social Welfare and voluntary welfare organizations was confirmed when it was agreed that both the State and the private initiative had a place in social welfare in South Africa. However, it should be emphasized that this partnership was not equal. The State
was to subsidize voluntary welfare organizations so that they might fulfil their role in society. A committee was appointed to investigate the division of work between the State and voluntary organizations, to investigate the funding of voluntary organizations, and to determine the principle of subsidies. Based on the Report by this committee, the then Minister of Social Welfare, Dr. K. Bremer, issued the following policy statement on 26 October 1954:

"Dat dit as die funksie en taak van die partikuliere inisiatief beskou sal word om die breë terrein van die gesinsorg waarby ook die kindersorg ingesluit word, te behartig, dat, wanneer die behartiging van maatskaplike staatsorg inhou dat dit noodsaklik is dat aan gesingsorg aandag geskenk sal word, dit die plig en vernaamste verantwoordelikheid van die staat is om toe te sien dat dit wel sal gebeur, maar dat ten einde onnodige en nadelige oorvleueling te voorkom en doeltreffendheid te bevorder, hierdie gesinsorg sover moontlik en doenlik in die hande van vrywillige organisasies gelaat dien te word" (Pieterse 1976: 65)6

This official agreement of co-operation between the State and the voluntary sector, was, as Dr. Winckler says, in a sense unique:

"Suid-Afrika is een van die weinige lande met 'n skriftelike ooreenkoms van samewerking tussen die Staat en welsynsorganisasies" (1976: 156)7

This agreement, and together with the voluntary sector's dependence upon substantial subsidizations from the State, virtually obliged non-governmental organizations to conform to the State's welfare policy. The agreement made the voluntary sector responsible for family care, and the State Department for all the statutory services, social security provisions, as well as overall planning and policy.

The second development during this period was the introduction of the National Welfare Act, No. 79 of 1965. This Act replaced the Welfare Organizations Act of 1947. It made provision for the institution of a National Welfare Council to advise the Minister on social welfare issues, and for

---

6"That it will be seen as the function and task of the voluntary initiative to serve the broad area of family care whereby childcare is included; that, if the social welfare of the State means that it is important that family care be a priority, then the duty and most important responsibility of the State is to see that this is implemented; with a view to prevent unnecessary duplication and to enhance effectivity; family care should as far as possible be left in the hands of voluntary organizations". (Present author's translation)

7"South Africa is one of the few countries with a written agreement regarding co-operation between the State and welfare organizations". (Present author's translation)
the co-ordination of the activities of welfare organizations. Furthermore, the Act made provision for special Commissions (responsible for certain areas in social welfare), for Regional Welfare Boards, and for the compulsory registration of welfare organizations. According to Pieterse, this was necessary in order to combat communist infiltration in voluntary welfare organizations (1976: 56). A major new stipulation in this Act was that all persons wishing to practise as social workers (as employees or otherwise) were required to register with a statutory Council the membership of which was at least in part controlled by the State.

Other developments worth mentioning here are (i) the rationalization of the activities of the Department of Social Welfare, and (ii) amendments to the Children's Act. In 1958 the two State Departments, of Social Welfare and of Pensions, were integrated into the single Department now being named Social Welfare and Pensions. The new Department was now responsible for social and civil pensions as well as for rehabilitation and professional services. Social welfare services, it was held, were henceforth to operate in a more scientific and integrated manner (Pieterse 1976: 62). All legislation administered by the Department was amended and modified. Significant changes were made to legislation governing children by the passage of the Children's Act of 1960, No. 33 of 1960.

Perhaps the most important policy development during this period was the official separation and structuring of social welfare along racial lines. This was based on the political ideology of apartheid. According to this philosophy, each "group" has its own culture, heritage, and way of life. In welfare this implies different needs and therefore separate welfare services. Arguments like the following were used for separate and unequal welfare services:

"Among the Black nations ... the traditional social system and family structures are such that a considerable amount of what is usually regarded as public welfare, assistance, and poor relief in Western societies, is carried out on a customary basis by relatives and associates ... For this reason, inter alia, it has been found necessary and advisable to differentiate between these groups and others as regards the nature and scope of assistance provided" (Republic of South Africa 1974).

To implement this policy, different State departments were created for the various racial groups; the Department of Bantu Affairs for Africans, the Department of Indian Affairs for Indians, and
the Department of Coloured Affairs for Coloureds. Social welfare services became now the responsibility of these respective departments. The Department of Social Welfare was responsible for White welfare. It stated:

"This department has largely limited its practical activities to promoting the social welfare of the White population" (Ibid).

Separate welfare services were not only applied by the State, other sectors were also compelled to do the same. In 1957 the Department of Native Affairs (later the Department of Bantu Affairs) advised local authorities and all organizations providing services to Africans that it would not approve the control of social welfare or recreational services for Africans by voluntary white bodies or racially mixed committees (Jinabhai 1986: 9). In 1966 voluntary welfare organizations were instructed to introduce separate welfare services, so as to conform with apartheid.

After the introduction of the Extension of University Education Act of 1959, the training of social workers in practice was also racially segregated. The policy of the Nationalist government was that the training of the various non-white population groups should take place at "universities of their own". This was essential, so it was argued, because the needs of these population groups differ in some respects from those of Whites. It was said that, not only do these groups have special, and unique problems, but they also require special knowledge and a different approach.

The social welfare system that evolved after the Carnegie Inquiry conformed in many respects to the idea of the "Welfare State" in some Western countries. However, as I have indicated, primarily only one sector of the population really benefitted. The separation of welfare services thus meant a continuation of better and sophisticated welfare provisions for Whites in terms of both quality and quantity, while the provisions for Black people produced the reverse, with a narrower range of welfare facilities (Dixon 1987: 185). The apartheid policy, also called separate development, was really the creation of two worlds; a world of development and a world of minimal development, a world of advancement for some and a world of lagging behind for others. Political structures and systems of social engineering were introduced that increased these disparities. The Group Areas Act, homeland policies, job reservation, and influx control produced a society in which the majority was politically and socially deprived, and economically impoverished. With the apartheid policies also came discrimination and disparities in welfare, education, health services, and housing. At the end of the period of consolidation we had a
welfare system based on the philosophy and practice of apartheid; and administration, services, and policy structures that largely benefitted the Whites.

4.3 THE EMERGENCE OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND THE RESPONSE OF THE STATE

The exclusion of the majority of the people from extensive welfare provision resulted in community poverty and discontent. Migrant labour and influx control resulted in family and community disintegration among urban African communities. The churches, community organizations, and grassroots movements responded to the needs of Blacks. Since the early 1970's there had been various grassroots efforts in community development to improve the quality of life. This coincided with the growth of Black consciousness in South Africa. This movement has fostered a growing conviction that the only community organization with any meaning must focus on empowering Black people. Self-help and communal action groups were growing despite State measures of control. These groups addressed a broad range of issues, including welfare needs.

The State responded in two ways; on 19 October 1977, 17 of these community organizations were banned and on 30 June 1978 the National Welfare Act of 1965 was repealed and replaced by a trilogy of Statutes, controlling, respectively, funding, Social and Associated Workers, and Welfare Organizations. The passing of these three Acts saw the State developing a coherent welfare policy to control the entire social welfare spectrum consistent with its racial policies.

In the early 1970's there were indications that changes in the South African welfare structure were imminent when it was held that there was a need for greater co-ordination of welfare organizations to meet the exigencies of the time (Comaroff 1979: 129). Pieterse said in this respect:

"Nieteenstaande die groot bydrae wat hierdie wet [National Welfare Act of 1965] vir die ontwikkeling van welsynswerk en maatskaplike werk in die besonder in S.A. gehad het, het die toepassing daarvan ook ernstige leemtes na vore gebring. Daarom is daar deur die Nasionale Welsynsraad reeds verskeie aanbevelings in verband met die wysiging van die wet by die Department van Volkswelsyn en
Some of the motivations for the amendment of the Act were the scarcity of money and manpower. Furthermore, it was said that the community should get a bigger say in social welfare services. Two commissions were appointed to deal with the issues. On 14 August 1974 the State President appointed a commission under the chairmanship of Prof. I J J Van Rooyen to investigate the collection of funds by voluntary welfare organizations from the public. A second commission was appointed on 31 January 1975 under the chairmanship of Dr A J Auret to investigate the regulation of social work as a profession, the accreditation of training institutions, and the financial implications thereof.

On 30 June 1978 the National Welfare Act of 1965 was replaced by the National Welfare Act, No. 100 of 1978, the Fundraising Act No. 107 of 1978 and the Social and Associated Workers Act, No. 110 of 1978. The legislation caused a stir in the welfare community and was criticised from virtually all sides. Even the National Welfare Board, which initiated the changes, was not happy and proposed amendments. None of these reactions had any ultimate effect. It is also significant to note that many of the original proposals by the Commissions were not even included in the final legislation. The only explanation for this could be that the Commissions adopted too much of a professional and pragmatic approach to social welfare while the legislators had political control and State security in mind. Despite all the objections, the legislation was passed. For at least a year after the enactment of the legislation, the South African welfare community existed in a state of confusion, not knowing how the new laws were going to be applied.

The main provisions of the 1978 National Welfare Act provided for the establishment of the South African Welfare Council, Committees, the specifying of welfare programmes, and the registration of welfare organisations. The Act stipulated that all members of the South African Welfare Council would be appointed by the State President and that its purpose was to be essentially advisory. Matters upon which the Council was to advise the Minister included: general policy

---

8"Notwithstanding the great contribution of this Act [National Welfare Act of 1965] to the development of social welfare and social work in particular, its implementation also brought serious deficiencies to the fore. For this reason the National Welfare Board has submitted various suggestions for the amendment of the Act to the Department of Social Welfare and Pensions". (Present author's translation)
measures to protect and promote family life and the welfare of dependants, measures to improve social policy, the rendering of social welfare services, and research. A study of the new welfare structure indicated that the Council members had no formal ties with the various sectors of welfare. It thus appeared that the advice of these individuals could only be based on opinions rather than on scientific research; they seemed to have been operating alone in the welfare system, and thus could not possibly have undertaken the necessary fact-finding exercises from their isolated position (Comaroff 1979: 134).

According to the Act, members of the Regional Welfare Boards are all appointed by the Minister. They have functions to:

* investigate social problems and to propose solutions,
* determine future welfare needs,
* prepare welfare programmes and to determine priority needs,
* obtain co-operation of welfare organizations during emergencies,
* encourage, promote and co-ordinate the rendering of welfare services without curtailing the right of organizations to self determination,
* regulate the registration of welfare organizations.

In addition, Regional Welfare Boards were empowered to appoint welfare committees.

In terms of this Act the registration of welfare organizations was a complicated process. In order to perform welfare functions an organization first had to register as a fund-raising organization in terms of the Fund-Raising Act. Only then could it apply for registration as a welfare organization. There were no direct lines of communication between the Council, the Regional Boards, and the Director of Fund-Raising.
The main provisions of the Fund-Raising Act (No. 107 of 1978) were to provide for:

* control of the collection of contributions from the public,

* the appointment of a Director of Fundraising,

* the establishment of a Disaster Relief Fund, a South African Defence Force Fund, and a Refugee Relief Fund,

* the declaration of certain events as disasters.

The real heart of the Act seems to lie in the control of money coming from outside the country and the suppression of certain organizations deemed to be undesirable or affected. Such organizations could under the Act be prevented from collecting funds within the country or receiving funds from outside. The Director of Fund-Raising was empowered to authorize the inspection of any organization or the interrogation of any member or past employee he suspects of contravening the Act. The Minister of Social Welfare stated that the Act would be used to take action against fundraising activities aimed at undermining authority.

The major provisions of the Social and Associated Workers Act (No. 110 of 1978) allow for:

* the establishment of a Council for Social and Associated Workers,

* the registration of social and associated workers,

* control of the profession of social work and associated professions.

The Council consisted of twelve members of whom four were appointed by the Minister. The other eight were elected from and by registered social workers. This was the only Act among the three where the Council, as controlling body, had real authority.
Despite the comprehensive legislation in social welfare, the authorities were still faced with serious problems, a possibility envisaged by Irene Comaroff. In an examination of the new legislation, she expressed serious doubts about the law enforcement potential of the legislation. She said:

"The structure that emerges from the Acts is a highly complex and unwieldy one and it is doubtful whether it can fulfil the concept inherent in law, that of enforcement. It will require extensive machinery to enforce it, and ironically one of the reasons for amending the welfare legislation was economic reasons in terms of money and manpower" (1979: 132).

The new welfare legislation was in a sense contradictory to previous positions taken by the government in welfare philosophy. Welfare was now being placed in the hands of the State which could lead to the "socialist ideology of State, State, State" (Comaroff 1979: 133). This was apparently considered necessary for two reasons: to ensure control over the collection and spending of money, and to ensure State determination of welfare needs and appropriate welfare programmes. With the introduction of such a strong control element in social welfare, welfare policy changed, as did the partnership policy between the State and the private sector. Comaroff's view is significant when she says:

"Instead of the community-sponsored welfare organizations working alongside the government, conducting their own research and establishing their own services, they may become puppets of the government, and in fact this may be tantamount to welfare in South Africa becoming nationalized" (Ibid).

Another area of concern in the new legislation was the limitations placed on the role of volunteers in social welfare. Volunteers were always a firm base on which voluntary welfare operated in South Africa. In terms of the Fund-Raising Act and the Social and Associated Workers Act, their activities would be severely restricted and controlled.

Soon after the implementation of the new Acts, it seemed that they were not proving as successful as the government had hoped. The departments who had to apply the legislation were faced with various dilemmas. For instance one of the functions of the Regional Welfare Boards was to regulate the registration of welfare organizations. As these Boards were structured in terms of racial categories, how was an organization rendering services to more than one population group..."
going to register? Another dilemma was the issue of manpower and an infrastructure to carry out the necessary investigations and the co-ordination of welfare services between the various State departments and Regional Welfare Boards. The Fund-Raising Act did not apply to institutions who were members of an organization, a religious body, an educational institution, political parties and organizations which the Minister chooses to exempt. Loopholes in the Act were used by many organizations to collect money. It was for example extremely difficult to separate welfare activities from religious and educational ones. Strangely enough, no one has been prosecuted in a court of law in terms of these Acts. The introduction of these Acts did not stop the country from working for a better life in a new South Africa. As a result of this, the government decided in 1982 to introduce a new political dispensation and to modify and reform social welfare in South Africa.
CHAPTER FIVE

ATTEMPTS TO REFORM SOCIAL WELFARE POLICY SINCE THE 1980s

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The major objective of this chapter is to look critically at social welfare policies that will be inherited by the new government and attempts to reform them since the 1980's. The dilemma with previous attempts to reform social welfare was the fact that the government was not moved by an independent vision for the future South Africa. They were forced by internal and external pressures. Consequently, all previous attempts to restructure social welfare were piece-meal reforms that did not touch the fundamental issues, these being a more equitable distribution of economic and social resources. A meaningful welfare policy, it is posited, should provide the minimum for everybody to live and to be self-reliant. I want to highlight, in particular, the Welfare State debate, the privatization of welfare services, and attempts to introduce development strategies since the 1980's.

5.2 THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES

Before 1980 the welfare policy and service structures consisted of a multiracial South African Welfare Council appointed by the State President. The functions of this Council were to (i) advise the Minister of Social Welfare on policy measures, (ii) to prevent and to treat social problems, (iii) to protect and promote family life, (iv) to protect welfare dependants, (v) to improve social policy, (vi) to advise the Minister regarding the rendering of social welfare services, and (vii) to sponsor and encourage appropriate research. The Council was also responsible for providing information and guidance to welfare organizations. It was primarily an advisory body. Structurally, however, this Council operated only to the benefit of mainstream welfare services, while welfare services for Blacks were structured under a different State department.

At a subsidiary level in the structure, we had the Regional Welfare Boards, along with their Welfare Committees, appointed by the different Ministers. During the time of the tri-cameral government, i.e. post 1983 and up to 1994, and in keeping with the Constitution then obtaining, it was stipulated that all provisions of the Act, except those dealing with the Council, were to be
administered by the separate Ministers controlling the affairs of the separate population groups recognized in the Constitution. This implied a racially divided structure and delivery of welfare services. In practice, social welfare services were the responsibility of four racially defined departments. The Department of National Health and Population Development (the former Department of Social Welfare and Pensions), while primarily responsible for White welfare, also had charge of overall policy. The members of Regional Welfare Boards were appointed by the four different Ministers responsible for social welfare to the different racial groups. These Boards were linked to a specific welfare department under whose aegis meetings were held. Although there were several regions all over the country in different areas, they did not overlap as they were looking at the affairs of one population group only, under the auspices of a particular Minister heading a particular department. The powers and functions of these Boards were discussed in the previous chapter and are not repeated here. However, as one of the functions of the Regional Welfare Boards was to regulate the registration of welfare organizations, it is important to point out the complexities that were experienced by those organizations that rendered services to all population groups. In practice, they had to deal with four different welfare departments which had different norms and standards, depending on the racial group they served. These departments were the real power bases as they were the structures and bureaucracies applying policies and paying subsidies to voluntary agencies.

Besides the Council mentioned above and its attendant Regional Boards, the Directorate of Fund-Raising and its inspectorate also had a controlling function regarding voluntary welfare organizations. From this Directorate, organizations had to get permission to collect funds and they had to report back on the use of such funds.

Another authority that voluntary organizations had to take into account was the South African Council for Social Workers. A social worker who was not registered with the Council could not be employed as a social worker. Voluntary organizations employing an unregistered worker got no subsidy on that person's salary; the person himself or herself, if purporting to be a social worker though not registered, could be found guilty of a criminal offence.
Where social welfare services were concerned, the following structures were in operation until recently:

(i) State welfare services which were delivered through various government departments on a racial basis - - the Department of Social Welfare and Pensions to Whites; the Administration of Coloured Affairs to Coloureds; the Department of Co-operation and Development to urban Blacks; the Department of Indian Affairs to Indians; and Welfare Departments to Blacks in the Homelands and the "Independent" states (the so-called TBVC - states). These departments were primarily responsible for professional social work in the form of probation services, court-work, counselling, places of safety, and administrative services in terms of subsidies, pensions, and grants. Other functions were policy-making and planning, co-ordination, and control. In some instances, provincial and local authorities also rendered social services in urban areas, in addition to primary services like housing and health which such authorities were responsible for.

(ii) Non-Governmental Services. The voluntary sector consisted of a variety of groupings. First, there were the traditional voluntary welfare organizations which worked in partnership with the State and which were statutorily registered as welfare organizations. They were financed primarily by subsidies (State or local government) and by contributions from the public. They were controlled by management committees drawn from the community and by professional staff. These organizations were responsible for generalized and specialized services, using social-case-work counselling, group-work, and community-work as their basic methods.

A second category of non-governmental organizations consisted of the churches. Some churches had their welfare sections registered with the State and were thus eligible for a subsidy. In this case, services were provided along the same pattern as those of the voluntary organizations. Many churches also had a variety of institutions where institutional care was provided. Several churches however operated financially independently, but focused mainly on the needs of their own members in providing material relief and moral support.
A third group consisted of self-help community organizations. They got their finances from the community and concentrated on community needs and issues. Many of these organizations were neither registered as welfare organizations, nor as fund-raising agencies. In the past they were regarded by the authorities as subversive organizations, and therefore as a threat. A few services were provided by individuals or partnerships in private practice. They charged a fee for service and thus had a profit motive with a limited scope. Only those who did not want to use existing welfare services and who could afford to pay the fees used such service.

5.3 POLITICAL REFORM AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

The process of Constitutional changes started in the middle 1970's when the government was faced with the fundamental question: "What to do about the political aspirations of Blacks?" The first signs that reforms were considered came with the appointment of a Cabinet Committee to consider changes to the Constitution. The appointment of this Committee followed upon the 1976 Soweto uprising and the recommendations by the Theron-Commission that the "Westminster system of government" be modified. In 1977 and in 1979 the National Party debated the issue of a "healthy form of power sharing" with Coloureds and Indians. This resulted in certain Constitutional proposals from the Constitutional Committee of the President's Council. In 1983 a new Constitutional Act which made provision for limited power-sharing between Whites, Coloureds, and Indians was introduced. Although the Act made provision for separate Coloured and Indian Chambers in the political system, it also ensured that political power remained firmly in the hands of Whites. Welsh said in this regard:

"Although there have been differences on detail, they have all aimed to find a formula whereby the Coloured and Indian populations could be given political rights in such a way that White control was not jeopardized, and, arguably, even strengthened" (1984: 147).

The idea was to share power without losing power.

The essence of the political reforms was the introduction of a tri-cameral parliamentary system with three Chambers or Houses; a House of Assembly for Whites, a House of Representatives for Coloureds, and a House of Delegates for Indians. The outstanding feature of the new
Constitution was the exclusion of Blacks from participation in the new political structures. The system was rejected by the majority of Coloureds and Indians on the grounds that it was structured on a racial basis; it entrenched apartheid in the Constitution; and that the majority of the population, the Blacks, were left out of this political dispensation.

The basic principle of the Constitution was the distinction between "general affairs" and "own affairs". This principle constituted the cornerstone of the new political dispensation and the reform process. Own affairs implied a policy to accommodate the group interests of each racial group in a racially heterogenous South Africa. In terms of this principle, own affairs were described as matters which specifically or differentially affect a population group in relation to the maintenance of its identity and the upholding and furtherance of its way of life, culture, traditions, and customs. Based on this definition a list of fourteen own affairs areas were compiled, which included social welfare, education at all levels, art, culture, recreation, health services, community development, local government, housing, agriculture, water provision, and marriages. As the system of "own affairs" and "general affairs" seemed to be the political arrangement for the future, there was speculation that Blacks might be accommodated in a similar way in a fourth Chamber.

However, looking at the own affairs concept, it was clear that apartheid, or differentiation as it was euphemistically called, was now firmly entrenched not only in the structure of society, but also in the Constitution of the country. The system purported to make provision for self-determination and decision-making as far as "own affairs" were concerned, and for joint decision-making on "general affairs". In practice the major question then was: what were "general affairs", and what were "own affairs" in a society where the interests and affairs of people as human beings overlapped and were in many respects the same? In broad terms, it was said the principle of "general affairs" should make provision for matters affecting all racial groups, also Blacks. This sector of government was responsible for determining norms, standards, financing, salaries, and conditions of employment. In practice, there were now sixteen Ministers for "general affairs" and thirteen for "own affairs", which was a very complicated and expensive parliamentary system. "General affairs", which was in the hands of Whites, dominated the political scene. For instance, in 1985, 12 pieces of legislation were passed in the chambers of own affairs and 96 for general
affairs; in 1986, 15 for own affairs and 96 for general affairs; and in 1987, 18 for own affairs and 85 for general affairs (Rapport, 22 November 1987). This gives us a total of 45 for own affairs against the 277 for general affairs. This was unquestionably a peculiar parliamentary system, with major contradictions in practice. Own affairs had a subordinate position while general affairs held the real power and dominated the political scene.

The enactment of the new Constitution led to the formation of two powerful organizations, the United Democratic Front and the National Forum. Both these organizations represented the more progressive and radical spectrum of the Black, Coloured, Indian, and even Whites who had opposed the new Constitution. They were campaigning vigorously against participation in the new dispensation.

With the introduction of the tri-cameral system in 1984, and the Black Local Authorities Act in 1983, some aspects of social welfare were considered to be "own affairs". This meant that Black Local Authorities were the providers of social services at local township level for Blacks (see Figure I), and that the Indian and Coloured Chambers of Parliament made decisions about some aspects of welfare and provided social services to those groups. Matters of common concern such as overall welfare policy, standards, control of welfare funds, and control of the social work profession (amongst others) were designated as general affairs.

The proposed new welfare policy with its emphasis on racial differentiation and privatization was a direct consequence of the prevailing political dispensation and reform. Privatisation was not only an issue in social welfare; it cut across a broad spectrum in South African society. In 1985 the Commission for Administration suggested to the Cabinet that 20 activities in ten public sections be investigated for privatization. They were national health, agriculture, Parliament, national education, industry and trade, water affairs, environmental affairs, development aid, transport and Provincial administration (Welfare Policy Steering Committee: 1987). Since then, the State President and several Ministers had argued for a comprehensive programme of privatization. At the same time, other concepts like "free enterprise" and "self-help" were being debated in government circles. This assisted the argument for the privatization of social services too.
5.4 SOCIAL WELFARE REFORM

The control measures envisaged when the three 1978 Acts (National Welfare Act No. 100 of 1978, Social and Associated Workers Act No. 110 of 1978, and the Fundraising Act No. 107 of 1978) were passed (see Chapter Four) proved unsuccessful in practice. Many loopholes were used, and community organizations were still active outside the State's network. Besides this, the government was faced with increased State expenditure on housing, education, transport, and welfare services. Anderson stated that in the period of 1972 - 1976, of all housing provided, the State was responsible for 14 percent of White housing, 80 percent of Coloured housing, 64 percent of Indian housing, and 84 percent for housing for Blacks --- an average of 62 percent, or two out of three houses (Welfare Policy Steering Committee: 1987). It was said that this trend could not continue. Given this challenge, the government had to find ways of reducing its responsibility for specific welfare services. In addition, it had to find new sources of funding such services. As the government was now faced with three major problems, a political problem, a problem of social control, and an economic problem, one of the possibilities was to introduce the subject of "national interest" and to determine national priorities. An area that was investigated to cut back on was social welfare services.

Social welfare reform started in 1981 when the South African Welfare Council decided that welfare policies needed to be revised and evaluated to address the short-comings that were experienced. It was recommended that a new welfare policy should be introduced to deal with the challenges of the time and to rationalize and streamline welfare structures. A provisional report was compiled and submitted to the Council. Although this Report was approved by the Council, it was not favourably received by the government. At this stage it became clear that the government was trying to control welfare services along strictly ideological lines, while reducing State responsibility for such services. On the other hand the Council members, of whom the majority were social workers or academics, were looking at more appropriate social welfare approaches to deal with the challenges of the time.

In 1982 the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning set up a Working Group to study existing social welfare policies and to make recommendations with regard to liaison
between the racially-differentiated welfare departments, and to design guidelines for the implementation of welfare policies on the principle of racial differentiation. The purpose of this assessment was to bring welfare in line with the tri-cameral system of own affairs and general affairs. In its terms of reference, the Working Group accepted that South Africa would not be a Welfare State and that the government therefore did not accept primary responsibility for the welfare of the population.

The Report of the Working Group, proposing a modified social welfare policy, was released in the second half of 1985 for comment. It dealt extensively with social welfare policy, the consolidation of apartheid in welfare services called "differentiation", the idea of a Welfare State, constitutional and community development, subsidization of welfare services, as well as administrative and policy-making structures. The following policy guidelines were proposed:

(i) separation of welfare services along racial lines;

(ii) privatization of welfare services implying a fee for service, as well as individual and community responsibility for welfare services;

(iii) reduced State involvement and increased self-funding of the non-governmental welfare sector;

(iv) devolution of welfare functions to local and regional levels;

(v) the establishment of a (complicated and costly) structure for the operation of a differentiated and fragmented welfare system.

The Group which compiled the report obviously realized that its proposals were going to be controversial and would be opposed by the welfare community. It thus recommended that an effort be made through a publicity campaign to promote the policy of differentiation and privatization. It was also proposed that "community development" should be implemented in such fashion as to "accelerate" the implementation of the policy. Furthermore, leadership qualities
should be fostered and developed so as to equip the various population groups to manage their own affairs. The administrations of own affairs, it was argued, had an important role to play in the campaign to foster a change in attitude. Other liaison bodies should also take part in the persuasion and information campaign.

To understand the proposed welfare policies, it is necessary to look at the way the process was conducted, the composition of the Working Group, and the motivations for revising welfare policy. The political instruction from the Cabinet Committee for Social Affairs to the Working Group was to consider guidelines for better interdepartmental liaison between the various racial welfare departments, and to make recommendations with regard to the implementation of racially differentiated welfare policies. Since this process formed part of the activities of the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning (the department that was the driving force behind the tri-cameral system), the instruction to the Working Group should be seen against the background of political reform and the rationalization of State structures in terms of the new Constitution. It has been mentioned that a very important principle of the Constitution was the principle of "own affairs" and "general affairs". Since welfare was now part of "own affairs", interdepartmental co-ordination was required. In addition to the official assignment, the Working Group felt that there was a need to determine to what extent the State has already moved in the direction of a Welfare State in terms of financing of welfare services and to evaluate whether existing welfare policy and welfare structures should be adjusted to render welfare services that would increase the over-all quality of life.

The Working Group that compiled the Report consisted only of government officials drawn from the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning, Health and Welfare, Co-operation and Development, Finance, and those from the former Department of Internal Affairs, who had been responsible for Coloured and Indian welfare services. Members were therefore all public servants, responsible for policy administration and implementation. No other interested parties were included or consulted.

From what one can gather from the Report, it seems that the Working Group was primarily motivated by financial and racial considerations. The Group stated clearly that the reasons for the
inquiry were:

(i) the increasing demand for financial assistance by the State for welfare services and the magnitude that this assistance had already reached,

(ii) financial assistance in the form of subsidies, social pensions and grants, and institutional care of individuals and families should not form the basis of the welfare system,

(iii) the new political dispensation would also make an increasing demand on the State's financial means.

The Group based its financial concern on figures quoted in the Report. It stated that subsidies to welfare organizations during 1982/83 amounted to R81.725 million. Moreover, it was estimated that this amount would increase to R90.809 million for 1990/91, R97.325 million for 1995/96, and R104.065 million for 2000/01 (Department of Constitutional Development and Planning 1985: 3). Only in terms of social pensions and grants, the Group stated that an amount of R464 million was paid in 1982/83. If current trends continued, and the criteria for paying out pensions remained the same, the estimated amounts for 1990/91 would be R571.5 million; 1995/96 R656.4 million, and R757.9 million for 2000/01. Looking at these figures in isolation, they appear to be astronomical.

It should be quite clear that the perception was that the State was paying too much for welfare services. Therefore expenses in this sector should be reduced and policies devised to deal with the issue. There was a strong view that the State should reduce its responsibilities and that the people should provide for themselves. Against this backdrop, it was proposed that welfare services should be privatized to the highest possible level and that measures should be devised to implement this principle so as to limit the responsibility of the State. Secondly it was proposed that the community should be self-sufficient and that the physical and social space should be created for the individual and the family to develop to its highest possible level. In this respect the Working Group felt that it should also support the programme for community development to
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improve the quality of life of people. With regard to private welfare services the point of
departure was that they should rationalize and adjust their structures to provide for a stronger
community involvement and to integrate social, physical, and economic needs in their approach.
It was stated further that private welfare organizations should improve the development and co-
ordination of policy for the different population groups. They should also co-ordinate welfare
services to bring them into line with the new political dispensation.

Issues that were debated extensively since the publication of the Working Group's Report were
the government's declared welfare policy, the Welfare State concept, and the privatization of
welfare services. The government-declared welfare policy held that the individual was primarily
responsible for his/her own welfare. If the individual and his/her family could not do so, the
community should provide the required services. The government would only accept
responsibility when the family and the community failed to provide the necessary services. This
was the residual approach to welfare.

The Welfare State debate in South Africa started long before the appearance of this Report. The
government had repeatedly stressed that South Africa was not a Welfare State and would not
become one. This was said despite the fact that welfare services for Whites (and indeed some for
Coloured and Indian people - - even some for Africans) had all the features of a Welfare State.
The following statement in a publication by the Department of Information clearly revealed the
government's attitude in this respect. It said:

"South Africa is not a Welfare State. South Africa is willing and able to provide
boots for the bare-footed, but it will not provide footwear for those who are fit
and able to work and earn an income adequate for their day-to-day requirements.
Nor will it provide a free meal ticket for life to those persons who are able, but too
lazy to make the effort to tie-up their own bootlaces. Anything which impairs the
drive and initiative of the individual, or his personal sense of obligation to perform
an honest day's task and to make provision for old age, is vigorously discouraged
in South Africa" (1972: 3).

The principle upon which the South African social policy is based is that every citizen should be
self-sufficient through self-help. "The individual is encouraged to shoulder his responsibilities both
to himself and to his fellow men and women - - not to shelve or cast them off upon the State"
The 1985 Report said the government's involvement in public areas (such as the provision of health services, unemployment insurance, minimum and maximum wages, price control, provision or subsidizing of housing, agriculture, and other economic measures) characterized the present situation as a Welfare State. As the government should not accept responsibility for the welfare of all citizens, it recommended that South Africa should not be a Welfare State, but rather adopt a caring and service provision approach.

If we take the historical circumstances of neglect and deprivation of Blacks into account, over-all structural arrangements and a more equitable distribution of economic, political, and welfare resources seem to be the only solution. A real need existed to look at alternative social welfare policies and strategies to guarantee a minimum level of welfare to everybody. However, the government's fear of the Welfare State caused it to promote a philosophy of privatization and "seeing to your own welfare".

On the issue of the role of the government in welfare and privatization, the Editor of Rapport (South Africa's widely-read Sunday newspaper published in Afrikaans) stated:

"Die owerheid tree ingroter mate terug as entrepreneur en ag dit sy taak om paaie vir die private sektor oop te maak. As die dae van die groot Staat korporasies, die dae van die Staat as al hoe groter werkgewer getel is, kom daardie verantwoordelikheid al hoe meer op die skouers van die private sektor" (22 November 1987).

Arrangements for privatisation were based on the following arguments:

* privatization had existed for many years;
* the State's active part in the national economy should be reduced;
* the possibility of the creation of more job opportunities in the private sector;
* the need to create a balance between preventive and developmental services on the one

---

1 "The government withdraws increasingly as entrepreneur and regards it as its task to pave the way for the private sector. If the days of the big State corporations, the days of the State as the most important employer, are numbered, this increasingly becomes the responsibility of the private sector". (Present author's translation)
hand and therapeutic services on the other hand;

* the dangers of the Welfare State.

In practice, social welfare services should be provided by:

* employee-assisted programmes by industry, commerce, mining, and agriculture;
* volunteers;
* mutual-aid groups where people take responsibility on the local and community levels in a spontaneous way to help provide for the needs of others;
* service provisions by bodies such as the Urban Foundation and the Foundation for Rural Development;
* private social work practices;
* levying a fee to clients for services rendered.

The Working Group recommended that voluntary welfare organizations not be subsidized as in the past. Instead, a newly-proposed subsidization system would operate on a project or programme basis, and no longer on a continuing basis. Subsidization of such programmes would be subjected to the following conditions:

* the need for such a programme should exist;
* only programmes approved by the State would be subsidized;
* the ability of a welfare organization successfully to implement a programme would be a determining factor for granting a subsidy;
* subsidized programmes would be evaluated on a continuous and quantitative basis where possible;
* programmes that were not cost-effective or where the results were not satisfactory would be terminated;
* national planning and priorities would be a determining factor for subsidizing a programme.
Government functions would include the designing of policy, liaison with the Council for Social and Associated Workers, setting of norms and standards, subsidization of rehabilitation centres, the physically handicapped, certain old age homes, and the rendering of welfare services which could not be privatized.

5.4.1 The Response of the Welfare Community

There was widespread rejection of these proposals. Even a statutory body, the Council for Social and Associated Workers, declared that one central State department was necessary to plan and to coordinate all welfare matters on a national level. Thus the Council stated in 1986:

"Die huidige en voorgestelde welsynstrukture is, na die Raad se mening, onhanteerbaar omslagtig, ondoeltreffend, hopeloos te duur in terme van koste en mannekrag en derhalwe onaanvaarbaar" (Council for Social and Associated Workers 1986: 47).

The Council continued:

"Die beleid van differensiasie, soos in die Verslag uiteengesit is, is vir hierdie Raad totaal onaanvaarbaar ... omdat dit tussen die verskillende bevolkingsgroepe diskrimineer en tot wrywing en vyandigheid aanleiding gee" (Ibid).

According to the Council, the proposed welfare structure belonged to an era of the past and was not in line with circumstances prevailing in South Africa.

It was clear that the proposed welfare policies would have profound implications for social welfare in general and for voluntary services in particular. Various constituencies and organizations responded to the proposed new welfare policies. The author will now highlight some of these responses to reveal their main thrust.

---

2 "The existing and suggested welfare structures are, according to the Council, extremely cumbersome, ineffective, and much too expensive in terms of costs and manpower, and therefore unacceptable". (Present author's translation)

3 "The policy of differentiation as outlined in the Report, is totally unacceptable to this Council ... as it discriminates against the various population groups and gives rise to hostility". (Present author's translation)
At a public meeting on 8 March 1986 convened by the Durban Co-ordinating Committee of Welfare Organizations, the proposed welfare plan was rejected for the following reasons:

(i) it would lead to fragmented, bureaucratic, and disorganized welfare services that would destroy the fabric of many non-governmental bodies;

(ii) it would result in increased impoverishment of the poor in many communities;

(iii) it entrenched apartheid;

(iv) it provided a basis for State control with considerably reduced financial responsibility for the development of welfare services;

(v) its implementation would prove cumbersome and costly in the extreme (Durban Co-ordinating Committee 1986: 2).

The Department of Social Work at the University of the Western Cape strongly criticized the policies and rejected them on the grounds that:

(i) the proposed welfare policies were based on the principle of apartheid;

(ii) social welfare services would be privatized;

(iii) the concept of welfare was restricted to social security and personal services;

(iv) the main arguments of the Report were in contradiction with the underlying values of social welfare and social work;

(v) the State and government authority was made supreme in relation to the rights of citizens;
(vi) The proposed welfare policies had major implications for the profession of social work.

The Action Group on Social Services said while the proposals incorporated certain policies and principles which were acceptable (e.g. an emphasis on State and community/church partnership in welfare), its philosophical foundation was flawed and the welfare structure that it proposed was an unjust and often irrelevant response to South African social realities. The Action Group continued by saying:

(i) The philosophical foundations upon which the proposed policies were based entrenched racial divisions in welfare with consequent maintenance of racial elitism and disadvantage;

(ii) The proposed welfare structures involved the duplication of welfare bodies and administrations at the local, regional, and national levels for each race group;

(iii) The government accepted only limited responsibility for the citizen's welfare;

(iv) An illogically heavy burden of responsibility for their own welfare was placed on individuals and families;

(v) The proposed policy provided a narrow perspective of welfare which did not embrace health, housing, and job creation;

(vi) Privatization was advocated in a sweeping, ill-defined manner, without any of its implications being addressed.

The Group did not only criticize the proposed policies, it also suggested alternative policies as a basis for discussion.

Despite the almost unanimous rejection of the proposed welfare policies, the Cabinet approved them on 4 November 1987 for implementation. Hundreds of social workers pledged to work to
counter the government's proposed welfare policy should it be implemented as originally outlined. This resolution was taken in July 1989 at a conference arranged by the University of the Witswatersrand School of Social Work. The conference condemned the policies because they would entrench apartheid, accentuate existing differences among the people of South Africa, and create further differences and conflict. The real flaw of the proposed welfare policy was the fact that it would mean more expensive services accessible to fewer people at a time when escalating unemployment and rising costs were causing hardships for the majority of South Africans.

5.4.2 Structuring and Implementation of the Proposed Welfare Policies

In order "to accelerate, coordinate, and secure a broadbased shift in attitude in favour of differentiation and privatization", the State set up structures that formed an integral part of the modified State policy on welfare. (See Figures I & II). These structures were largely constituted on a racial basis to oversee welfare on a national, regional, and local level. The purpose was "to foster and maintain an orderly society". The proposed structures made provision for coordination and control on different levels. At the central level, under the Department of National Health and Population Development, there were three statutory bodies:

(i) National Welfare Policy Council

This Council consisted of the different "own affairs" Ministers and officials of central government, and Provincial Administrators responsible for welfare. It was responsible for national policy in respect of "general affairs".

(ii) Interdepartmental Consultative Committee

This Committee consisted of representatives from the administrations of "own affairs", the Department of Cooperation and Development, and officials of central government. It was to be responsible for coordinating the work of the four departments of welfare, and all measures aimed at introducing racial differentiation and privatization.
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1. National Welfare Council
2. Coordination for the National Welfare Policy Committee
3. Representatives of various advisory committees

- Provincial Councils (Central and Provincial authorities)
- Interdepartmental Consultative Committee (General Affairs)
- National Welfare Policy Council
- Population Development (Secretariat)
- Department of National Health and Welfare Advisory Councils
- Representatives of various welfare boards

Regional Welfare Boards

- Field of service and working committees
- Welfare Advisory Councils
- Community Services

- Liaison Committee (Blacks Only)
- Department of Development Aid

- Department of Health Services
(iii) South African Welfare Council

This Council consisted of the various "own affairs" Advisory Councils and was responsible for advising the National Welfare Policy Council.

At this level welfare services for Blacks were now under the Department of Development Aid with a Liaison Committee consisting of representatives of Central and Provincial authorities, and National Councils.

Four structures operated at the regional level:

(i) Welfare Advisory Councils

These Councils were regulatory bodies consisting of representatives of the Regional Welfare Boards under the chairmanship of the "own affairs" Ministers. These Councils advised the Minister on social welfare policy at the regional level, on existing needs, as well as on what programmes to introduce.

(ii) Regional Welfare Boards

Members of these Boards were appointed by the "own affairs" Ministers. These were statutory bodies constituted on a racial basis. They were supposed to study local social conditions and plan welfare programmes in terms of needs and priorities. Other functions included the following: to obtain the cooperation of welfare organizations during emergencies, to receive and to approve welfare programmes from organizations in their respective regions, to encourage, promote and coordinate the rendering of welfare services by voluntary organizations (without curtailing their right to self-determination), to advise the Minister on matters relating to their functions at local level, arrange discussions and conferences, promote the policy of racial differentiation and privatization in welfare services, and to activate local and area welfare committees.
(iii) Field of Service Committees

These were non-statutory committees established by the Welfare Advisory Councils. Their functions were to provide advice and information to the Welfare Advisory Councils.

(iv) Area Welfare Committees

These were non-statutory committees with representatives drawn from Local Welfare Committees, local authorities, and government departments. They had practically the same functions as the local committees but covered a broader area. In addition, Local Welfare Committees operated at the local level.

All the Area Welfare Committees were set up by the Regional Welfare Boards to perform such functions as may be assigned by the Boards. The Boards were expected to work in cooperation with Committees for community development.

5.5 MEASURES OF CONTROL

At this stage the South African government experienced a serious legitimacy and credibility crisis. Consequently, parallel to political reform and attempts to win the "hearts and minds of the people", stringent control and repressive measures were applied. For this purpose the National Security Management System, which had existed since 1979, was activated to resist the "total onslaught", and to co-ordinate the security and welfare functions of the State. This strategy entailed selective repression of the resistance-leadership by the security forces and carefully controlled social reform of material conditions. The latter strategy worked to defuse the "liberation struggle" by ameliorating the social problems around which people were politicized and mobilized.

The National Security Management System operated under the direct guidance of the State President as part of the activities of the Cabinet. A complicated structure was put into place to deal with the challenges faced by the government. In this respect, Joint Management Centres
should be mentioned. These bodies were extensions of the State Security Council that was set up in 1972 to advise the government on national security policy and intelligence. The State Security Council was made up of politicians, officials, the military, and the police. This Council had to oversee the following areas in society: the military and para-military; science and technology; political, economic, and religious activities; psychological aspects; manpower resources; community services; and telecommunications. The Council also focused on all areas of conflict and dissent. The State Security Council had branches with similar functions at the regional and local level. These branches were called Joint Management Centres (J.M.C's.). The whole country was divided into nine regions with a J.M.C. for each region. Officials from different government departments sat on the Joint Management Centres as did persons drawn from the military and the police. In order to make control more effective, sub-J.M.C.'s existed in each city or metropolitan area and mini-J.M.C's in local areas. At the local level, mini-J.M.C.'s also included Management Committees or Community Councils with local people like head masters of schools, religious leaders, social workers, and other people in leadership positions. The job of the Joint Management Centres was to monitor the activities of community organizations and to detect areas or activities of dissent at the regional and local levels. These J.M.C's had large sums of money to spend in problem areas to defuse popular demands and conflict. They also used their power and resources to strengthen the role of the Management Committees and Community Councils, and to weaken the role of "progressive" grass-roots organizations.

5.6 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Besides social welfare reform and measures of control, strategies to promote community development were designed that were in some respects contradictory to the measures of control. In 1975 the government accepted the National Physical Development Plan. This was later followed with a new approach to regional development. Since the 1976 uprising the idea developed that the welfare needs of people should be addressed and that they should be given property to protect. Based on this view a campaign was started to sell housing schemes to tenants. Besides housing, other social services like education, health, welfare, and the social upliftment of deprived communities were to be improved. The idea was to involve the local community and private sector in a regional community development strategy. The goal of the community
development strategy was to stimulate social development in order to improve the quality of life and to secure a higher standard of living for all South Africans. This idea was based on the assumption that 80 percent of the problems faced by the government were of a social welfare nature, and only 20 percent security problems. It was also realized that the quality of life is to a large extent determined by the balance between the country's resources and the size of the population. The National Population Development Programme was later incorporated into this strategy to form the government's National Community Development Strategy. For this purpose the country was divided into nine regions for development.

The purpose of the Community Development Strategy was to stimulate and to improve the socio-economic conditions of individuals and communities by increasing the economic, the physical, and the social development of the regions. In this respect, the public sector and the private sector were to cooperate. The more specific objectives of this programme were intended to:

- promote community involvement in community development;
- encourage self-help programmes, and to stimulate initiative and community responsibility;
- develop the human potential and to mobilize resources in the regions to the advantage of the community;
- recognize and protect the human dignity of all people;
- promote preventive and development programmes;
- coordinate all welfare activities and other service programmes at the local and regional level;
- initiate services and organize at the local level for the advancement of the people.
- improve the bases of authority in communities in order to bring a balance in social, economic, and physical development at the local level.

The community development strategy was based on the principles that:

- the State and the private sector cooperate as partners at all levels of development;
- there should be a balance between social, economic, physical and political
development;
* the human being and his orderly functioning should be the focus in any development programme;
* development should focus on the real problems and needs of individuals, groups, and communities as identified by them;
* there should be coordination on local and regional levels between all the development programmes and actions by the authorities and the private sector.

To give content to these objectives and to achieve them, implied a multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary approach. This should focus on social upliftment: improved schooling, education, health and housing services, family income, family planning programmes, provision of physical facilities like water and sanitation, economic development, urbanization, rural development, and the provision of basic infra-structures.

This programme was to operate on two levels: the level of governmental authorities and the level of the private sector. On the governmental level, the Department of Health and Welfare was to initiate and coordinate the programme. There was also an inter-departmental committee to coordinate cooperation between the different departments involved in the programme. The primary task of the Department of Health and Welfare was to:

* implement community development programmes within the objectives of the proposed development strategy;
* coordinate the community development strategy at the national level;
* ensure that programmes by other departments promoted the aims of the community development strategy.

Figure III gives an overview of the structure of the strategy. (The figure which appears immediately below is given in Afrikaans. I have not been able to trace an English version. I have, however, translated key concepts of which the Afrikaans abbreviations appear in brackets). Structures that were intended to foster cooperation between the authorities and the private sector were to operate directly under the government (Regering) at three levels, viz. national, regional,
and local. Details follow.

(i) The National Regional Development Advice Board (NSOAR).

This was a statutory body that coordinated and oversaw regional development country-wide. At this level the Board operated in co-operation with the South African Welfare Council (SAWR).

(ii) Regional Development Advice Committees (SAOK’S).

Their over-all objectives were to advise the government with regard to regional development and strategies. They planned and coordinated development activities in order to pursue economic objectives, and social and physical development. Their specific functions were:

* to determine regional development policy and priorities within the region;
* to disseminate information and advice on development to the community and to those who seek advice;
* to create a regional consciousness and identity in cooperation with the Regional Development Societies.

These Regional Committees consisted of representatives of the Regional Development Associations, local authorities of all racial groups, private organizations like industry, commerce, agriculture, mining, labour, Provincial Administrations, and government departments who were involved in regional development. These Committees were assisted by Community Development Officers who were responsible for liaison and development of regional and local structures. Development initiatives at this level were done in co-operation with the Regional Welfare Boards (SWRE).
(iii) Regional Development Associations (SOV'S).

At the regional level there were also fifty-seven Regional Development Associations. They were voluntary, autonomous bodies, but their position was not quite clear within this structure. They had existed since 1975 when the government's National Physical Development Plan was initiated. They co-operated with regional welfare committees. At a horizontal level there was also a link with the Department of Health and Welfare (Dept. Gesondheid en Welsyn) under whose aegis the National Community Development Strategy (Nasionale Gemeenskapsontwikkelingstrategie) was to be implemented. For this purpose an Interdepartmental Committee for Community Development (IDK VIR GO) existed to oversee the process of community development.

(iv) Local Committees for Community Development (PK vir GO).

These operated in all towns within the areas covered by the Regional Development Advice Committees. The composition of these local Committees was to a large extent determined by local conditions and needs. In practice, they included representatives from local authorities, and from local interest groups like churches, women's organizations, organized labour, education, sport bodies, agriculture, health authorities, service clubs, youth movements, welfare organizations, development agencies and other interested groupings. Local initiative, involvement, and self-determination were encouraged. Governmental involvement would be confined to advice and to material support of projects. In practice, these local committees identified and investigated social, economic, and physical issues that impeded development and stability in the community. They determined development priorities, proposed solutions, assigned certain tasks to persons or organizations who had a direct interest, stimulated self-help programmes, acquired technical and financial support from governmental and non-governmental sectors for local development, evaluated the progress and effectiveness of these programmes, mobilized the involvement and participation of people in community development, coordinated liaison between the various projects in operation, and advised local authorities and Regional Development Associations, welfare committees, and government departments.
with regard to problems in the region.

Despite the potential of this strategy, the government had great difficulty to implement it. Many people questioned the motives behind it and the ideological framework within which it had to be implemented.

5.7 A CRITIQUE OF THE PROPOSED WELFARE POLICIES

What has been described above constituted fundamental policy changes, with major implications for social welfare in South Africa. Besides the possibility that the proposed policies could lead to impoverishment, they also had the potential for conflict and for destruction of the welfare system. Moreover, they were likely to demonstrate to Blacks that the system of capitalism is on the whole inimical to their welfare and equality, a crucial issue to be faced in a post-apartheid society. In a document submitted to the Natal Coastal Regional Forum of the South African National Council for Child and Family Life on the proposed welfare policies, such implications were clearly stated:

"By recommending privatization of welfare services, the government is not only abrogating its financial duties to meeting the welfare needs of its taxpayers -- but by introducing the profit motive and a fee-for-service motive, it is striking at the heart of the welfare movement in this country, viz. the service motive" (1986: 1).

The underlying purpose of the new policy was a more effective consolidation of racially-based apartheid. It was suggested that voluntary welfare organizations should cooperate in promoting the philosophy of racial differentiation. The ideal was clearly stated, viz. that separate organizations be established and maintained for the various population groups on national as well as regional and local levels.

The government's decision to steer away from the idea of a Welfare State was based on its fear of the principle of equality and the equal distribution of welfare benefits and opportunities. We have seen that the economic base of welfare resources rested primarily upon taxes paid by business and individuals. In South Africa these resources were mainly in the hands of a small portion of the population, which was White. To secure and to provide a more equal distribution
of welfare resources would create the impression that Whites were paying for the welfare of Blacks, a notion that had been widespread among Whites for generations. Whites owned the land, had the ownership of most property and economic resources, were better educated, and earned more money when they sold their labour. Blacks on the other hand had only their labour to sell at a much lower price. Thus, their income tax contribution amounted to less than that of Whites. (On the other hand, Blacks paid VAT at the same rate, and paid the same prices for heavily-taxed consumption articles such as alcohol and tobacco. Although individual Blacks might consume less, on average, than individual Whites, the Black population was so overwhelmingly large that the total contribution by Blacks to the Treasury from taxes on consumption goods had to outweigh that of Whites.)

It is quite clear that the government was not prepared to provide welfare services on the same scale to Blacks as it did to Whites. The argument was that the government did not have sufficient resources to do this. The welfare of Blacks had been neglected to such an extent that it would require massive redistribution of land and economic resources, or a massive distribution of welfare benefits within the present system, to bring about equality in areas like income security, education, health services, and housing. This option was not considered by the government - - in fact new measures in some respects worsened the position of Blacks.

The basic problem is that the entire South African society is structured on social and economic inequality. To introduce equality in social welfare would imply equality in other areas of life as well. Apartheid as an ideology and as an organising principle to structure the South African society should be seen from this perspective. On the other hand it remains true that "social equality is one feasible organizing principle for shaping the quality of life and the circumstances of living of individuals and groups in society, as well as for structuring all human relations" (Gil 1973: xvi). The principle of social equality derives from a central value premise according to which every individual and every social group are of intrinsic worth. This means that every human being is entitled to equal civil, political, social and economic liberties, rights and treatment, as well as being subject to equal constraints. That this has not been the case is the basic problem in South Africa, and a real challenge for the post-apartheid society.
From a social science perspective, it is clear that the proposed welfare policy was not designed and structured on theoretically or scientifically sound foundations. Moreover, this fundamental change of social welfare policy took place apparently without any in-depth analysis or consideration of its ultimate consequences. Instead, it was either based on the convictions of a few officials and politicians, or else based on the views of a small interest group of powerful individuals. It is interesting to note that a similar view of welfare was expressed in 1977 by a well-known business man, Dr P E Rousseau in an article in "Die Huisgenoot" (1977: 152). In this article he said it was impossible to provide welfare services to Blacks on the same scale as to Whites, and that alternative approaches should be explored. One solution, he said, was to move away from the idea of a Welfare State. People should pay for services to meet their personal needs. Moreover, children should pay for their education, and adequate provision should be made by everybody for old-age and ill-health. The needy should be cared for by their own families and by voluntary organizations, as in the past. He based his arguments on certain conceptions of welfare, welfare "malpractices" in the United States and Britain, as well as economic and racial perspectives. In South Africa, he said, we are faced with an even bigger problem because of the racial composition of the South African society.

Social policy deals with questions directly concerned with the basic goals of society. Policies dealing with such matters as income distribution, employment, education, health services, housing and levels of living are too important to be left to chance or to the assumption that the market accommodates everybody and is naturally just. The basic question faced by South Africans is what are the new goals to be, and how do specific social policies relate to these goals? What has happened in the field of social policy has been indicative of the government's hesitation to change and of its lack of clear reform goals. The government wanted to reform apartheid, but at the same time wanted to maintain it.

In the newly-proposed policies, the emphasis shifted to resources and technical matters, the basic goals and values which these policies were to attain being pushed aside. Not that technical matters and resources are not important. They are indeed, and alternative means need to be considered in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. However, unless goals and values are clear and are constantly kept in mind as main criteria, alternative social policies and approaches will be of
limited utility.

The real dilemma at that time was that South Africa was facing a political crisis in which it had to maintain economic growth, profitability, and stability. This created a legitimacy problem for the government. Some people regarded privatisation and devolution of welfare and other services as a strategy by the government to solve its political and economic crisis. It was a strategy to depoliticize the economy and social services. Whereas in the past government involvement could be seen in almost every aspect of people's daily lives, it now appeared as if it was being "withdrawn". This was particularly evident in the economy, where the free-enterprise system was supposed to control the market. Within this system, the government saw its function as primarily the formulation of policy and the establishment of an infrastructure for the system to function. By doing this, it was possible to make it appear as if the many problems which people face were the fault of the economy and not the government. This took the focus and pressure away from the government. Government's policy towards housing and social welfare was a good example of this strategy. In the past, nearly all housing for lower-income groups was built and owned by the government (or local authorities). In social welfare, the government provided a wide range of services, mainly to Whites. Where poverty and the welfare needs of Blacks had to be addressed, the government said it was not responsible for the welfare of all its people. The private sector and local initiative should take over. In this respect Coovadia said:

"Apartheid had led to an alteration in the logic of accumulation and the economic and political spheres had become indistinguishable. The economic crisis was reflected in a crisis of legitimacy for the State. The natural outlet for the Nats was to uncouple the economic and political spheres so that ongoing poverty and unemployment and inflation will be seen as the failures of economic policies rather than political decisions" (Welfare Policy Steering Committee 1987: 6).

The government's proposed welfare policy was not only a retreat to a stringent residual approach where welfare programmes existed only to meet the emergency needs of individuals incapable of providing for themselves through the family or the market, it was regarded as extraordinary that a government could abdicate its primary responsibility, viz. the health and welfare of its citizens. It was argued by progressive organizations that social welfare programmes should make provision for a minimum level of well-being coupled with concrete programmes of social development. Programmes should not only assist individuals to survive, but to aid them in
developing to their highest capacity. The State bears the responsibility for all its citizens and should therefore be in charge of health and welfare to serve the equal needs of all people. But the needs of all citizens were not equal. Young people, for instance, had different needs from those of the aged.

Privatization is based on the principle of free enterprise, private property, competition and profit—a capitalist mode of service provision. Capitalism, with its emphasis on profit and competition, is intrinsically exploitative. The principles of a capitalist market system and welfare values are in contrast to one another. It is therefore clear that if the "market forces" are to provide for welfare, we need a restructuring of the economic system to make it responsive to human needs instead of capitalist motives.

5.8 THE LIMITATIONS OF REFORM

Of all the welfare reforms and measures imposed, the National Community Development Strategy seemed to be a strategy with great potential. However, it did not make real progress. The programme was severely restricted by the prevailing social and political order in South Africa. In an open and democratic society, this strategy had great potential to improve the quality of life. These development strategies and reform initiatives were restricted by the political framework in which they were implemented.

Two major political forces were operational in South Africa during the 1980's: the government with its reluctant reform initiatives, and extra-parliamentary forces which envisioned a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa. At that stage, both government and extra-parliamentary forces were talking about a transitional process and a "new" South Africa. However, it was quite clear that two completely different conceptions were envisaged. In terms of the government's reform programme, new structures of government and control were created, some laws were amended, and new ones introduced. Although the government's reform process gave the impression of "major changes", the situation did not change fundamentally. It took place within the framework of apartheid which was entrenched in the Constitution. The Constitutional dispensation, the reforms undertaken, and the "new" South Africa envisaged by the government
were based on the old ideology of apartheid, then called differentiation, own affairs, and general affairs.

The extra-parliamentary forces on the other hand had envisioned a total transformation of the South African society, free from apartheid, racism, and racial capitalism. In reality, this would mean a completely different political, economic, and social structure. In the next chapter the author collects some of these views and analyzes the implications for their possible implementation.
CHAPTER SIX

VIEWS ON POST-APARTHEID WELFARE POLICY: RESPONSES OF SOME STAKEHOLDERS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

As was stated in Chapter One, the objective of this work was inter alia to collect and examine ideas relating to welfare policy in a post-apartheid South Africa. To achieve this objective, a theoretical frame of reference and conceptualization of social welfare was required. It was also necessary to consult the citizens to whom such welfare policy is directed. In a participatory democracy, citizens have the right to engage in and influence processes that affect their lives.

In research of this kind, qualitative (rather than quantitative) methods were found to be more appropriate. Thus in-depth and open-ended interviews were conducted with representatives of a wide range of organizations in civil society, in which their views on welfare policy and related issues in South Africa were sought. It needs to be clearly stated that these interviews were conducted before the political transformation of the 1990's. Some of the opinions gathered might no longer apply. Others, while relevant in the country's changed circumstances, might have been differently formulated.

6.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Organizations consulted included, inter alia, community organizations, trade unions, health and welfare agencies, church organizations, and groupings concerned with research or education or politics. Interviews focused in particular on socio-political and economic issues. Many organizations did not have explicit policy positions on post-apartheid welfare policy. In that case organizations were asked to respond within their broad philosophy and policy frameworks, in terms of the objectives that they were pursuing, and according to their visions for the future. In most instances, ideas were collected from such individuals as were nominated by their respective organizations to respond to my research questions. Although these individuals responded within the policy frameworks of their organizations, opinions expressed are to a large extent based on the interpretations of their organizations' policies and philosophies. Their responses should
therefore not be regarded as the considered opinions of the organizations they represented, such as might have been reached after months of systematic debate. Hence, some organizations have stated explicitly that the views expressed by individuals are personal to them. Other respondents had no formal mandate from their organizations to speak to me, or preferred to remain anonymous. In such instances the report refers only to the region or place of the interview, not the organization or respondent.

As this was not a statistical survey, the selection of respondents for the interviews was done by applying the informal, non-probability sample method. The sample was therefore purposive, which means that the choice of units was subjected to conscious selection. In this way the researcher selected a sample in relation to his needs and relevance to the issue. "A common strategy of purposive sampling is to pick cases that are judged to be typical of the population in which one is interested, assuming that errors of judgement in the selection will tend to counterbalance each other" (Selltiz et al 1976: 521). This method of selecting a sample is determined very much by the nature of the research, and whether the researcher is looking for qualitative or quantitative data. A serious disadvantage of this method is its high risk of biased selection. To counteract this, the researcher attempted to build in some measure of control in terms of what Gergen calls "leverage points" or "social leverage".

Leverage points, according to Gergen, are relevant when the researcher needs to identify a particular interest group so as to constitute the sample. The purpose of this research was primarily to collect views on social welfare policy. This subject is not an issue of concern for all persons and all organizations, neither are all members of society equally involved in decisions on social welfare. People as well as organizations have specific fields of interests, areas of involvement, and objectives they pursue. In this regard Gergen's notion of "social leverage" to identify such a core group of persons was utilized (1968: 200).

But how do you develop a model for social leverage? Gergen says the implications of the term leverage point can be understood by considering any social system constituted by a set of interacting subunits. If the social system is taken to be an entire society, the subunits at one level might be the institutions or organizations within society (Ibid: 182). On the other hand, it is a fact
that the subunits of greatest importance are individual persons rather than organizations or institutions. This model was used to identify organizations and influential persons in the community. Consequently 82 organizations were selected in this way. (See Annexure One for full list of organizations.) These organizations were thus considered "leverage points" for the system as a whole. Within these broad criteria, the researcher attempted to include diverse participants representing different views. (It needs to be mentioned here that not all organizations involved in the welfare arena embraced the post-apartheid vision at the time of the research.)

As was also experienced in this research, the critical issue seems to be how to isolate these leverage points for study. According to Gergen, the model assumes that any individual in a society can be viewed along three dimensions relevant to the concept of leverage: issue relevance; subphase resources; and personal efficacy (Ibid: 183). With regard to issue relevance, he says that persons vary greatly in their relationships to a given public issue, and different issues may impinge on a person in varying degrees. The greater the relevance of an issue to a person, the stronger will be his/her attempts to exert leverage. With respect to subphase resources, Gergen says the formation of public policy is not a single stage process taking place at a single point in time. Within any stage of the process a set of resources is required that would give a person leverage in that stage. These resources may vary in nature. Some may accrue to an individual as a result of a public position he/she holds; others may be in the form of power and authority, influence, or even the respect and admiration of others.

In order to identify and assess leverage points, various approaches may be followed. Gergen identified five: the reputational approach, the positional approach, the social participation approach, the opinion leadership approach, and a demographic approach. In terms of these approaches, we identify the most influential persons, in general as well as in specific spheres. However, even this approach is not without problems. Despite the importance of issue relevance and subphase resources, individuals involved may attract less public attention, communicate less effectively, or get along with others less well, and these factors may seriously hamper the individuals influence in any situation. It would therefore seem that personality or social capacity is an important criterion for a person's effective leverage. Furthermore, since a measure of own judgement is involved, it could be argued that the validity of the approach depends on the
researcher’s ability to identify the powerful and the influential.

Having identified the areas of investigation, and having gone through the procedures to identify the target group, all the different organizations and persons that were to be interviewed were listed. The necessary arrangements were made to conduct the interviews with each of the individual organizations and persons selected. (See letters to organizations in Annexure Three.) As this research concentrated primarily on visions and ideas, the researcher conducted all the interviews himself to gain first-hand experience of the visions that organizations had. On the whole, organizations were anxious to participate in the research. Of all the organizations approached, only two refused to be involved. One was probably of the opinion that the research was politically too sensitive, while the other one had "a tight schedule". Altogether 95 interviews were conducted during the second half of 1989.

During the interviews a schedule was used to identify and discuss key issues pertaining to social welfare and public policy. (See Annexure Two.) The interview guide included a list of questions introducing a range of topics and sub-topics within the field of social welfare. The guide was particularly helpful in that it specified in advance the topics and issues to be discussed in the interviews. It basically served as a checklist during the interviews, to ensure that all relevant areas were covered and that the same information was obtained from all the respondents. The guide was structured in such a way that it allowed for further questions, the sequence of the questions, and which information to pursue in greater depth. It was not used to restrain responses. On the contrary, the interviews were intended to be as free as the interviewee wished them to be.

The themes covered in the interviews derived from the literature review and included four basic areas of concern:

1) Views on welfare policies that applied at the time

2) Views on post-apartheid welfare policies.

3) Views on future political scenarios
Views on transitional strategies.

In the interviews held, respondents were given the opportunity to speak freely in their own terms on a future welfare policy. The approach was applied with great care, to avoid the researcher imposing his preconceived ideas on the interviewees. In a sense, the approach was subjective in that it focused on the views or experiences of the actors and their perception of the situation. Nevertheless, qualitative methods are particularly suitable in the collection of insights and ideas. The value of this research methodology seems to be its open approach, i.e. what Smaling calls "open-mindedness", "open-heartedness", and "dialogical openness" (1993). This method of data collection is open, flexible, and not restricted to structured questions and discourse.

In some instances, focused group interviews were conducted with selected respondents of an organization. (Five of these interviews were conducted.) One of the interesting features of this approach is that respondents not only respond to the interviewer, they also discuss issues amongst themselves. Each respondent is free to comment, correct, criticize, or elaborate on the views expressed by other members of the group. This approach was fruitful, since several organizations did not seem to have clear positions on social welfare policy. A further advantage of the group interview was found to be the fact that information was gathered in a rapid and economical manner. Group interviews also tend to reduce inhibitions, and information might be provided that would otherwise not have been revealed. Nevertheless, critics caution that group interviews might not provide the same depth of information that can be gained in individual interviews.

This present Chapter reports on the views and suggestions of organizations and individuals on social welfare policy for a post-apartheid South Africa, as revealed by the interviews. This is done by analyzing transcripts of the interviews and field-notes made by the researcher during the interviews. Because some of the data collected relate to a political system that no longer exists, such data have not been included here. Views on welfare policies that applied at the time of the interviews are however included, in so far as they provide a framework for the formulation of future welfare policy. The development of social policy needs to be informed by knowledge from the past as well as an understanding of contemporary issues.
The data are presented primarily in the form of summaries and narrative descriptions which provide a broad picture of experiences, perceptions, and opinions relating to welfare policy in South Africa. Use is made of direct quotations and expressions by participants themselves to elucidate their thoughts and views. Much store was put on the exact terms in which responses were made. These frequently suggested frustration, exasperation, anger, sometimes what amounted to despair, regarding the status quo at the time of the interviews. Recurrent themes, and responses that run contrary to these themes, were identified. A simple form of content-analysis was used, by means of which the researcher aimed at little more than merely an impressionistic result. In this way an attempt is made to generate new ideas about social welfare policy and to modify current theorizing within the South African context.

6.3 VIEWS ON WELFARE POLICIES AS REVEALED IN THE INTERVIEWS

As previous chapters have shown, welfare policies of the past, as well as the proposed policies of the eighties, met with strong opposition from individuals, welfare, and community organizations. In the interviews, respondents were asked to state their reasons for this opposition, and also to indicate what alternatives they favoured. Analysis of established policies are relevant in the sense that concrete adjustments would need to be made to them, and since the welfare system guided by these policies continues to affect the lives of many South Africans. Respondents adopted a strong normative approach in terms of stating what ought to be.

6.3.1 Views on welfare policies and poverty

A thorough knowledge of welfare policies, as inherited from the previous government, is essential, as we will have to start from there. An understanding of the existing non-egalitarian and oppressive social, political, and economic order is necessary when we begin to design alternative policies and approaches which should facilitate the evolution of a different social order. Respondents were very critical about policies that prevailed. Welfare services were seen as totally inadequate, and as not addressing issues of poverty and deprivation as suffered by many South Africans. As they did not meet the needs of people, they would require total revision. Its underlying philosophy placed South Africa's welfare policy in the residual category (which means
that social welfare activities should only come into play when the normal structures of supply, namely the family and the market, break down). Responsibility is devolved upon the individual. State intervention is minimal and there is no intention to reduce inequalities or confer maximum opportunities. In fact it was stated that the system entrenched the inequalities and racism which had long been a basic dimension of the South African society. "All welfare facilities operate on a racial and unequal basis" (Nactu, Western Cape).

Some of the responses, capturing general views in this regard, are quoted below.

"Present welfare policy is mostly biased towards the minority, not the needs of the majority."

"Present policies do not reflect the views of the people. They have been devised without the views of the people, who were not politically represented".

"Present policies still seem to adopt the approach of blaming the victim. In South Africa the victim of a system is blamed for not being able to cope".

"Services are not sufficiently accessible to the ordinary person in need".

"Present welfare policy is totally inadequate. There is a huge backlog that needs to be addressed".

"The present policy only provides a random, partial, temporary, material relief".

"It's a discriminatory policy whose aim is to keep the peace - - to ensure some stability".

"The policies that are pursued by the State at the present moment in this country amount to no more than mopping up under a whole series of dripping taps".

"The State's welfare policy seeks to perpetuate a system of apartheid and economic injustice which is manifested in the inadequate, inappropriate, and unequal provision of social services".
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"Present social welfare operates on a deficit model. It devalues the human being. Present welfare policies blame the person for his/her situation".

There was a strong feeling amongst respondents that social welfare was inaccessible to large numbers of people, and that it failed to restore human dignity and self-reliance. A respondent from the South Western Council of Churches in Oudtshoorn said:

"I'd probably say it's the complete opposite of what I have said it should be, that they do nothing to actually enhance and allow the people to live human lives. There are things that are provided . . . in the line of grants and pensions. There is something provided, but it doesn't begin actually to allow people to live as human people".

The Black Sash Advice Office seemed to have similar experiences about inadequate and ineffective welfare provision. They said:

"We have thousands of people coming in whose lives are in ruin for one reason or another, and it's actually very little [we can do], very few places that we can refer them to. Very few organizations that we know about seem to be able to do something".

This indicates that there are serious problems about accessibility to welfare services and to an infra-structure that would address the needs of people. Besides the fact that policies were described as inadequate to meet needs, it was also felt that welfare services are not readily available to those in need. Present welfare services tend to be removed from the people they are supposed to serve which indicates that there is an element of alienation. It was said that services are provided in a one-sided fashion, while consultation, advice, and education, which should accompany them, are neglected, if not disregarded. Participation by consumers of welfare services in central decision-making processes, was highlighted as a problem. It was said that the system emphasises statutory welfare, while community development is under-emphasised. Respondents argued very strongly for a developmental and preventive approach in social welfare.
An area that was singled out for strong criticism of welfare policies of that time was racial discrimination, and its implications for planning and for the provision of welfare services. In practice, it was said, this means less money is available to the poor than to the more affluent sectors of society. "Its whole approach is geared towards a particular group of people, Whites. This is still the case today despite the fact that they have benefitted extensively from welfare policies which have existed . . . for most of this past century, from the 1930's right to the present" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Although the welfare system was regarded as problematic and had many short-comings, some respondents have expressed the view that "it is not such a bad system", and that it can be improved. Some interviewees have cautioned that we should be careful not to reject everything concerning present policies. "We tend to be too reactive, rather than pro-active, in our response to the proposed welfare policies". They argued that "we cannot throw everything out of the window". The status quo could serve as a basis from which to acquire incrementally what is still needed. A respondent of the Ravensmead Advice Office stated:

"All that I'm saying now is that we need to rethink as to how we envisage utilizing the present welfare policy to better the socio-economic position of our communities".

The view was expressed that prevailing policies were not only "inappropriate", they were largely based on "personal morality", and they "serve the needs of people with personal problems". It was further said that social work activities, which operate within the framework of social welfare, are seriously constrained by problems of poverty and unemployment, while the social work profession deals only with the symptoms of these issues. Since the profession is not able to deal with the issues themselves, they are not seen as the central concern of social work.

A more fundamental perspective was that social welfare cannot be viewed in isolation from the prevailing political and economic system in the country. A respondent of a political organization in Johannesburg stated:

"Social welfare policy in South Africa is based on the economic policy of the country, which is also influenced by the politically racial policies".
Another respondent, attached to a church organization, said:

"Personally, I feel that the social welfare policy is based on the socio-economic and political situation in South Africa, and it does not meet the needs of those people who are in this situation in society" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

It was often held that "welfare is not the correct approach to deal with poverty and deprivation". The history of the situation should be considered. Poverty and inequality are "deeply rooted within the political economy of the society itself. Any institution, however, benevolent, so long as it's rooted in a system that itself generates this kind of injustice will never be able to address the core of the problem" (Azapo).

The core of the problem is that South Africa's welfare policies were not really intended to address poverty and deprivation (unless it was the poverty among Whites in the twenties and thirties of the present century). In order to understand the limitations of social welfare, we need to analyze the nature of capitalist society. This system needs a labour reserve, and therefore benefits by unemployment. The question is whether government and the institutions of a capitalist society are structured in such a way as to enable them to address such issues. The way social work and social welfare operate can do no more than secure the survival of an individual or perhaps a family. Besides the fact that social welfare presently operates as a "rescue system", in another way its purpose is to keep in place a system it itself needs for its own survival. "It is a reformist activity which only begins to touch the fringes of the needs of people" (Cape Action League). The League's view is that social welfare "tends to blame the people, rather than the system. It is the people who have to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, and so on. That kind of deficit model that comes with most social welfare practices is for us intrinsically part of devaluing the human being, the human spirit".

6.3.2 Consequences of Previous Welfare Policies

As the welfare system does not address the real issues in society, the point was made that it creates different levels of welfare and leads to the entrenchment of poverty. Regarding the impact of extant welfare policies on the lives of people, interviewees tended to highlight the negative side
of welfare provisions. One view was that they do not make any difference despite the fact that some people need them for survival. Interviewees said that such welfare policies create dependence and alienation. Others said that welfare provision might in some respects be the only income a family had. One respondent stated:

"I wouldn't argue that welfare policies keep people in a state of poverty dependence. The poverty is there, and the welfare policies are often the only way that people actually make it . . . If you take them away, it wouldn't solve the problem" (Idasa, Port Elizabeth).

Azapo expressed the view that the welfare system had particular spatial consequences, such as forced removals, squatter camps, and so on. This organization further held:

"But there is also the subtle deprivation of the mental psychological make-up of the oppressed people".

A respondent in Johannesburg added to this view by saying:

"And I think that Whites have paid a high price for the system, to maintain the system of apartheid in terms of their own mental health".

It was argued that the consequences of social welfare cannot be seen in isolation from the oppressive and discriminatory apartheid context within which it operated. The Durban Indian Child and Family Welfare Society stated that major consequences of the State's ideology of apartheid were "rising social problems such as overcrowding, housing shortages, family disintegration, high rates of alcoholism; declining economic, political, and social conditions; and heightened disparities between rich and poor".

The underlying philosophy of welfare was singled out for severe criticism. It was said that the welfare philosophy "reminds people that they are inferior when they are on welfare". (This argument is however not encountered only in South Africa.) Although some organizations recognized the contribution of welfare, they were doubtful whether welfare has had a meaningful impact under current socio-economic conditions. One organization said that due to "the nature of the South African society, welfare provision disappears in a bottomless pit" (National Council
of Women). The present welfare system tends to focus more on the symptoms of the problem rather than its root causes.

To get an idea of the consequences of existing welfare policy, it was said that we need to look at the housing crisis, the level of illiteracy, the rate of illegitimacy, and the incidence of alcoholism, poverty, and crime. Vast social dislocation in South Africa had resulted from government policies, e.g. influx control, resettlement, differential health, education, and welfare services. These are all reflections of the present society. One interviewee said:

"To answer the question, we may ask what the welfare system does to assist those in detention, the vigilante thing, violence, families who have members on death row, and the whole question of oppression" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

The view was often expressed that welfare could only make a meaningful contribution after a restructuring of society, and after a more equitable distribution of resources had been achieved. Unequal and discriminatory distribution of resources leaves some people deprived. (The question must however be asked whether there is any society in the world in which some members are not "deprived" in the sense that others have more than they do.)

These views have tremendous implications for social policy and planning in the future. They also indicate that participation and involvement of people in planning are crucially important.

### 6.3.3 Privatization of Social Welfare

The principle of privatization has also swept South Africa since the 1980s. Privatization of services, and particularly sections of the economy, has increased recently and has adopted a global dimension. The following statement by Fitzgerald (1989: 35) clearly reveals this trend:

"Privatization is a quiet revolution that is sweeping the world. More than 50 countries have engaged in some form of the process - - either selling off State enterprises, deregulating agricultural or industrial sectors, or contracting out government services - - at a speed and breadth of global transformation that has been almost breathtaking".
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The global nature of privatization and its acceleration during the 1980's seem to be an acknowledgement that the State has failed to secure a high standard of living for all. The growth of privatization seems to rest on its perceived promise of raising living standards by introducing competition, which will bring about efficiency, lower costs, and better service.

The privatization drive in South Africa gained particular momentum at the beginning of the 1980's. It first started in the government sector of the economy, and then attempts were made to extend it to essential services like health and welfare. The 1985 proposed welfare policy recommended that the government withdraw from welfare provision, which should in future rest on private initiative, where the individual, the family, the community, and voluntary welfare institutions assume primary responsibility for social welfare. In addition to these proposals, it was also suggested that a fee for welfare services should be introduced. Obviously, such policy proposals would have serious implications for the poor, and for the principles on which social welfare operates.

During the interviews, respondents were asked to state their views on such ideas. Three views emerged: total rejection, a need for more clarity on privatization, and conditional acceptance.

Privatization was rejected particularly on political grounds and because of the cost factor. Organizations were suspicious about the government's motives for privatization. They said privatization was being considered for ideological reasons, not so as to respond more appropriately to needs. It was said that the government wanted to abandon its responsibility of providing social welfare services to the people. Nevertheless, despite the talk about privatization, the control of welfare services remained firmly in government hands. The National Council for the Blind stated:

"Privatization provides a basis for State control with reduced State financial responsibility for the development of welfare services. This will severely impair the ability of private welfare organizations, already under extreme financial pressure, to continue their work".

The previous government, it was held, wanted to abandon its welfare responsibilities so as to have more money available for defence "in order to prop up the system".
Regarding the cost factor, it was argued that, in "areas where privatization has been most prevalent, such as in the medical services, we've seen the results in the escalation of costs". This happens despite the fact that those supporting privatization claim that it would lead to cheaper and more efficient service. The problem with privatization is that it allows the development of conglomerates and monopolies which are not accountable to the people who need the service. Respondents felt that privatization under conditions of extreme poverty and inequality does not make sense. Organizations who are supposed to render the service have reached their limits in terms of what they can do and what they can get from their communities. The State which has the resources and the infrastructure should therefore take on a bigger responsibility for welfare, not transfer it to the market. A respondent from a private welfare agency stated in this regard:

"We don't believe that welfare needs can be met through market mechanisms ... I mean, privatization is a policy extremely problematic, and free-market principles cannot be applied to welfare" (Community Organization in Cape Town).

It was argued further that privatization in practice would mean that a community will have to depend on its "own" members for contributions. Affluent communities will receive a better service, while those who have been left behind and neglected historically will have to help themselves, unless big companies contribute funds. This will only entrench poverty and inequalities in the South African society.

Some organizations were not clear what exactly privatization means in the context of social welfare. They expressed the need for more clarity on what the State understood by privatization of welfare services - - was a businesslike principle intended, or was the idea to cater for a certain income group? Would organizations get a grant from the State to render the service with no further interference? The view of the S.A. National Council of Child and Family Welfare Society in this regard was that:

"If the State is willing to allow the welfare organizations to deliver services on a contract basis, whilst paying them for the services, it will be welcomed. In contrast, if it means the abdication by the State of its financial reponsibilities, private welfare organizations cannot agree to be party to this move, as it would inevitably result in the total destruction of the entire welfare field".
Organizations which had conditionally accepted privatization said that voluntary initiatives had always been a feature of the South African society. However, the problem is that "the State is at present placing more responsibility for the financing of welfare services to meet basic human needs in the hands of the private sector. This will inevitably lead to private welfare organizations increasingly serving the wealthy segments of the community in order to retain maximum return, to the further detriment of the poor" (Oassa). It was stated by an action group:

"Privatization is advocated in a sweeping, ill-defined manner, without any of its implications being addressed. Privatization in the sense of services being funded largely by client fees, or of basic services being considered to be the responsibility of the private sector, can only lead to increasing inaccessibility of services to those in greatest need. An overwhelming proportion of actual and potential service recipients are economically disadvantaged, and the private welfare sector is already chronically overburdened" (Action Group on Social Services, Johannesburg).

A more positive, and yet a cautious view was expressed by a representative of a church organization:

"Privatization can be of benefit to the community, but then it must be the right people who are in charge. But if you get unscrupulous people who are out for a profit, than you could have a problem. So it depends on who is going to be in charge. It depends on the person's commitment to the community. Privatization can be a tremendously good thing, but it is also a very dangerous thing. If people are out to make a profit, then we are in trouble. But if people are really out to help the community, then it would be a fantastic thing. Because once you have competition, the standard will always improve. But you know why we have competition in the private sector? It is for more profit. Private organizations . . . these are the people who are looking for more profit. And so it is not worth working on that basis" (Representative of South Western Council of Churches, Oudtshoorn).

With regard to the suggested fee for welfare services as a part of the privatization initiative, respondents found it difficult to understand how it could be expected of people who are in need of welfare to pay. This is not only "highly impracticable", it is also in contradiction with the roots from which social welfare has emerged, i.e. charity. A respondent from the Black Sash said:

" . . . the people that come into our office (and we get a huge number everyday) . . . a lot of them have to walk from the township, because they don't even have the
bus fare. For us to charge them to have their needs attended to is saying: 'when you get there you are going to have to have a rand or fifty cents'. They will just turn around and walk back again".

If this is what a fee would entail, it is ethically wrong. The likely outcome of charging a fee could be that people will not approach welfare organizations for assistance. A respondent in Cape Town added to this view by saying:

"The services are going to be sophisticated, and they are going to be aimed at sophisticated audiences, and the people who need the services the most are going to be neglected" (Ravensmead Advice Office).

These views co-incide with that of the South African National Council for the Blind who stated:

"Privatization will inevitably mean more expensive services available to fewer people, at a time when escalating unemployment and rising costs are causing hardship for many South Africans".

Although some interviewees said that a fee for welfare should be voluntary, and that there might be two structures; one where people pay, and the other a free structure; this would not solve the problem. Where a fee is charged, welfare services will be organized in such a way that the agencies who charge a fee would be relying on such clientele who could pay. "And even though they say they'll turn nobody away, if your money comes from that . . . sector of the population who can pay, than everything will be geared towards them" (Respondent in Cape Town).

The philosophy that the family, the church, and charitable organizations should be involved in welfare provision was deemed acceptable. In fact, it was said that it was the traditional function of such institutions to look after the welfare of their members. To say that the individual, the family, or charitable organizations should be responsible for welfare, is to state the obvious. Furthermore, the principle allows for citizen participation and collaboration, which is essential for success. A respondent said in this respect:

"So that point of departure, I think, is scientifically for me understandable. The people, the family, and the community should be . . . I mean the basic people who determine what their needs are and how they should be addressed. If we take the question of housing, which is a basic need, who should determine what kind of house I need? Not somebody else. Well, of course the question of finance is also involved. But the fact of the matter is, the individual, the family, should be a
Although there are also other benefits in this principle, e.g. community involvement and less alienation, some respondents did not think it the correct approach under present conditions. It should be recognized that the functions of the family, the church, or charitable organizations have changed because of socio-economic changes in the broader society. It was however the emphatic view that these institutions should not and could not take over the role of the State with regard to social welfare. Although these institutions are involved in social welfare provision, the State has an over-all responsibility to all, irrespective of race or religion.

Respondents mentioned several reasons why this strategy would not be viable. The traditional functions, structure, and composition of the family have changed with industrialization and urbanization. It was said:

"In any post-colonial African country which is in the process of being urbanized, the traditional forms of social security provided by the family and the community wither away, and we believe that the State has a duty to assume the responsibility for compensating and protecting its citizens against the changed circumstances in which they find themselves and over which they have little or no control" (Lawyers for Human Rights, Pretoria).

Another respondent stated:

"The family, that used to be the nucleus of our communities, is at the present moment finding it difficult to cope" (Ravensmead Advice Office).

The problem is being exacerbated by the breaking up of the extended family and the high unemployment rate in the country.

Organizations argued that the traditional functions of the family cannot be formalized to replace government responsibility. A respondent from a Bloemfontein civic organization said:

"Voluntary organizations should be there, and will be there, but should adhere to their practice. They are involved on a voluntary basis, not because the government wants it to be so".
This view of social welfare disregards the changing nature of the family. Changing family structures and greater geographic mobility have had a fundamental impact on the role and capacity of the family and kinship group as social support systems. These institutions have a particular role to play pertaining to welfare, and so has the State. Voluntary organizations and institutions of the family can supplement government activities, and in practice they should work together, each fulfilling a particular role.

As another reason why privatization and fee-paying were not acceptable at this stage, it was said that "poverty is rife and ... development at such a low level in society that it is almost impossible to expect these structures to be responsible for social welfare". And:

"It is irresponsible of the government to expect families to provide welfare services when families are not enabled to do it" (Oassa).

Welfare organizations and churches cannot render the required services unless they have sufficient funds. This is a big problem at the moment. "A lot of them are suffering". Furthermore, it was said:

"So inevitably the State is working on a wrong premise if they are thinking that is the duty of society, particularly in a country like South Africa where there are such huge numbers of unemployed" (Black Sash Advice Office).

The Ravensmead Advice Office adds to this view by stating:

"Under present conditions this policy should be seen as a trap by the government to disregard its responsibilities. The fact that the government allows community organizations to use foreign funding should also be seen against this background. Welfare and community organizations should be careful to say to the State: 'Okay we can go on our own, and to do it on our own', because that's what they are waiting for".

It makes absolutely no sense to say to the poor that they should be responsible for their own welfare, and that they should provide for themselves. "It means again that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, and that the poor must basically spend for themselves and get on with their life, which is ridiculous" (Respondent in Cape Town).
The view was expressed very forcefully that this assumption (i.e., that the individual is primarily responsible for his/her welfare, and thereafter the family, and thereafter the community) should be turned around. The State should be primarily responsible not only for the over-all welfare of its citizens, but also for creating the social infrastructure that will enable individuals and families to take maximal responsibility, first for their own well-being, and then the well-being of their fellow citizens. The role of the church and welfare organizations in this regard should be to facilitate and enhance this process.

It is interesting to note that organizations have not rejected privatization completely. The problem seems to be with the time and the political motives behind it. In a democratic society with a legitimate government whose priority is to secure the welfare of the citizenry, views may also change on the concept of privatization.

6.3.4 Partnership in Welfare between the State and Voluntary Agencies

Partnership in welfare between the State and private welfare organizations has existed in South Africa even before the inception in 1937 of a separate State Department specifically charged with social welfare. (It was indeed the private sector which initiated social welfare in South Africa.) This partnership was accepted by virtually all respondents as an ideal way to provide welfare services. It was argued that "we should guard against stunting the initiative of people". However, some felt that it should be an equal partnership, with mutual consultation. At the time of the research survey, the partnership relationship was seen to be a problematic one. As a respondent in Johannesburg said:

"And I think, in the way that they're talking about partnership now, that's not partnership. They're trying to place the responsibility upon the welfare organizations, with State control".

It was emphasized that partnership can only really work where the government is considered to be legitimate. Referring to the government at the time, a respondent in Johannesburg stated:

"In the present, partnership is not possible, because we do not see the government acting in our interest".
It was emphasized further that partnership should not relieve the government of its over-all responsibility. It was felt that the role of the private sector should be a supplementary one, not a primary role. The State as an accountable institution needs to ensure that welfare is accessible to every citizen. However, while the State takes primary responsibility for social welfare, it should allow for strong grassroots participation and involvement. A respondent in Johannesburg said:

"Voluntary initiative means that people who are in touch with the community render the service, because private organizations are basically from the people".

Notwithstanding the problems respondents had with partnership at that time, in general it was seen as a good welfare philosophy which should be promoted in a post-apartheid South Africa. It should however be realized that voluntary agencies fulfil only a supportive role. It was said:

"In future the State should take primary responsibility for social welfare, but be supported by various agencies, and various institutions, individuals, and families in providing welfare facilities" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Within the context of partnership and privatization of social welfare, a significant perspective to bear in mind is the concept of welfare pluralism, or the "mixed economy of welfare" (Pinker: 1992). According to Pinker, this idea of welfare promotes the merit, desirability and importance of other sources of welfare - - in particular the private market, the family, and the voluntary sector. The problem may be whether people are able to compete on an equal basis with the State. If a subsidy is paid, it seems inevitable that ultimately the State will dominate the relationship.

6.3.5 Views on Grants and Pensions: a Supplementary Income or a Salary?

Different views were expressed on this issue. Some interviewees felt that pensions or grants should not be seen as a favour. They should be seen as a right, especially when they are the only sources of income. It was said that, in rural areas, a pension or a grant is very often the only stable income for the family. Under such circumstances, it was suggested that a pension should be seen as a salary, and should enable the recipient to live a decent life. There was broad support for this view. (This view is based on the assumption that all people would be contributing, directly or indirectly through taxation). However, some respondents felt that provision should be made during the economically active period for retirement and unemployment.
Other interviewees emphasized the needs of people and their standard of living as a starting point. The question arises: What are the needs of people, and what kind of living standard? These are relative issues, calling for careful study. It was also said that a distinction should be made between supplementing an income and providing a person with an income. Individuals who can provide for themselves, but have not made a direct contribution to a pension fund, should be provided with a supplementary income when reaching the age of retirement. However, the disabled were singled out for special attention. In this instance organizations agreed that pensions and grants are a right for those who cannot provide for themselves through the market or their own economic activities. The point was made very strongly that it is not fair to treat disabled persons as if they were able-bodied. The disabled should be treated differently when it comes to a "livable income". One respondent stated:

"I think again of people with mental handicaps. They have as much right as anyone else to have access to what community life can offer... have an income from a pension or a grant that is not limited..." (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Another respondent said:

"I think that people that can't actually make an income in an open market... should also be able to live a reasonable life" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Covering the amount that should be paid, the general view was that the household subsistence level, or the individual's circumstances, should serve as a guide in determining it. Interviewees said that people should get a "livable income", an income which should be "sufficient to ensure the respectability of the person" (Centre on Black Research, Durban). The dilemma with the present system is that it operates "between starvation and the breadline" (Ibid). It was said that, in providing an income to citizens, we should guard against disincentives. A means test should therefore be applied.

The problem here seems to be one of how to ensure that levels of benefit are sufficiently high for a reasonable standard of living, but not too high to discourage the poor from seeking work. Although most societies have accepted some degree of responsibility for the 'impotent poor' (the sick and the disabled, the elderly and children) the question of how to deal with the 'able-bodied'
poor has long been a matter of controversy.

6.3.6 Provision of Welfare and Economic Resources

The gap between needs and the resources available to meet them has almost invariably been at the heart of debates about social policy. In the study, respondents agreed that resources for welfare would always be a problem. It was said that there are services that governments in many countries would want to provide, but have not been able to provide, due to insufficient resources. However, "when we look at the South African situation, it is simply not true". In South Africa we also need to take into consideration social and political issues besides economic scarcity. Socio-economic obstacles, not so much limitations caused by the scarcity of economic or natural resources, have been standing in the way of eliminating inequality. Moreover, interviewees felt that insufficient resources should not be a reason to discriminate on racial grounds. The problem in South Africa, it was said, is not so much with resources. It is a matter of priorities, and the way in which resources are being allocated and distributed amongst the population. As one respondent said:

"I do not think that people who see how rich this country is, and who understand the wealth of this country, can easily buy that argument. I don't think so. The reason why there is economic scarcity for some of us, is because of the present policies" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Particular areas singled out for criticism were the then government's policy of duplication, and the defence budget. It was said that during the apartheid era too much money was spent on the military machine, State security, and propping up the apartheid structures. The trend in the last few years had been to spend less and less on social welfare and more and more on arms. In a post-apartheid society, priorities need to be restructured.

Another area for criticism was the racial basis on which resources were being allocated. The views of a respondent in this regard were:

"The resources in this country have, over the years, and are still to a lesser extent . . . aimed at the White community, and that's where most of the money goes" (Respondent in Cape Town).
It was recognized that the government's policy in terms of welfare provision was obviously aimed at those people who put them into power, and who will keep them in power if their needs are met. In a post-apartheid society, resources should be redirected to the areas of greater need.

Finally, the point was made that we should stop pointless recriminating arguments, but should rather get the principles clear. There are needs and realities which should be addressed, and resources should be distributed accordingly. Investment in the welfare of people works both ways; it helps the individual and it also builds a better society.

Compared to industrialized nations, South Africa may not be a rich country. On the other hand, it is not a poor country, and has enough material resources for all to be healthy and well-fed and housed.

6.4 VIEWS ON POST-APARtheid WELFARE POLICY

As reported in the first section of this Chapter, stakeholders have expressed very critical views on welfare policies in the apartheid era. In some instances, policies were totally rejected as being associated with the apartheid ideology. What now follows is an overview of visions and ideas on post-apartheid welfare policy. Organizations were asked to say what they saw as alternatives to welfare policies of the time and how these policies might be transformed to ensure that they address issues of poverty and inequality more appropriately, so as to make a contribution to reconstruction and development. Interviews focused on a variety of areas which are now analyzed under the themes covered during the interviews.

6.4.1 The Freedom Charter as a Basis for Welfare Policy

Since the recently designed Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) is based on the traditions of the Freedom Charter, it is interesting to know what people had to say about it. In 1955 the Congress of the People adopted the Freedom Charter as a description of the kind of society they would like to live in. Since then it has remained a guiding document and vision of a
future South Africa. The RDP attempts to realize the visions of the Freedom Charter by translating it into actual programmes of government.

During the time of the interviews, the Freedom Charter was being seen by many organizations as a document that could guide us to a post-apartheid South Africa. Organizations were therefore asked to state their views on this document or any other "charter" that could assist in transforming welfare policy. The Freedom Charter, it was held, provides us with a vision, a frame of reference, from which to start. Although the Freedom Charter does not refer to social welfare as such, it was seen as articulating the basic human needs that should be addressed. It could thus serve as a very important basis for designing and structuring social welfare. An interviewee said in this regard:

"So, yes, I think that the Freedom Charter is a very good vision of what one would want in terms of welfare and in terms of providing it. In fact the Freedom Charter . . . covers adequately most sort of welfare demands" (Idasa, Port Elizabeth).

It was said that the Charter is also inclusive in the sense that it refers to all the people; education for all, housing for all; which gives it "the potential of really creating a situation where people start realizing that they are not alone in South Africa. It has been thought for a long time that South Africa would go to the Whites. Blacks are in the homelands" (Respondent in Johannesburg). Interviewees acknowledged that the philosophy underlying the Freedom Charter had the potential to unlock the stalemate situation in South Africa. It could also serve as a guide to structure a system of social welfare, a system to rebuild a society on the basis of justice for all.

While approving the Freedom Charter's support of some basic human rights, certain organizations had reservations about the economic viability of the ideals as articulated in the Charter. It was said that, although the Freedom Charter contained a sound philosophy, it was an "old document" having been written in the 1950's. It might be necessary to revise it in the light of contemporary realities in South Africa. A contrary view in this respect was that, although it is an old document, it has universal value, since it articulates basic human needs and basic human rights. The document is primarily a statement of demands, of what people really need. The question would be how to translate it to reality so as to put it into practice.
6.4.2 Guiding Principles and Values for Post-Apartheid Welfare

A system of social welfare does not exist in a vacuum. It is based on the dominant values and principles of society. These in turn are shaped by both the economic structure and the political system. In practice social welfare is inextricably linked to other societal systems through which people meet their needs, such as housing, health, education, and employment opportunities, among others. Hence, it is acknowledged that social welfare should form an integral component of wider development programmes.

Granted that societal values develop over a period of time, respondents in this research were asked what the underlying values and principles of social welfare policy in South Africa should be. Developmental social welfare was emphasized by far the majority of respondents as a guiding principle for post-apartheid welfare. A respondent said:

"When the post-apartheid comes, welfare must give place for development"
(Representative of Nicro, Cape Town).

Themes which have emerged repeatedly were "development", "empowerment", "enabling", "prevention". It was stated by most organizations that social welfare as a system should operate within the broader framework of social development.

Within the development paradigm, two divergent value positions emerged, one collectivism and the other individualism. These perspectives juxtapose the view of individualism with "the people", or communalism. The significance of such value positions means that respondents either subscribe to the idea of a predominantly institutional welfare system, or the notion of a residual system where the State merely provides a safety net for a small minority. A respondent of a religious organization remarked:

"There is still this view that the human being is a human being because of other people... [for us] in the Black communities... this element of individualism is... to put it mildly, non-existent. [We] are always part of a community. [We] don't start from the individual. We start from being part of the community, and therefore it may also create a different kind of starting point insofar as understanding of the policy is concerned" (Belydende Kring, Johannesburg).
Within this context (communalism), nation-building was emphasized as a central underlying principle and philosophy for social welfare in South Africa. It was seen as a way of dealing with the consequences of apartheid and of uniting a divided nation. The objectives of nation-building are to give people hope and to create an environment where they will be happy to live. According to Aggrey Klaaste, Editor of the Sowetan, nation-building is for all South Africans, not for a certain sector. It is about development, education, and giving people a new vision. However, the point was made that we should not take nation-building for granted. We should consciously work for its implementation, and guard against the abuse of the concept by people with ulterior motives. A system of social welfare should build people, not dehumanize them. Universal values like humanity, self-respect, self-reliance, and responsibility for one another, were emphasized by all respondents. One respondent said:

"I think that underlying values and principles which people (should) attempt to build into a viable welfare system in any future society must . . . [promote] the acceptance of the idea that the problems that human beings have in modern society should not arise from deliberate policies of discrimination, whatever the base. . . . On the contrary, the policies should underline the common humanity of people, and the fact that the deficiencies that necessitate most of the different aspects of social welfare activity should be recognized as being common to all people. And consequently the mutual supportive nature of these functions should be a continuous thread" (New Unity Movement).

Some interviewees cautioned that welfare can be repressive and dehumanising. Azapo said for instance:

"At the end of the day you become . . . a more dehumanized person than what you are suppose to be".

The over-all objectives of social welfare should be to realize that it is about human beings. The dignity of the person should therefore be a crucial principle of social welfare. An interviewee said:

"The starting point should be that all people are equal. That is number one, that we will look for. And then number two is that each one, who is going to be equal, must have a say in his society or her society. Which means we are talking about true democracy" (Representative of Southern Cape Council of Churches).
Based on this principle, it was suggested that welfare should adopt a strong humanistic approach instead of responding technically to human needs. Social welfare is about human beings, and its services should therefore be provided with human compassion and dignity. Given this humanistic and people-centred approach, it should also provide for people's participation. People have the right to define their needs and to be involved in every aspect of their welfare.

Other principles that were emphasized were egalitarianism, democracy, and non-racialism. It was said that social welfare services should be provided on the basis of need and merit, not race. Welfare should provide assistance to people, and help them to become full human beings. People should have knowledge to live and to do things for themselves. Welfare should guard against alienating people from themselves. A respondent of the New Unity Movement stated:

"First of all . . . whatever welfare is undertaken [must be] in a society which has rid itself of discrimination based on race, colour, sex, and what have you. It should have a basic underlying philosophy of not merely providing for people in the way which we've described, but providing a kind of bulwark against a reversion to attitudes that the needs of people, and consequently their social welfare facilities, depend upon their colour and race, and so on".

It was said that social welfare policy is "about human beings". It should therefore not only correct injustices of the past, it should at the same time lay the foundations of an egalitarian society. The Durban Indian Child and Family Welfare Society believes a good welfare policy should have as its essential elements a capacity to advocate social justice. It should respect individual worth and dignity, reflect social reality, and promote a vision of a better future. Other respondents agreed that social welfare should be based on justice, and "justice . . . means that people should be able to live in that society in such a way that they are able to meet their own needs as individuals or as families" (Respondent in Johannesburg). Within this context it was said that "there would be a need for concentration on the needs of the people who have not had access to resources and education" (Respondent in Cape Town). It should be a right of all human beings to enjoy equality of access to all society's resources. Social welfare must address certain minimum requirements and provide all South Africans with a basic standard of living.

Another underlying principle emphasized very strongly was human resource development, which entails the promotion and stimulation of inherent human capabilities. Welfare should guard against
encouraging dependence, both of the able-bodied and of the disabled. In this regard an interviewee said:

"We must look at the old question of education and training for the handicapped, so we do not invest resources in people who . . . say they are handicapped. Just because they are crippled, they do not have to sit and wait for a grant at the end of the month. We must revolutionize welfare. Handicapped people must . . . understand that they are not sick; this must be inculcated in education. There must be special education to address the special needs of handicapped people" (Representative of the SACC).

The respondent of the SACC continued by saying:

"But I would not see the new order just giving grants to people sitting at home because they are blind. I see the new order exploring the potentials and the abilities of the handicapped and disabled people, so that we do not end up building institutions, when people should have been integrated into the community. Sometimes this is how resources are wasted - - all sorts of resources - - and when I look at them sometimes you can see that these people have not been integrated into the community".

To determine a value base for social welfare in South Africa will not be easy. Difficulties may arise due to conflicting values hidden in a heterogeneous society with an apartheid history. There was however agreement among respondents that welfare policy should change and that there is a crucial need for an over-all policy that addresses the needs and concerns of all people. Furthermore, it was said that future welfare policy should be based on the concrete conditions and realities of South Africa. "We cannot build welfare policy on ideologies and ideas that sits [sic] up in the air" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

6.4.3 The Goals of Post-Apartheid Welfare Policy

Respondents seemed to realize that it would be an illusion to think that a post-apartheid society will automatically solve all problems. They thought that unrealistic expectations could be a major problem. One respondent stated in this regard:

"I just want to say right at the very beginning that I'm a little bit cynical about the enormous amount of talk that is going on about the post-apartheid society. I think
that it is a bit of a theatrical [sic] in which people are indulging at the present moment. It arises from the fact that we are saddled with such a multiplicity of problems here that most people think that problems are just going to melt away in the post-apartheid society. And as a result of that they indulge in quite a great deal of Alice in Wonderland type of thinking in different arenas" (New Unity Movement).

It has also been indicated that the introduction of post-apartheid welfare policy will take place incrementally. Respondents realized that the formulation of post-apartheid welfare policy will take time and effort. The first, and most important phase, should be to address the "backlogs" among the majority of citizens. Those who have been "left behind" should be assisted to develop to a certain level of existence so that they might meaningfully participate in the changing society. The dismantling of apartheid will be a long-term process. During this process, it would be useful to look at models in countries which have gone through similar phases of transformation, and to undertake comparative studies of welfare policy.

Respondents said that the transformation of social welfare should not be seen in isolation from other processes in society, neither should social welfare be seen as a separate system meeting needs. With regard to transformation a respondent said:

"I think it's integral to restructuring of society, so that you can't see social welfare meeting needs as something separate ... I think integral to your welfare policy must be a dimension which is integrated into the restructuring of your society" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

So, while services are being rendered, organizations need to develop new approaches and visions. It was suggested that restructuring of society should be a continuous process and an item which remains on the agendas of organizations. An interviewee stated in this regard:

"I think that people who work in these areas, where they are concerned with these back-up activities in society, working very closely with a host of economic factors which are encountered in these fields ... I think the welfare functions can have the important additional function in pointing out directions in which political and economic policies have to be amended, developed, pursued, in order to maximize the benefits of legitimate social welfare policies. Otherwise the back-up work that is normally the scope of social welfare activities is vitiated by the destructive effect that misdirected economic and political policies are likely to have" (New Unity Movement).
Organizations were explicitly asked to say what should be the goals of social welfare in a post-apartheid society. Different views were expressed in this regard. According to the South African National Council for Child and Family Welfare, it is essential to have clarity on the mission of welfare services for future planning purposes. Consequently the Council gave the following as a mission for social welfare:

"to improve the quality of life, and to protect the interests and promote the welfare of all citizens in South Africa".

The Council stated further that it is essential to value and develop human potential to its maximum and to view the family as the basic cornerstone of society. Similar ideas were raised by various other organizations. An idea that stood out very clearly was that social welfare should function as a system that redistributes resources in order to address issues of poverty and inequalities. Others had doubts whether social welfare could address inequalities on its own. This needs to be done from the side of the economy. Should welfare be used to bring about equality, then the work incentive may become a problem. We first need economic development, and a minimum level of income at that level, before welfare can make a meaningful contribution. In this regard it was suggested that social welfare secure a basic minimum standard of living below which no one should fall. Interviewees of the Black Sash Advice Office saw social welfare as "a sort of safety network for people not only . . . in order for them to survive, but also to enable them to work their way back to being an efficient working, productive member of society". The Office continued by saying:

"It should aim at nobody being hungry, or homeless, or in poverty to the point of being a drain on society. But those people are inevitably going to be there. So there should be some way of maintaining them in society so that they can lead some sort of a good life" (Ibid).

The purpose of this type of welfare provision is to ensure that people do not drop below a certain minimum living standard due to personal misfortune. Social welfare services ought to be universally accessible and available to everybody irrespective of race, colour, or religion. In this respect it was said that welfare services should be provided in such a way that the "ordinary grassroots person" has contact and access to such services on a regular basis. This view of welfare corresponds very much with the institutional model which is embodied in the idea of a Welfare
Another view of welfare was that it should only be provided to the poor and those in need, not to everybody. The purpose of welfare is to take care of those people who are physically or mentally disabled or unable to care for themselves, not the able-bodied. Even for the disabled, provision should be made to be productive and to make a contribution. It was argued that the goals of social welfare should be to cater for those people who are definitely in need. A respondent in Ravensmead remarked:

"There has to be a cut-off point. I mean, it is useless for somebody that is rich and that has all the money, constantly needing assistance".

This view corresponds with the residual model, which holds that social welfare should only assist those who "fall through". The system thus serves a residual function, which "picks up" the casualties of the economic system and tries to prevent starvation. Here, welfare serves a temporary function by assisting those who are unemployed and who have no income. It serves as a bottom line, not a minimum standard. Social welfare should assist people to find their way again, and to become self-sufficient.

Other respondents felt that we need a definition of welfare which goes beyond the minimum, i.e. a welfare system that not only provides resources, but which addresses the structural causes of deprivation and improves the quality of life for people. In this regard, representatives of the Cape Action League said:

"The obvious answer would be to say that social welfare should work itself out of a job".

Few and fewer people should need social welfare provision in an abstract sense. Although there will always be some people who need assistance in society, "the aim, the goal, the view should be to reduce it" (Cape Action League). It was repeatedly said that welfare is only successful when it "works itself out of the job". In terms of this view, social welfare is regarded as a back-up system for fundamental economic, political, and social policies. The dilemma with social welfare is that it does not look at the structural causes of poverty and inequality. "Those things are left
as if everything is fine. You don't need to look there. Just pay attention to the problems you are faced with" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Based on this structural approach, there was a strong view that social welfare can only serve a useful purpose if it is based on a just and equitable socio-economic and political system. One respondent remarked that a social welfare system which is rooted on an unjust system "is merely wall-papering the problem. But in the march of time, when the paper gets worn out, the cracks will still remain. So it is an ideal situation where you got to go deep down and investigate all possible cracks in order to deal with it effectively" (Azapo). It is only after we have removed these basic injustices that we can develop "a social welfare type of thing which is there to take care of some casualties" (Ibid).

A view that was expressed by far the majority of interviewees was that social welfare will really have to move away from its short-term orientation of responding to crises and dealing with casualties. The purpose of social welfare should not be to promote charity. Instead, it should promote development, and empower people. A new welfare system therefore should be aimed at building the community, building the family, and enhancing the family's ability to provide for its members (Wilgerspruit Fellowship Centre, Johannesburg). The Fellowship Centre made the point that social welfare should be integrated with education and the development of life skills and knowledge. The developmental goals of social welfare in society should include the following:

(a) To develop the individual's potential

(b) To make the individual self-sufficient

(c) To develop skills and employment capabilities of the individual

(d) To address the root causes of social problems

(e) To prevent instability in society by focusing on the family, communities, and the larger society simultaneously
(f) To secure a stable family life.

Within the developmental paradigm, the view was expressed that welfare programmes should get their inspiration from "grassroots", and should also address issues like violence, drugs and alcohol abuse. In this regard, social workers have a particular role to lead this process by "setting the standards and maintaining the norms of the society".

The developmental functions of social welfare were defined as empowering people, and to educate them concerning their rights as citizens. People should be taught that they are entitled to certain rights. Furthermore, developmental social welfare must provide consultation and advice on the utilization of welfare services, and enable citizens to plan and organize their own lives. People should be helped to help themselves. This would "mean a lot of education, a lot of training, a lot of involving people in their own programmes" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

It was felt by some respondents that, in our approach to welfare, we need to bear in mind that the South African society consists of a "First World and a Third World component", and that these realities should be taken into account in our policy and planning. These realities may require different approaches. The First World approach tends to focus on individual problems and how to integrate the individual into the normal processes of society. Within the Third World context, needs are spread over the broader community, which requires wide-scale intervention and development (Respondent in Cape Town). It may therefore be necessary to distinguish between providing services and "building people". In building the nation, we do not necessarily exclude services, but the emphasis is different. Tension may arise between those who assume that the purpose of social welfare is to assist the poor and the disabled, and those who conceive the aim of social welfare to be an instrument for development. Compromise could lie in recognizing that intensive welfare programmes may very well have developmental as well as redistributive functions.
6.4.4 Who should make Welfare Policy?

When it comes to the policy-making process, various stages and components may be identified, as well as influences acting upon it. Three basic questions are relevant here: Who makes policy? How is policy made? Where is policy made? Various institutions and stakeholders are involved in the shaping and documentation of public policy. Sometimes a distinction is made between policy formation in the State system and policy formation in civil society. Gramsci distinguishes two specific realms within the State, that of civil society - commonly called private - and that of political society, i.e. the State apparatuses of administration, law, services, etc. (Bennet et al: 1981). This distinction is not static; merely methodological in the sense that it represents a balance between the civil society and the political society. The State cannot simply be identified with the realm of government; it consists of civil society and political society. The State therefore represents the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent of those over whom it rules" (Ibid: 216).

Policy-making is very much a political process, with an interplay between the centre and civil society. Within this context, politicians and external agencies often play a decisive role, while the role of civil society is often a subordinate one. It is necessary to know from where the process has emanated and how it was institutionalized. This could indicate whose interests are being served.

Although it is generally accepted that in a democratic society the State system is primarily responsible for policy-making, I wanted to know from respondents who they think should make welfare policy in a post-apartheid South Africa. Because of negative experiences of the past with an authoritarian State, respondents were sceptical about the role of the State. Although it was realized that ultimately the final decision is taken and legislated by the government of the day, respondents thought that it should be a joint responsibility between the State system and civil society. Welfare policy, they held, should be made through a democratic process of consultation with the various stakeholders in this field. Policy-making takes place in a political milieu, and in a democracy it requires a dialogical relationship between the State and organizations of civil society.
Unless a sound infrastructure exists, this could be a cumbersome process which constrains the government. In a democracy, the authority and the mandate to rule is given to a representative group of people that embody the government. Most governments operate on the principle that all sovereign authority emanates from the nation as a whole, which gives them the mandate to rule in its name, and that the central government is the only executor of that authority. That is why a respondent in Durban said that the democratically elected representatives of the people should make welfare policy (Centre on Black Research). As the representatives of the people are not specialists in all areas of welfare policy, they need to be guided by specialists and people active in the field of social welfare (Ibid). Other respondents agreed that policy-making actually is a government function, but that it should make provision for citizens' participation. There should be democratic consultation between the State, experts in the field, and beneficiaries of the system. The Durban Indian Child and Family Welfare society stated in this regard:

"The process of shaping an alternative welfare order must involve the principle of participatory democracy, i.e. consultations and decision-making with the people at the ground level and with the democratic organizations within the various sectors of community life which articulate needs and aspirations".

It is necessary that policy initiatives are taken to the people for input and shaping. In this regard it was said that community and church organizations should play an important role in forming the moral and ethical bases of social welfare provision. It was also felt that social workers can make a particular contribution from the service rendering point of view. However, it should be pointed out that social work in South Africa has a leadership problem in the sense that we don't have well-equipped and skilled personnel to guide policy-making processes. People in other fields take the lead in social welfare. The question is: How can we develop the needed leadership? This is where the training of social workers and the role of training institutions become crucial issues. Other respondents were not so sure about the role of social workers. They cautioned that social workers and government officials should implement policy, not make it. Some interviewees felt that we should also consult the recipients of welfare services. They should indicate how they experience the services, and how they should be changed.

Respondents had different views on how citizen participation could take place in policy-making. By far the majority said participation should take place through community structures. However,
others said that policy-makers should consult the tax-payers to hear from them how their taxes should be spent. A strong argument was that "workers who bear the brunt of the economy should play a major role". Workers are the key to determining welfare policy. A respondent in Johannesburg said:

"And they're the ones who can be helpful in terms of determining the wages, the pension schemes . . . They are able to participate in those kinds of areas".

The skills that community organizations and trade unions have acquired during the struggle against apartheid should be applied to improve the welfare of the population.

In terms of the institutions which should channel the policy process, two views were expressed. One was that the Welfare Department in the State system should be responsible. The other was that we need a Non-governmental Organization - - a representative Non-governmental body which determines welfare policy, to be presented to Parliament (National Council of Women). A major role is also foreseen for tertiary institutions and academics to "act as a clearing house for policy-makers".

The views expressed here are congruent with general trends in policy formation. In the field of social policy, different interest groups contribute to the development of welfare policy, inter alia politicians, Ministers, civil servants, professional groups, voluntary organizations, and consumers. There is always the question how far social policies result from pressure from below as opposed to originating within the ranks of government. The question is also whether policies emerge as compromises, out of a process of conflict between different interests groups, or whether they develop on a consensual basis of rational planning at the executive level. It is apparent from these responses that social policy was seen optimally to be the product of wide consultation, debate, and reflection on what is needed - - a process of consultation and joint policy formation.

6.4.5 How to Deal with the Legacies of the Past: the Role of Social Welfare

Organizations were asked to say how they thought legacies of the past should be addressed, and what the role was that social welfare could play. Despite the fact that in some circles there was
talk about corrective actions to address injustices of the past, respondents seemed to realize that post-apartheid society could not immediately solve problems in all areas. It was said: We will not have apartheid structures any more, nor discriminatory legislation, but we will be faced with large scale inequality and "backlogs". First of all, we will have to do away with present systems of oppression. This is going to be a long process as we have to redress inherited injustices as well as meet new challenges. While we are dealing with legacies of the past, we cannot allow new problems to arise. Society would need time to establish itself on a fundamentally different ethos. Furthermore, correcting injustices of the past is going to be difficult. We should therefore focus rather on the challenges we are facing now, and how to deal with them in the future. We should not create too many expectations. It may be more useful to concentrate on current injustices and inequalities, and rectify these.

A two-pronged approach was envisaged to address legacies of the past: basic needs satisfaction, and human resource development. Addressing the basic needs of people was seen as an immediate challenge. Furthermore, it was said that self-help projects and co-operatives should be introduced to provide some measure of alleviation in the short term. The particular role of social welfare should be to assist with the redistribution of resources.

The long-term solution to poverty and inequality was seen to be development in its broad sense. Within the development context, economic growth was seen as a crucial factor in generating resources. These views co-incide with what Terreblanche had to say in 1988:

"From the point of view of the Political Economist there are only two methods towards the economic empowerment of Blacks: Economic Growth and Redistribution (mainly through the supply of appropriate welfare services). It is important to recognize that 'wealth generation' and 'wealth distribution' are - - especially from a longer term point of view - - closely interdependent" (1988: 11).

Terreblanche emphasized that strategies of growth and redistribution should be pursued simultaneously.

In addition to economic growth and redistribution, respondents said a wide variety of educational activities to empower people would be required. These should include a massive national literacy
campaign, basic education, recurrent education, lifelong education, adult education, and community education. Education was seen as a central mechanism to address inequalities and to develop human capabilities.

6.4.6 Human Needs and Welfare: Appropriate Political and Economic Policies

As social welfare operates within a given economic and political system, respondents were asked to say what kind of socio-economic and political system they thought would be appropriate to address issues of poverty and inequalities in South Africa. To develop an appropriate socio-political and economic system, it was held, there should be a careful historical analysis of systems amongst our neighbours and other nations of the world. A recurrent theme here was the importance of the human being, a society based on an egalitarian ethos, the basic needs of people, and a participatory democracy. Interviewees said that whatever system is introduced, should be determined by "the people" through debate and discussion. In this respect we need an economic and political system that works and which does not exploit people.

Regarding basic needs, interviewees said that the broader structure of society should make provision for the basic needs of people without discrimination. An interviewee in Johannesburg said:

"I think that there must be a living wage. We're talking about housing, about education, about health, about all those kinds of things. And that perhaps the treatment aspect of social welfare policies is to step in where gaps have emerged . . . But I think that is at the end of the process. The first process is that the society must be structured to respond to basic needs and that the first priority of welfare is to link in with that to enable people, like I said, to respond to others".

A particularly important role is envisaged for social welfare immediately after apartheid is abolished and post-apartheid government is instituted. It was said that we will definitely require a taxation system to provide people with social security as well as a system of social reconstruction. With reference to the structuring of society to meet basic needs, a representative of the South African Council of Churches said:

"When I am saying, they are essential. I am saying . . . if it is humanly possible, the
State [should] make provision that no member of its society goes to bed without food, no member of its society struggles for shelter, no member of its society remains illiterate. So, those are very fundamental things".

In addition to basic human needs, humanity and egalitarianism were emphasized very strongly. It was said that the individual should take the central position in restructuring society. The following statement captures the feelings in this regard:

"For many, any system that is going to put the person in the centre will be an ideal system to have in South Africa. So whether there are no socialists or... you can just put the person in the centre, and that would be the ideal system to use. That is why we are against a hear-say commitment, because the person is not in the centre, but the State is in the centre" (Representative of the Southern Cape Council of Churches, Oudtshoorn).

With regard to particular economic and political views, respondents pointed out that it is difficult to say what kind of system would be appropriate. We should look at examples where countries have tried to develop contextual systems. We will have to do the same, taking into account our own challenges and issues. Organizations realized that the context and the realities faced should determine the socio-economic and political system. Concerning what kind of economic and political system will produce the necessary growth and redistribution, the views of Terreblanche are relevant. He said:

"Experience proved that Capitalism or a market-oriented system has a better growth record than Socialism. And as far as redistribution is concerned, it is of decisive importance to have a representative type of democracy. Depending on the level of development, an adapted system of Democratic Capitalism can be recommended" (1988: 13).

Some sort of balance between socialism and capitalism, with a strong social democratic base like the Scandinavian countries, seems to be an appropriate solution.

Broadly speaking, two main views emerged: a socialist view and social democratic view. Interviewees said we need to look at the way wealth is generated and distributed in the country. In this regard a socialist system, with the nationalization of big business, may be necessary. One respondent said:
"I think they can move to a system where they can share some of the wealth of our country. So, obviously, I mean nationalization is not excluded if you have to create a State where people have to live, given the kind of effects of apartheid capitalism, where there is a lot of unemployment, and unemployed people. I think it's fair that you have to get everybody to work" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

The Cape Action League stated clearly that it is committed to a socialist South Africa. For the League post-apartheid South Africa is a socialist society - - a society based on socialist principles. In this regard "workers' control of the means of production", and "workers' democracy" are fundamental issues. According to this view every individual in society should get what he/she needs. Within the socialist paradigm, welfare should be an integral component of restructuring society and meeting human needs. With regard to the institutional function of social welfare, the Cape Action League said:

"We would wish to structure the economy and other relevant aspects of society in such a way that we could reduce the provision of welfare to the bare minimum".

However, it was realized that it will take a long time before we have a country and a society sufficiently developed to realize that goal. Meanwhile a system of social welfare would be required as a "band aid" mechanism.

Respondents with a socialist philosophy admitted that a transition from capitalism to socialism was unlikely in the near future. The view of the representative of the Wilgerspruit Fellowship Centre is significant:

"Ideally a socialist system [would be preferred], but we are in a capitalist world, and we do not operate in isolation. It will be very difficult to transform the present capitalist system".

It was said that the capitalist base will be required for production and motivation. What may be required in South Africa is a mixed economy if the experiences of many other developing countries are taken into account. It was felt however that there should be "a gradual development in the direction of a socialist system" (Respondent in Durban). Another respondent said:

"I see it as a long-term goal, and I see the phase of transition as really being a part of the process of building a national democracy" (Representative in
Interviewees within the socialist paradigm emphasized that in the long term we need to rid ourselves of capitalism. Respondents further away from the socialist paradigm, said it would be difficult to decide on one or other system. They agreed that it should be a mixed economy which allows for welfare services and private initiative. They emphasized "whatever model is adopted, it should emerge from debate and thorough discussion". In this regard we should also look at models in other countries. However, the economic system should not be seen in isolation from the prevailing political system.

The views of Sampie Terreblanche are explicit and clear in this regard. He says the future economy should have the following characteristics:

(a) A market-oriented economy

(b) A labour intensive-economy based on appropriate technology

(c) An economy with a well-developed and well-organized welfare system (including a well-developed educational system)

(d) An economy with a necessarily large (but not too large) bureaucracy with a fair degree of efficiency

(e) A full internationally integrated economy and at least part of a Southern African Economic Confederation

(f) A fairly stable, prosperous, and unitary system of Democratic Capitalism, structured to fit the situation in South Africa that in all probability will still be described as unique (Wattrus 1988: 130).

The views of Bobby Godsell are significant. He believes a desired economic future should focus on three basic ideas; growth, equity, and participation (Ibid). The growth imperative is obvious because of poverty and the critical need for development in areas such as housing, schooling, and
health care. Godsell says:

"Apartheid has been an economy of growth and very significantly has made economic progress a divisive instead of a uniting objective for our people".

He continues by saying:

"Besides this it has forced a mal-use of economic resources and has bedeviled South Africa's economic relations with world markets" (Ibid).

With regard to equity, Godsell pointed out that two types of economic equality can be distinguished - - equality of opportunity and equality of entitlement. He said that economic policies that address opportunity, but ignore entitlement, are doomed to failure. A third imperative should be that of creating a participative economic culture. With the rise of mass unionism in South Africa, the existing pattern of hierarchical and authoritarian control is being challenged and people are being empowered both collectively and individually. "Workplace democracy" seems to be a vital issue for a future economic system (Ibid).

With regard to the political system, respondents said that we need a political system that puts a lot of power in the hands of people - - a kind of a "people's democracy". They adopted a strong integrated economic and political perspective. One such respondent in Johannesburg said:

"You need to have a situation, political and economic, which addresses both the political and economic effects of apartheid. And therefore I speak in the direction of... a situation where... we have raised a lot of capitalists in South Africa... who are making it. There is going to be also a very heavy struggle to... regulate or share all the resources of the country together. It's going to be... a difficult task. But what I'm looking forward to is a situation where, politically, people have the right to make their own mistakes, choose the wrong people democratically. Everybody has that right. Secondly, a society which also caters for the welfare of everybody. This is my view, that's what I feel about democratic socialism. I see it as a possibility. It originates from Japan" (Belydende Kring).

Restructuring the society will not mean that things happen automatically, and that welfare problems will be no more. A representative of a political organization said in this regard:

"I mean that is reductionist, it's deterministic, and it actually doesn't take into
account the reality of the human being, and how they're [sic] functioning in society" (Johannesburg).

Respondents realized that it is virtually impossible to structure society in such a way that social welfare will not be required. The kind of society envisioned by many interviewees is captured in the following statement:

"I do not think we are looking for a new society where, again, we talk of racial privileges. I do not think we are talking about a new order which is planning to uproot people. I do not think we are talking about a new order which is planning to separate families. I do not think we are talking about a new order which is sitting designing grand manifestos to detain children. I do not think we are talking about a new order which will . . . [be] going and shooting people when they are making a point, either striking as workers or whatever. We are talking about a completely different order . . . I think what we want is a society which will recognize every person as an African, as an African citizen who has a contribution to make . . . I hope all these things are embodied in the aspirations of the people" (Representative of the South African Council of Churches).

As organizations and individuals embrace different political opinions and ideologies, it is going to be difficult to arrive at a common position on the political and economic system. What seems to be required is an eclectic approach, where we take from all sides and create a unique South African system.

6.4.7 The Responsibility of the State with regard to Housing, Health, and Education

Representatives expressed somewhat different views on the issue of a Welfare State for South Africa. Nonetheless, there was consensus that the State should provide some basic services to all citizens. By far the majority of organizations regarded education, housing, and health services as a right, not a privilege. One respondent said:

"I think they are basic rights, human rights . . . So for me a society which has not honoured the basic human rights of individuals . . . even its policy won't be meaningful in terms of addressing the needs of people" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Respondents had different views on how these services (which they regard as rights) should be provided. Some said that individuals should be enabled to provide them for themselves, while
others said that it was the responsibility of the State. Another view was that there might be a need for welfare State provisions at the beginning, but the matter should not rest there. We should include in this policy a system of developing people and empowering them to become self-reliant. If these principles are not included in a new welfare system, tremendous problems could be created for the country. As one respondent said:

"I would feel anxious about what would happen to the people in the long term. So certainly, I would be for a Welfare State, if Welfare State meant that the State would take responsibility for developing and empowering people rather than . . . simply giving hand-outs on a continuous basis. And I don't know whether that is incorporated in the concept of the word. If not, certainly for me it could be a very important aspect" (Respondent in Cape Town).

On the whole organizations gave qualified support to the idea of a Welfare State. However, it was said that we should be aware of the dilemma of dependence, the dangers of alienation, bureaucratic power, and the lack of motivation that could flow from it. It was pointed out that if the State provides everything, it demotivates people to do things for themselves. Also, if you just give these things to people, they seem to have less value.

If the role of the State in the provision of services is emphasized, this does not imply that the State should do everything. Rather the State should work in partnership with the private sector, and ensure that the necessary services are provided. The ultimate responsibility will however lie with the government to play an enabling role. Furthermore, it was said that the provision of housing, education, and health services should take place in conjunction with macro-economic planning. An interviewee in Johannesburg said:

"So I'm not saying that you only have State services. And I think we're talking of a welfare State of a very different variety, certainly not of the European variety".

6.4.8 Restructuring Social Welfare: A Centralized or a Decentralized System

Respondents were of the opinion that a dual approach should be followed in this regard. Welfare policy would need to be planned and co-ordinated at the central level to ensure that the same policy and standards apply across the board. On the other hand, the implementation and
determination of needs should take place at the local level. If policies are centrally planned and organized, they should be streamlined to guard against over-bureaucratization and so that regional needs are not neglected. Power should be devolved along regional lines, thereby accommodating diversity by allowing a greater variety of political, economic, and welfare policies to function simultaneously. Respondents were of the opinion that there were many advantages in decentralized services. They would make welfare more accessible to the people and allow for citizen's participation in needs assessment and project implementation. The central government should be virtually invisible at the local level. It should only create the space for the local people to do things for themselves. The local community should have control over their own operations.

Despite this rational approach to welfare planning, some interviewees have warned that we are an extremely unequal society, as well as a racially divided society, which is geographically structured. It might therefore be necessary to have fairly strong centralized powers to deal with the legacies of the past and to overcome regional disparities. A contrary view in this regard is that we may need a local focus, precisely so that regional imbalances might be addressed. Thus, although the need for central control is recognized, it was said:

"But simultaneously one has got to recognize the fact that regional and local differences are there. That you can't sweep either the differences, or the effect of these differences, under the carpet by having a single set of policies applicable to all communities. So . . . within a process of centralization, there also has to be an effective decentralized policy that brings us nearer to realities of solutions that are needed in any community" (New Unity Movement).

6.4.9 The Role of Employers in Social Welfare

A particular welfare role is envisaged for employers. Welfare, some respondents said, should start at the workplace, because work and income secure the welfare of people. A definite role for employers was seen in job creation and social responsibility. A respondent in Johannesburg said:

"But certainly, I mean that employers is [sic] contributing to over-all economic development, job creation, and their involvement in financing of services will obviously almost desire towards pushing up production [sic]".
Despite the welfare role foreseen for employers, various obstacles were pointed out. The following statements capture some of the doubts:

"The question is how serious are employers about making a further contribution, besides the job?"

"Employers want privatization to push up their profits"

"Employers would to a large extent act in their own interests"

"They are more keen to contribute to one or other fund and then qualify for a tax deduction".

Respondents felt that the problem lay in the capitalist nature of the economy. It was said that business basically operates on capitalist principles, not social welfare principles. Employers have a narrow view of their welfare responsibility. Many of them believe their responsibility to be limited to their own workers. They see welfare from the work perspective. Whether employers would be willing to accept greater social welfare responsibility, is uncertain. Interviewees recognized that employers are in business, not welfare, nor service provision. Therefore, their contribution will differ from that of the government.

However, it was felt that employers should be challenged about their responsibilities for welfare. Their thinking should be re-orientated. A respondent in Johannesburg said that "it is disturbing to know that some employers don't care whether their workers live in a house, or that their children are at school. Their attitude is that the worker must be at work, no matter where he/she slept the previous night" (Respondent in Johannesburg). Employers, respondents felt, should redefine their social responsibility and play a more direct role in national reconstruction. A respondent referred to this new role by saying:

"I tend to think that a different kind of society may also create a different attitude on the part of the employers, in so far as being responsible for ... welfare policy. ... For instance, I see ... employers in a situation where they see that it's the right of each and every person to own a house. Also ... enabling their own workers to be able to get a house, paying them a better amount of money, or providing
sources enabling them to get loans, or whatever, so that they must be able to acquire houses. I see for instance that employers, if they are concerned for the welfare of their own workers, they would see to it that the children of their workers are also going to school. So my point is it depends on how they understand their workers" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

The idea was also raised whether we should not move away from the workers-employers dichotomy. It was said that the current frame of reference creates a problem in the sense that workers and employers stand opposed to one another.

"So I'm thinking about . . . a different kind of framework where workers are also part of the economic system and participate on both sides of the system. Not only in terms of consumption, but also in terms of production and also participation around the production. At this point in time we are caught up where workers are mainly consumers, amid owners" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

6.4.10 The Role of Workers and Trade Unions in Social Welfare

Since work and welfare are closely connected, it was argued that welfare should be a central issue for trade unions. The workers who produce the wealth should determine how it should be redistributed and spent. "Production should be for the welfare of the people" (Cradora). The Advice Office Forum (Cape Town) said that trade unions are the guardians of the people's welfare. It is therefore imperative that they should play a role in improving the welfare of their members, which extends beyond the workplace. Some respondents argued that workers should take control of the workplace. They should analyze the situation within the work setting and see how they can determine the direction of the company. It is apparent from these responses that a conflictual relationship with employers is proposed. It was argued that trade unions should apply their "bargaining power that they have acquired during the fight against apartheid to exert pressure on companies and the government. They should apply their bargaining power in a post-apartheid society to improve the welfare of their members" (Nactu, Western Cape).

The view of Nactu (Western Cape) was that the fight against exploitation and oppression should continue. Its spokesmen contended that, during the apartheid era, trade unions fought over a broad spectrum. In post-apartheid society, it will be a different fight. Although the focus and the direction of the fight will be determined by the workers, democratization of the workplace is
going to be an issue for the future. Notwithstanding the socialist view of "workers' democracy" and "workers' control", Nactu (national) cautioned that trade unions should be realistic in their expectations as to what they could do. The question was posed what the Labour Party Government achieved with a "trade union government" in Britain. It was also not clear what is to be understood by "workers' control of factories". Although trade unions have achieved some bargaining power, the question is: What kind of knowledge do trade unions have, and in which areas can they make a contribution? It was argued that, in their endeavours to improve standards of living, trade unionists must see that the community as a whole benefits. Workers should therefore equip themselves to be skilful negotiators.

Where their members are concerned, trade unions were seen by respondents to have a variety of functions. It was said that they should develop and empower members through literacy programmes, workers' education, continuous education, and recurrent education. Unions should also introduce welfare programmes. Bread-and-butter issues pertaining to workers, like crèches, maternity leave, T.B. screening, and amenities at the workplace were mentioned. One very important function for trade unions was to defend the "purchasing power" of workers in different fields of employment. Unions were seen as guardians and monitors in respect of wages and salaries paid to their members. They should also monitor the social experience of their members. They could even explore the possibility of setting up their own factories or co-operatives.

It was granted that the welfare functions of unions were principally restricted to their members and to activities in the workplace. This meant they could not directly influence policy or needs outside of that context. Nevertheless, unions were not without potential influence on welfare policy in society. They could contribute to determining the real needs of the workers. In this respect a respondent said:

"In so far as they are workers and labourers and they organize around those issues, they can provide a very meaningful base upon which a policy for social welfare can be devised to meet the needs of people" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Another view was that unions and workers should develop a new vision of their role in society, which should not be seen in isolation from other organized sections of society. One respondent
with a socialist perspective said:

"I don't see the working class as only being organized in the unions. And therefore I see an alliance forged between progressive forces of community organizations and trade unions" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

It is said that the Union Movement should combine with the welfare sector - the formal welfare sector, social workers, and all people rendering social services. The organized Trade Union Movement can also assist such sectors of the labour force which are not organized, like farm workers and domestic workers. A further function for unions might be to help and organize the unemployed. The socialist view is that South Africa needs to move towards a socialist system and that trade unions should be means to that end.

6.4.11 The Role of Social Welfare in Reconstruction and Development

Nowadays, with an ANC-led government in power, there is much talk of the RDP, i.e. the plan for Reconstruction and Development. At the time of the research interviews discussed in the present Chapter, such a government programme could not with certainty have been foreseen. However, respondents were at the time asked what role they foresaw for social welfare to compensate the victims of apartheid and to improve the standard of living. They were asked to state in particular what contribution social welfare as a system to meet human needs could make in solving some of the problems that would be faced in a post-apartheid South Africa. The general view in this regard was that welfare would have only a limited contribution. During the transitional phase welfare might play a "first aid" role by alleviating some immediate problems. Assistance might be given to people returning from exile, and those released from prison. They would need to be integrated into the community. They would need housing, an income, and help in locating their families. It should however be realized that such contributions would be relatively small and restricted in the face of the country's over-all situation.

Another response was that social welfare could only contribute from a developmental and empowering point of view. An interviewee stated:

"I think too much of welfare resources in the past has [sic] often been called to
paper over the cracks in our society" (Respondent in Cape Town).

There is a risk for organizations to continue to do this. Sometimes there might well be a need to "paper over the cracks", but this should not be the focus in a post-apartheid society. The main focus should instead be on development and the empowerment of people. In this regard an overall development strategy is required, which might however be difficult for welfare to adopt. It was said:

"The whole concept of welfare is not a creative concept. It's not building something . . . it's sort of helping an existing situation. It's not like trade union organizations, or something where you are actually creating something for the future" (Respondent in Port Elizabeth).

Apart from welfare provision, employment and hard work would be required to address burning issues and to rebuild the country. A civic leader in Worcester said in this regard:

"Wel in die Nuwe Suid-Afrika . . . daar sal baie hard gewerk moet word. Daar sal moet baie tyd opgeoffer word. Om dit so te stel, slapelose nagte sal daar wees. Ek meen . . . daar sal dag en nag gewerk moet word . . . ek meen dit sal lank vat, want nou lyk dinge . . . het nou so agteruit gegaan . . . en ek dink die water het nou al begin opdraand loop".1

6.4.12 Attention given to Future Welfare Policy by Organizations

In order to determine how prepared organizations were for the post-apartheid South Africa, interviewees were asked to say what thought their organizations had given to welfare policy for the future. It was found that very little had been done by organizations. Respondents admitted that this was a neglected area which required much more attention from them. Organizations claimed they were so "bogged down by day-to-day activities that there was hardly time to plan and to reflect on the future". Some mentioned that the issue was a subject of ongoing debate and discussion, but that there wasn't "anything on paper". The Advice Office Forum had focused on

---

1 "Well, in the new South Africa, hard work lies ahead. People will really have to sacrifice. To put it this way, there will be sleepless nights. I mean, we will have to work night and day to redress those things . . . it will take long, because things have deteriorated so much . . . I think the water is already flowing uphill". (Present author's translation)
how welfare could fit into a national development plan.

Despite the constraints under which many organizations work, some had devised Mission Statements. These spell out the vision of a particular organization for the future. Many organizations have realized that they need to re-orientate themselves in terms of emerging realities. Mission Statements should therefore be seen as attempts by organizations to transform themselves so as to operate within changing social, economic, and political contexts. Traditional welfare organizations seem to be much more restricted than the so-called "progressive" organizations. Organizations receiving a State subsidy are restricted by the conditions of the subsidy, by government policy, and by partnership between the State and the private sector. Some of these organizations also have a long history. They tend to have established ways of operation, and are much slower in changing their practices. On the other hand, organizations who do not receive State funding adopt a more pro-active and progressive attitude. The Port Elizabeth Advice Office stated in this regard that their present policy framework is based on:

"Non-discrimination on colour, sex, or creed; that all apartheid laws should be removed, programmes to ensure people's ongoing participation, to assist victims of the system, to build people, and ongoing assistance to people who suffer, or cannot work".

6.4.13 What Welfare Organizations can do to Transform Social Welfare

Breaking away from the apartheid mentality and practices is going to be a long process. The role of social welfare in this regard seems limited. It was said that social welfare as a system does not have the power, nor the intention, to change the structural constraints in the wider society. A further dilemma of social welfare was highlighted by a respondent who said that "the concept of welfare in South Africa is rooted in racism" (Centre on Black Research, Durban). Many organizations and social workers operate within this framework. It would be difficult for them to challenge or to change racial welfare practices. Despite these difficulties, it was said that organizations could contribute to the foundations of a new welfare system.
The racial attitudes within the population were seen as a major stumbling block in a post-apartheid society. We should not only be aware of these attitudes, but work together to build a common non-racial value system. Respondents said organizations should seek to change people's attitudes by projects that break down prejudices. This should be done in an egalitarian manner to build people's confidence. Furthermore, the basic requirements of a citizen in a healthy society might be emphasized. These requirements should be clearly stated, to themselves and to the authorities. Organizations and welfare personnel could also formulate new perspectives and develop alternative frameworks for operation. Pressure should be exerted on the government to restructure social welfare.

Despite all the difficulties that organizations might experience in this regard, respondents were of the opinion that people should take the initiative and "do something", even if it were to be on a small scale. It was essential that new concepts and systems be introduced. Agencies should not only say what should be done, but start to practise the values they envisioned. As a respondent in Johannesburg explained:

"People should start doing something, organize something, programmes where people start providing for themselves in a very small, whatever kind of scale, to be economically competitive enough. But I think the fact of the matter is ... to start planting the seed in people to be entrepreneurs. ... designing for themselves those kinds of things. I think it's important".

Some interviewees felt that organizations should, within their limited scope, challenge racial practices and allow social workers to work with all racial groups. This, however would require cross-cultural and inter-racial skills for which social workers might not be equipped. Welfare agencies should embark on collective action to challenge racial practices and to change welfare policy. Respondents thought that a national network should be established between a range of community organizations, so as to plan policy approaches and procedures leading to a programme of action. This network could include the religious sector, community-based organizations, trade unions, the private sector, universities, and the formal welfare sector. Such a process should culminate in "a progressive, united welfare movement that would be based on a broad cross-section of people that would come together on a common basis and with a common set of principles" (Respondent in Johannesburg).
According to Oassa the welfare fraternity should take a range of steps to transform social welfare. The following were mentioned:

* Invoke maximum discipline in the rendering of welfare services, to ensure cost-effectiveness and as high a quality of service as possible

* Evaluate welfare programmes carefully

* Document the effects of the welfare policy

* Expose the results of the policy

* Broaden the concept of welfare to include housing, health, employment, recreation, and social security

* Work democratically together with the welfare community and the community as a whole towards the goals as contained in the human welfare aspects of UN's Universal Bill of Rights”.

Very strong argument was made for a vision of the future. It was held that what organizations and people could do would depend on the vision they had of post-apartheid society. A respondent said in this regard:

"For me the vision is the seed for any kind of structure, or any kind of activities that need to be followed. A vision inspires activities, a vision motivates, justifies reason not to sit back and doing nothing. So I think we need to have visionaries" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Whereas a vision was seen as a first priority, training people and exposing them to a different kind of experiences was second. People need to believe that the vision can be realized. In the words of another respondent:

"We need to have programmes now already which expose people to a different kind of experience that would be able to start them thinking differently . . . I also
think that it is necessary also now to start on doing what I call co-operatives, where people can start learning to produce by themselves. They must have full economic control in the present situation, and not to look forward only to what can be given as employment" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

The attitudes and values of people were singled out as areas for concentration. Interviewees emphasised that we should "work on people's prejudices" and to establish new values. One respondent said:

"I think one needs to do two things. On the one hand you need to build up among people a consciousness of their ability to govern, and one also needs to build up skills. I mean we are actually going to be desperately needing administering skills, and economic skills in order to run the economy efficiently. If we don't build them up, then we are going to rely on people who don't necessarily have the interest of the people at heart . . . The other thing which is important is the . . . whole issue of non-racialism, which is a lot more than a sort of statement of principles. It's building up an ideology which is actually essential to the running of a future country" (Idasa, Port Elizabeth).

Some respondents believed that, although "we are one nation", it might be difficult to create a national identity. The question was whether all South Africans saw themselves as part of the "New South Africa", and as one nation. It might be difficult to convince people from different apartheid backgrounds. Nevertheless, we should be breaking the barriers. We should understand and respect one another as human beings.

Meanwhile there should be serious assessment of social welfare, away from hand-outs and towards empowerment and development of people. Welfare organizations should assist people to discover their talents, their abilities, their self-respect and humanity. In this regard, organizations should embark on progressive and innovative social welfare activities. Organizations should conduct comparative studies in order to develop models relevant to the South African context.

6.4.14 The Role of Social Workers in a Post-Apartheid South Africa

The profession of social work is essential in a system of social welfare. It has been said that social work stands to social welfare as the medical profession stands to health. A study in social welfare
should therefore also examine the role of social workers. Respondents were thus asked to state their views on the role of professional social workers in post-apartheid welfare. Interviewees saw social workers as being in a key position where welfare was concerned. Yet it was said that "they are very quiet", and that "they tend to avoid conflict and confrontation". Although interviewees realized that social workers were restricted in terms of their employment conditions, and to some extent by the Council for Social Work, they nevertheless believed social workers should adopt a stronger activist role by highlighting social issues and organizing the community for action. Organizations said: "We need organic [sic] and committed social workers who align themselves with the community". Social workers should acquaint themselves with the social and political issues that communities face. They should be pragmatic in their approach and utilize community power to generate resources. Social workers should interact with the community, initiate projects, and help to lay the basis for a future welfare system. It was felt that social workers should be critical, constantly questioning their role. "They must break out of the system... and empower themselves". For social workers to make a meaningful contribution, a strong organization, rigorous debate on welfare issues, re-orientation, and commitment would be required. Social workers were often disunited. They would have to unite and speak with one voice, and explore alternative approaches to welfare.

What was specifically lacking within the ranks of the social work profession, it was said, was rigorous debate on welfare issues. Social workers were in a position to know what the needs were, and should therefore lead the debate upon them. "The spin-off of such debates is that politicians and political organizations will be able to pick up on these issues" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

Social workers appear also to lack organization. They could play a meaningful role only if they are united in one professional association. Unlike the status quo, where some professional associations are organized on a racial basis, there was a need for an all-inclusive professional body. One respondent said:

"As you know, we have so many splinter groups within the social work fraternity. It does not help for group A to do its thing here, and group B there. This is a national issue. It has a bearing on the future society. It is not an issue to play marbles about. It is not a question of White Social Workers meeting Black Social
Workers... This is a critical issue. It is something that has a bearing on the future of the society... on the future of our clients... It is a matter of national concern, and I see social workers taking a lead in that matter of national concern" (Representative of South African Council of Churches).

Regarding social work activities, interviewees believed these should be rooted in the communities, and their needs. A representative of Idasa in Port Elizabeth said:

"They should be relating to community groups in the communities where they are providing welfare, and being in touch with political dynamics. They should be thinking precisely the sort of things that we are talking about now. About how things are going to work in the future, and how they should be restructured, what the needs are going to be, and to start planning for those needs".

The view was also put forward that "social workers need to take a serious look at themselves". Their approach should be broader. Social workers had been trained to be "functionaries of the system". They should now transform themselves, and re-orientate themselves. They should think differently. Hence, clearly, attention should be paid to the training of social workers. This training should be reassessed so that social workers could make the contribution which will be required of them in a post-apartheid South Africa.

6.4.15 The Role of Training Institutions in Training Social Workers for a Post-Apartheid South Africa

A particular role is foreseen for social work training institutions in a post-apartheid South Africa. Not only should training institutions play a decisive role in post-apartheid South Africa, but they should initiate and guide changes. It was important that training institutions provide the staff to administer and manage the State Department of Social Welfare. The issue of administration of welfare agencies should be stressed in training courses.

The dilemma at the moment is that training institutions appear to operate within the status quo, set by the government. Social workers were mainly trained in a particular mode, i.e. to do statutory work. Respondents said that training institutions should break away from the old style of doing things. What was required was a re-orientation in training including a re-appraisal of traditional terminology.
Training institutions should be asking themselves what kind of social workers they were producing, and what kind of social workers would be required for the future. In this regard a representative of NICRO Johannesburg said:

"Universities and training institutions should guard against only turning out highly qualified, professional, First-World social workers".

The view was that training institutions should equip social workers to become "agents for transformation". Training institutions, too, needed a vision for the future. The vision of a training institution would motivate it in its educational programmes.

In addition to being "agents for transformation", the social workers should be able to analyze and criticize. Training institutions should produce "progressive welfare thinkers", able to identify root causes of problems. "Training Institutions need to be heretic, creating people of different conviction". They should produce "people who are thinking". "Social workers should be thinkers more than workers". A respondent in this regard was adamant when he said:

"Training institutions have a responsibility of creating people who can think. It's very important . . . it's a very, very important thing" (Respondent in Johannesburg).

There seemed to be wide consensus that training institutions will have to review their curricula so that they "reflect the process of change that's taking place" (Respondent in Johannesburg). Students should be taught to conduct community- needs-analysis, and the implementation of projects. Exposing social work students to contemporary realities should be an integral component of their training. A representative of a community organization said:

"I think that all the students should be taken to go and see the conditions . . . and then they would understand. I think seeing is the most important thing. Also bring in community organizations to explain certain things and organize workshops" (Advice Office, Port Elizabeth).

In this way training institutions could allow the community to participate in teaching and designing the curriculum. (The author states here, in parenthesis, that this is precisely what the better Schools of Social Work in South Africa have been doing for a long time.)
Interviewees felt that social workers should get a broader education than just in social work. Training institutions should "divert from their narrow professional training" and give social workers a wider perspective on society (Advice Office Forum). Social workers should not only know something about the broader socio-economic and political issues, they should understand economic and political processes. They should have a thorough knowledge of fundamental causes, especially of poverty.

Not only ought training institutions to be teaching students the theory of a post-apartheid society and how organizations might be helped to change; they should be encouraging discussion and debate about the kind of post-apartheid society envisioned, and on welfare policy for the future. Training institutions should therefore be doing research, collecting and storing information on issues in their field of interest. Training institutions should take the lead in research and critical analysis. Were that the case, it would not be necessary for an interviewee to say:

"If I say give me information on proposed welfare policy, I may not get it at a campus, but from the office of a community organization. If I want documentation right now on privatization, I may get it from a union office, I may get it from Black Sash, I may get it from... I will not get it at a campus" (Representative of South African Council of Churches, Johannesburg).

6.5 CONCLUSIONS

On the whole, respondents were very critical indeed about welfare policies practised by the government in office when the interviews were done. Some elements of these policies were vehemently rejected. It was said that the policies do not address the real needs of people. Views varied from a strong socialist position to a social-democratic position. Not many organizations held a conservative, or pro-government view. Even the traditional welfare organizations strongly disagreed with the welfare policies of that time.

On the other hand, respondents were by no means united on the type of social welfare system desired for South Africa. Opinions ranged from the need to move towards a Welfare State, to greater independence, to more direct funding from the State and the private sector. The basic question was what the functions of social welfare in post-apartheid society should be. Should
welfare operate as a system trimming up the "untidy edges" of society, or should it operate as an integrated developmental system within a broader policy framework? As South Africa embodies an interesting and complicated mix of First- and Third-World components, an effective balance between these two views is needed so that both the State and private initiative can play their parts. It was however clear that a need was felt for a redefinition of social welfare, outside the parameters of the apartheid ideology and in a completely different political context. There should be a clear understanding of the locus and function of social welfare within the broader network of social services and development policies, designed to enhance and protect the quality of life.

Finally, it appeared that respondents realized that a future welfare system was likely to develop in a piecemeal fashion, continuously changing and reforming. The mainstays of the South African welfare system would however undeniably remain. Family and self-help networks would not disappear, nor would mutual aid, or contributions from religious and voluntary bodies. Although there seemed to be consensus among organizations on a number of welfare issues, we should be careful not to generalize. Organizations included in the study ideologically constituted a somewhat homogeneous group.
CHAPTER SEVEN

TOWARDS A MODEL FOR POST-APARTHEID SOCIAL WELFARE

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 6 described and quoted views on social welfare policy in South Africa, referring especially to an envisaged future without apartheid. Since the field interviews were done, this new society has, constitutionally and administratively at least, been achieved. The new government has formulated a comprehensive Programme for Reconstruction and Development (ROP). This programme emerged when the author's field study had all been completed, but the work in its present form was still under way. The ROP is of immense importance as it provides us with a framework for resolving issues of poverty and inequality. Although discussion of the ROP was not originally part of the planned study (the ROP at that stage not yet having been announced), consideration of this vitally new approach to social policy in South Africa has subsequently become essential to it. In what follows, the ROP is not discussed in detail. Instead, the findings of Chapter 6, the main thrust of the RDP, and some relevant theories of development are examined for the light that they shed upon each other, and for the light they might shed upon probable future steps in the field of welfare policy.

The fundamental question facing the study now is: What should the role of social welfare within the post-apartheid South Africa be and, in particular, within the framework of the RDP? How should social welfare define its role within this new context, and what approach would be most appropriate? The present Chapter juxtaposes theories of development, a conceptual understanding of social welfare, the views expressed by stakeholders on post-apartheid social welfare, and the Reconstruction and Development Programme. These views, theories, and strategies will be assessed in terms of their appropriateness in meeting the challenges of a post-apartheid South Africa. The author aims at being able to suggest a model for social welfare policy. Central themes which have been dealt with in previous chapters will be repeated here with the aim of developing such a model.
7.2 POST-APARTEID NEEDS AND LEGACIES

In order to examine the potential of different development models, it is necessary to contextualize them and to reflect on some basic dimensions of the South African society. These dimensions have been highlighted in Chapter One, and throughout this research, and need not be repeated now. But we should remind ourselves that present realities have been created and perpetuated to a large extent by the political and economic policies of previous governments. The point has been made that South African society is characterized by extreme economic and social inequalities. (There are however other developing countries today in which such extremes might be greater than in South Africa, though they might not be racially based to the same extent.)

One of the most alarming aspects of South African society is the unequal distribution of direct income and economic resources. Sampie Terreblanche has for instance said analysis based upon the Lorentz-curve and the Gini co-efficient (measures that show how close a given distribution of income is to absolute equality or inequality) indicate that, of all the recorded nations, the income distribution in South Africa is the most unequal. "The Gini co-efficient is estimated on 0,68 for South Africa, 0,61 for Brazil and Mexico, and 0,57 for Turkey" (1988: 6).

The post-apartheid needs and legacies manifest themselves in various ways and on different levels in society. For instance if we take housing, education, and health services, the dilemma is particularly evident. The housing shortage in 1988 was estimated to be between 1,1 million and 1,8 million units (South African Institute of Race Relations 1989: XXXII). In addition, it was estimated that another 2,9 million to 3,4 million homes would be needed by the year 2000 to cater for national population increase and urbanization. In practice it would mean that 400,000 - 600,000 units a year would have to be provided to families. Since 1988 not many houses have been built, due to the intensification of the political struggle. One can therefore expect these figures to have increased since then. In 1993 it was for instance estimated that the number of people living in shacks ranged from 5 million to 7,7 million (South African Institute of Race Relations 1994: 319).
With regard to health services, there are major problems. Although an amount of 5.8% of the GNP was spent on health services in 1988, it did not reach most of the Black population. Prof P.W. Coetzer, head of the Department of Community Services at the Medical University of South Africa, said that 61% of deaths among African children were the result of malnutrition and premature births, and of related infections, especially gastro-enteritis (South African Institute of Race Relations 1989: XXXIV). The corresponding figures for Coloureds, Indians, and Whites were 41%, 16%, and 9% respectively (Ibid).

The South African National Tuberculosis Association estimated in 1988 that 12 million people in South Africa had dormant tuberculosis and an estimated 15% of these would contract a full-blown form of the disease, resulting between 10 and 20 deaths per day (Ibid). It is a well-known fact that figures for the disease in the Western Cape are rated among the highest in the world. In 1989 a medical officer of health for the Regional Services Council reported that the number of sufferers in the Western Cape, as at the middle of that year, had once again shown a significant increase over figures of the year before (Ibid). According to the Department of National Health and Population Development, the incidence of tuberculosis for all race groups except for Coloured people had been decreasing steadily since the 1960’s. The number of cases among Coloureds rose from 5,889 in 1971 to 9,090 in 1981, and 21,519 in 1991 (South African Institute of Race Relations 1994: 48). In 1992 the incidence per 100,000 people was as follows: Africans, 194; Coloureds, 661; Indians, 52; and Whites, 19 (Ibid).

There were indications in 1991-92 that the previous downward trends in disease indicators had been reversed, mainly as a result of the worsening economic situation (South African Institute of Race Relations 1992: XXXIII). Child mortality rates and nutritional problems also worsened. The malnutrition mortality rate for Africans had declined from 15.3 per 100,000 people in 1979 to 6.9 in 1985, but had then risen to 9.5 in 1988 (Ibid). In 1993 it was reported that South African health indicators were in many cases far worse than those of other countries of comparable per capita income. It was reported that:

* 53% of African children in South Africa between two and five years of age suffered from stunted growth owing to malnutrition, in comparison with 39% in the rest of Africa;
* More than twice as many South African children die from preventable causes before reaching the age of five years than could be expected of a country of its wealth;

* The annual incidence of tuberculosis in South Africa was 250 cases per 100,000 people, in comparison with 220 per 100,000 in all of Africa;

* 63% of children in South Africa who were under one year of age received complete immunization against diphtheria, whooping cough and tetanus, in comparison with 89% of children in Zimbabwe and 79% in Zambia (South African Institute of Race Relations 1994: 48).

In November 1993 the infant mortality rate in South Africa was reported to have reached 72 per 1,000 live births (Ibid).

With regard to education, some improvements were made in the last ten years. The 1991 census found that levels of education in South Africa were slowly improving (Ibid: 41). On the other hand the census revealed that illiteracy is still a big problem. Ten percent of the population over 18 had no schooling at all, and 1.4 million children, or 14% of the population of schoolgoing age (6 - 18 years), were not attending school (Ibid).

In addition to the redistribution of political power, another dilemma for the post-apartheid government is access to economic power and assets. "Blacks own only 2 percent of the assets of South Africa" (Terreblanche 1988: 6). A survey in 1988 indicated that the top 5 percent of the community in South Africa (almost all White), controls 88 percent of the wealth (Ibid). Moreover, we have seen that we are not only faced with issues of poverty and different levels of welfare, but also with a racially unequal and fragmented welfare system. Immediate objectives therefore would be the equalization and deracialization of social welfare. Obviously, this will include the restructuring and integration of different welfare systems.

Although South Africa now has a democratic political dispensation, most of the socio-economic problems still exist, and will persist if they are not addressed purposefully. We have vast
underdevelopment, squatter camps, unemployment, and illiteracy. The new government has inherited these conditions. In its attempts to move towards a juster and more egalitarian society, the government is faced with major difficulties. One of the serious consequences of the unequal distribution of wealth is that large numbers of people (other than Whites) are not able to satisfy their basic human needs. It was estimated in 1988 that 50 percent of the Coloureds, more than 30 percent of the Asians, and more than 60 percent of the Blacks are living under the breadline (Terreblanche 1988: 6). (The terms breadline, or poverty datum line, are here used interchangeably, meaning an income level below which a minimum nutritionally adequate diet plus essential non-food requirements are not affordable to a household.) Although the prevailing democracy creates a political framework in which issues of mass poverty and inequality may now be more meaningfully resolved, it is an illusion to think that all problems will automatically be solved. The country is faced with the legacies of apartheid. Unless there is purposeful intervention, the status quo is most likely to continue. Clear policy strategies must be designed and pursued, aimed at breaking down existing divisions and inequalities. The question that needs to be answered now is: What are the options realistically open to the country in devising alternative social policies? Attempting to answer this question, the author now revisits and assesses the potential of different approaches and strategies.

7.3 THE POTENTIAL OF SOCIAL WELFARE

What is the potential, and what are the limitations, of social welfare in contributing to reconstruction and development? What should be the role and the place of social welfare in post-apartheid South Africa?

Social welfare, we said, tends to take on different meanings and approaches depending on the context and the nature of the issues faced. Social welfare thus needs to adopt approaches relevant to South African realities, and to pursue policy objectives of the new government. The changing nature of social welfare should be seen against the background of the prevailing social realities, the country's economic system, the stage of its economic development, and the extent to which needs are satisfied or neglected. Social welfare programmes should be designed in relation to social issues and problems, which vary in terms of time and place.
There are however some limitations to bear in mind when we say that social welfare should adopt new approaches. A major difficulty is to define social welfare and to distinguish it from other processes of provision and distribution. This has implications for the operationalization of social welfare and to give it content. Still, a system of social welfare is essential in society to prevent hunger and deprivation.

Traditionally, social welfare has been associated with assistance to "the least privileged members of society" i.e. a special service to the poor. This is a narrow approach. The broader meaning and scope of social welfare encompasses planning and development intended to promote a more equitable and more desirable distribution of the national income. In considering the role of social welfare for post-apartheid South Africa, we need to decide whether to adopt the narrow, restricted concept, or the broad developmental perspective.

It is reasonably clear, from the RDP, that the State will favour the broader concept of social welfare. The question is how to do it and what does it mean? On this there are different views. Strong emphasis is already being placed on basic needs satisfaction (the provision of housing for instance receives much attention), but others prefer a Welfare State approach. Perhaps as a relic of the past, social welfare is seen as a separate system, planned and implemented to meet basic human needs. In other words, it is a way of transferring income to "socially disadvantaged individuals and vulnerable groups"; of providing an income to citizens who cannot assure an adequate income for themselves by their own economic activity. Social welfare thus operates as a means of redistribution of resources, to prevent economic deprivation and poverty, while the economy forms the productive base to provide the resources that are to be distributed. In this way social welfare supports, supplements, or substitutes functions traditionally performed by the family, and (in modern society) by the market, while the economic system operates in a separate domain. Economic policies and social welfare policies operate separately. Economic development and growth are seen as ends in their own right, rather than as means for the attainment of social ends. In this sense the function of social welfare is to meliorate the deficiencies of the economic system and to pick up those who fall through the net of economic provision. This is a major dilemma and has serious implications for what social welfare can achieve.
Different views exist on how society should respond to issues of poverty and how to secure the general welfare of the population. First, there is the socialist view which starts from the belief that the capitalist system of private enterprise and free market economy is inefficient and unjust. This school holds that the economic system should be planned and regulated by political power. Under such a system the needs of everybody should be met and their welfare secured by the operation of economic and political structures. "Social progress, therefore, should be marked by a reduction, not an increase, in the special social services which are extraneous and supplementary to the working of the social and economic system itself" (Marshall 1967: 29). This calls for belief in a regulated socialist economy. Capitalism as a system should be eliminated. "Social welfare measures were merely palliatives, which sapped the strength of the attack on capitalism" (Ibid: 31). The question here is: What is to happen to those who are unable to participate in economic activities - - the chronic sick, the mentally ill or defective?

The second school of thought holds that, not only is the economic system unable to accommodate everybody, it also leaves many needs unsatisfied and distributes its resources unequally amongst the workers. Hence it is the responsibility of the State where necessary to intervene to rectify or supplement the effects of the economic system. Social legislation is required to humanize capitalism, without destroying it. This system represents a dual approach. It allows free enterprise to produce surplus resources, at the same time extending the provision of social services, so as to balance private enterprise and public provision. This school of thought finds expression in the Welfare State as an institution to meet human needs.

The third school of thought is conservative. It holds that there is "nothing seriously wrong with the economic system and that the main concern of the government should be to see that it had every facility and encouragement to continue its good work" (Ibid: 29-30). Everybody should work hard and make provision for sickness and old age In this way, the numbers requiring assistance would be small. The philosophy underlying this school of thought is that public social services diminish the incentive to work and to make provision for the future. This is a strictly residual approach. It is that of the Poor Laws, with a stigma attached to welfare services. If everybody who is capable of working is to be responsible for their own maintenance and that of their dependants, social conditions should make this possible. The question is: What happens
when social conditions do not permit individuals to meet such responsibilities? Marshall says:

"The crux of the matter for this school of thought as a whole was the contention that the State should not intervene with the economic system nor try compulsorily to modify its working. It should remain outside the arena in which the economic battle went on and confine itself to picking up the casualties" (Ibid: 30).

These three schools of thought are deeply rooted in the very nature of modern society and the issues underlying them persist. To a large extent they determine the potential and functions of social welfare.

It is also important to recognize the historical traditions from which social welfare has originated. We should remind ourselves once again of some of the major motivations for the introduction of social welfare measures. These were: mutual aid, religious commitment, the desire for political advantage, economic conditions, ideological factors (Macarov, 1978). The fact that social welfare has its roots in more than one tradition may affect its potential to adopt new approaches. Noble as some of the traditional approaches may be, however, a distinct characteristic of this mode of social welfare is that, for the most part, it does not change the basic inequalities in society, nor does it set out to do so. Welfare is mostly seen as charity with a remedial and corrective function, while the existence of rich and poor is taken for granted.

It is apparent that welfare provision and in particular the Welfare State can serve a useful purpose. But what if we experience problems to finance it? If it is the nature of welfare to transfer income, who guarantees to produce enough to continue such transfer in the face of increasing demands? Under current economic conditions, welfare becomes the mechanism to deal with the consequences of the economic system manifested by unemployment, underemployment, and low wages. Welfare is then used as a rescue operation and to prevent too much disharmony in society. Social welfare is thus supposed to solve problems caused by the malfunction of other systems or when other structures have failed. Under such conditions social welfare as a system is not effective.

There is a need to move to a twofold conception of welfare; on the one hand a narrow but significant concept of welfare for a certain section of people in the community who are
"incapable" of providing for themselves due to certain "disabilities", and on the other a wide and significant concept where institutions in society as well as policy objectives are geared towards the welfare of the population and the satisfaction of basic human needs. The challenge seems to be to adopt innovative approaches and to design appropriate policies which will realize welfare objectives.

Worldwide social welfare as a system seems to be in a crisis. Contemporary issues are ever-increasing social benefits, lack of economic growth, and the inability of the economy to provide the goods and services to be distributed by the welfare system. As the costs of welfare programmes have increased rapidly, taxes have been raised to such levels that there is ongoing conflict between social welfare programmes and taxation. Several countries have cut back on welfare programmes. Some Western countries are indeed attempting to dismantle the Welfare State as an institution, and have introduced policies for the privatization of welfare, or for welfare resources to be distributed according to market principles. This is not a promising scenario for the provision of social welfare in a post-apartheid South Africa.

The dilemma in a capitalist society is the fact that it faces contradictory values between social welfare and the economy. "It has to be recognized that the dominant values and institutions of capitalism are on the whole quite inimical to the values underlying the social services" (Mishra 1981: 37). It is therefore very difficult to comprehend how privatization, and in particular "the market", can solve the dilemma. The market model is based on an economic structure that fosters competition and profits. The system itself creates conflicting interests in which the nature of man is revealed. Despite these inherent limitations and characteristics of market capitalism, privatization proposals seem to assume the natural good of the market and of man. It would however remain the responsibility of the State to lay down uniform standards and to see to the welfare of its citizens. The State seems to be the best institution to provide for welfare services through legislation, and through fiscal and social security policies. Privatization and the market do not deal with economic imbalances, unemployment, poverty, and social injustice.

Highlighting the limitations of the market and the dilemmas of privatization does not mean that an institutional system of social welfare can solve all the problems. It is doubtful whether social
welfare could satisfactorily address poverty and inequality in South Africa, since these problems were structurally created and perpetuated. Structural causes must be addressed first before social welfare can be effective. Traditionally and inherently social welfare does not address structural problems. Some would argue that social welfare operates to control people, rather than to concern itself with social issues. (See for instance Piven and Cloward 1971, and Janowitz 1976).

A more dynamic approach in social welfare is preventive and developmental. In this instance the aim is to maintain a high level of self-reliance and to meet the basic needs of everybody in the interest of the whole society. The potential of Developmental Social Welfare was realized as early as 1967 when the United Nations' International Expert Meeting on Social Welfare Organization and Administration stated:

"Social welfare as an organized function is regarded as a body of activities designed to enable individuals, families, groups, and communities to cope with the social problems of changing conditions. But in addition to, and extending beyond the range of its responsibilities for specific services, social welfare has a further function within the broad area of a country's social development. In this larger sense, social welfare should play a major role in contributing to the effective mobilization and deployment of the human and material resources of the country to deal successfully with the social requirements of change". (International Council on Social Welfare 1971: 105).

The idea of Developmental Social Welfare was taken a step further in 1968 when consultations were started by Ministers and senior policy-makers in social welfare which culminated in the adoption of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development in 1969. "Guiding Principles for Developmental Social Welfare Policies and Programmes in the Near Future", were endorsed and adopted by the United Nations in 1987.

The Guiding Principles set forth recommendations for action at the national, regional, and international levels for appropriate and effective Developmental Social Welfare Strategies and Programmes. The concept diverges from the traditional remedial and support functions associated with social welfare. The focus here falls on prevention and addressing the root causes of social dysfunctioning. Developmental Social Welfare focuses on the maximization of human potential and on fostering self-reliance and participation in decision-making. It emphasises the organization of family-oriented, community-based, and integrated services. The idea is that social welfare
programmes should assist individuals and groups at various stages and in different circumstances of life to develop their capacities and to become or remain productive members of society, in addition to supporting those in need of care, protection, and financial assistance.

It is envisaged that these strategies and programmes would provide a global agenda for the 1990's and beyond. They cover a wide range of areas over the entire spectrum of human welfare. Some of the basic areas of concern in Developmental Social Welfare are social welfare policies which are focused on meeting new challenges. Social welfare policies are therefore widely perceived as being in need of redefinition and redirection. It is argued that issues such as poverty, social inequality, lack of financial resources, population patterns, economic structures, all call for continuous adjustments in welfare policies and priorities. Despite the fact that many countries have social welfare programmes, all countries have a common concern, that is to redefine and reorientate programmes in line with emerging social realities.

Central to Developmental Social Welfare is the concept of participation, both as an aim and as a means of social development. In contrast to approaches that marginalize the poor, full and free participation on equal terms in all social, political, and economic activities underlie this view of welfare. It is suggested that participation is to be achieved through new partnerships in the field of social welfare policy, providing opportunities for greater involvement of beneficiaries (individually and collectively) in decisions concerning their needs and the implementation of programmes, including community-based programmes. This welfare strategy would imply new ways to respond to human needs. Developmental social welfare favours policies which give greater attention to the needs of the family as a fundamental unit in society as well as to the needs of individual members. Such family policies should include family planning programmes, and also make provision for newly-emerging family patterns and models, including single-parent families. Weakening family links, family violence, and the increase in family breakups, pose a major challenge to social welfare. Such problems call for greater emphasis on programmes that strengthen the capability of the family to face these challenges.

Developmental welfare reveals a sensitivity to the rights of women. It implies making provision for their advancement. Social welfare policy in this instance includes the promotion of equality.
between men and women in all fields, including political and economic life. According to this view of welfare, the government should not only assume wider responsibility for the protection and support of specific vulnerable groups of the population, but should move towards a strategy of protection, rehabilitation, prevention, equalizing of opportunities and intervention to ensure the fullest development and effective social functioning of all. Family and community-based programmes and informal care form part of such a strategy. In addition, institutional care needs to be re-evaluated to ensure appropriateness as an alternative to family and community-based programmes.

With regard to children, greater stress is placed on integrated child development services and on enhancing the capacity of families to care for their young. In the context of a rapidly changing social environment that places major strains on young people, programmes need to be devised and strengthened to meet the needs of the youth. These should be in addition to programmes related to employment, training, family-life education, urban living, and rural development. Support for disabled persons should have prevention, education and training, rehabilitation, and the equalization of opportunities as major objectives. Equally important are programmes aimed at modifying the views and attitudes of the public through public information and other means, thus raising society's awareness of the needs and the situation of disabled persons.

Crime and substance abuse are serious problems. Welfare programmes need to give greater attention to delinquent behaviour and its social consequences. Equal attention should be given to harmful behaviour such as drug, alcohol, and tobacco abuse. More emphasis is needed on prevention, and on rehabilitation of delinquents, former prisoners, and addicts. This should be done wherever possible in a non-institutional, community setting, with social integration and access to productive employment being major aims.

With regard to AIDS, the strategy proposes that more emphasis be placed on social measures for those suffering from this disease. Measures should be implemented to avoid discrimination and segregation of AIDS victims and also to take into account the situation of their relatives.
Other important elements of Developmental Social Welfare are employment, income security, and the eradication of poverty. Social welfare policy should be directed towards the root causes of poverty rather than its alleviation. In terms of this view, social welfare policy should be seen as an integral element in a broad strategy to increase employment and investment opportunities for both men and women. Productive employment should be possible for everybody in society who is employable. Only for those who cannot work, or who are retired, sufficient provision should be made through social security and special benefits, in line with the prevailing standards of society and within available resources. In conditions of mass poverty, the main thrust of social welfare has to be in supporting wider programmes aimed at creating income-earning opportunities and enhancing the productive capacity of the poor (especially women) through a variety of urban and rural local co-operative, self-help, and community development schemes.

Regarding basic human needs, Developmental Social Welfare suggests that programmes should support wider efforts to provide adequate shelter, health care, nutrition and education to all by focusing on problem areas and special needs, and facilitating access to available social services. Housing requirements of especially the poor and the vulnerable should be addressed by combining governmental and non-governmental endeavours, and by drawing on the resources of the community and self-help schemes. Health needs, especially of the most vulnerable, can be met more effectively when integrated with social welfare activities involving not only medical and para-medical practitioners, but also community workers and health workers suitably trained in prevention and promotion techniques. Less emphasis is placed on institutional treatment and more emphasis on ambulatory health care in the community context, in co-ordination with other welfare services.

Nutritional education and nutritional programmes, particularly in the context of maternal and child care services in schools, can promote the health and full development of young people and other groups at risk, even in conditions of poverty. Within the context of educational opportunities, social welfare programmes need to provide more adequate links between the school, the family, the community, and the workplace, so that they can reinforce each other. The idea is that fuller use should be made of the potential of community organizations, co-operatives, and youth and womens' groups, to reinforce education or to provide an alternative for those who
cannot attend school or who drop out of school.

There is scope for a reorientation of social welfare policies and services so as to advance the over-all development process. We may argue that the value of Developmental Social Welfare lies in the fact that it covers the entire spectrum of human existence and welfare. It focuses on all segments of the population by strengthening social policies and institutions, and making them part of balanced development. In this sense it may claim to be comprehensive. However, a potential weakness of Developmental Social Welfare may lie exactly in its broadness of vision. Emphasis on Developmental Social Welfare does not mean that social services for specific sectors (such as families and children, youth, the aged, disabled persons, and the wider issues of prevention of crime and drug abuse) should be neglected. In all these areas social welfare retains an important, short-term, remedial and rehabilitative function.

Social welfare should therefore adopt a social interventionist approach, combining the remedial and developmental functions. This would include provisions and processes directly concerned with treatment and prevention of social problems, development of human resources, and improvement in the quality of life. In other words, social services to individuals and families, as well as efforts to strengthen or modify social institutions, would be included. The developmental approach means that "the over-all focus is on enabling individuals and groups to function most effectively in their families and communities and to contribute as best they could to the broader processes of development" (United Nations 1983: 8).

The overview demonstrates that Developmental Social Welfare re-affirms to a large extent present functions of social welfare, but it covers a wider scope, adopts a new philosophy, and places a stronger emphasis on prevention and self-reliance. Clinical approaches and social assistance become starting points for development and independence. Developmental Social Welfare represents a comprehensive view of welfare, and is concerned with the welfare of the nation as a whole. The challenge however is how to translate the ideals of Developmental Social Welfare into practical programmes to deal anew with social issues. How are current welfare approaches to be changed into developmental approaches? For this we would need not only a vision, but clear policies, operational activities, infrastructure, funding, training, and personnel. The training
and employment of suitable personnel as implementors of Developmental Social Welfare are vital issues to bear in mind. The training of social workers, of social welfare personnel, volunteers, governmental personnel as well as community leaders requires high priority. Responsibilities in this regard are diverse and complex, ranging from direct service to policy formulation and planning.

Another question concerning Developmental Social Welfare seems to be to what extent these innovations have been adopted and implemented. The proposals so far seem to exist only in theory with no concrete case studies to learn from. What is required now is for individual countries to contexualize these broad and universal guidelines, to design policies, and to plan for their implementation.

The developmental vision requires a democratic and social philosophy as well as efforts to renew social institutions so as to reflect a commitment to human well-being (Romanyshyn 1971: 379). Continued renewal of society's institutions, so as to promote the fullest development of the individual, is called for. Political will is needed to initiate social transformation. Developmental Social Welfare was emphasized by stakeholders in the field, and so the author will return to this approach when the views of community organizations are assessed.

For the successful implementation of Developmental Social Welfare, a policy for creating resources, mobilization, and distribution, is crucially important. This requires partnership in the interest of development and welfare between the State and the private sector. The general aims and direction of the government should be made clear through policy statements, legislation, and national plans. The government has the primary responsibility for determining over-all policies and the setting of priorities and standards. On the other hand, non-governmental and voluntary organizations, trade unions, co-operatives, and community action groups are major sponsors of development programmes. These organizations must be recognized, supported, and consulted. The involvement of such a diversity of participants may result in a need for better co-ordination of programmes. There may also be a need for a clearer delineation of areas of responsibility and functions to achieve optimal effect. Non-governmental organizations co-operate with the government and often work within frameworks, standards, and guidelines established by
governmental policies. Within this partnership the government recognizes, acknowledges, and encourages the manifold contributions of non-governmental organizations, and makes every effort to involve them in the planning and implementation of programmes, both at local and national levels.

Social welfare in South Africa will have to divert from its short-term, crisis orientation towards a long-term development orientation. Furthermore, it would seem, for social welfare to be more effective, it will have to operate within the broader economic policy and planning framework. Education and re-education are seen as important elements of post-apartheid welfare policy to equip citizens with knowledge and life skills.

Although there are doubts whether social welfare as a system has the potential to change wider structural constraints, it nevertheless has an important place in society. Its potential however is at present severely restricted in terms of the functions at present allocated to it in South Africa, and by its very poor place within the broader policy and planning framework.

In order significantly to deal with contemporary realities in South Africa, it is not enough just to restructure and deracialize social welfare, even if the integration and equalization of different welfare systems are included. In the past, social welfare has reflected the inequalities in society and may be said to have contributed to present conditions. These inequalities and contradictions will first have to be rectified, while at the same time alternative and more dynamic approaches are explored. Thus, there is a need for social welfare in South Africa to refocus and redefine its role. Conceptions of social welfare are linked to the general ideas of the time, and to the way society is organized, as well as to the problems faced. The question however remains: How can social welfare be transformed?

7.4 THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT: A SOLUTION OR PART OF THE PROBLEM?

In Chapter Two an overview of central theories and approaches to development was given. This overview revealed that various theories of development emerged after decolonization. Such theories seek to explain extant situations, and also to indicate how problems might be alleviated.
Based on these theories and assumptions, different models of development have been implemented to improve the economic well-being of citizens. In what follows, the author explores the potential that these theories and models of development might have in solving problems in post-apartheid South Africa. Valuable lessons might be learned from experiences in other countries in terms of what has been achieved, and what did not work and why.

Based on theories of industrialization and modernization, there has hitherto in Developing Countries (including South Africa) been strong emphasis on economic growth and development. The solution to poverty is believed to lie primarily in economic growth and modernization. The underlying assumption of growth-centred development is that increasing capital investment will stimulate growth, which will ultimately benefit the poor and eradicate poverty and deprivation. With this emphasis on industrialization, an important sector of the economy, the agricultural sector, has been neglected in many Developing Countries. Industrialization, rather than agricultural development, was seen as the priority. (This is perhaps understandable in South Africa, when the virtual landlessness of the indigenous Africans as a result of conquest, reinforced by legislation, is borne in mind.)

Although economic development has certainly been taking place, the benefits of growth in the GNP did not effectively reach the poor. The South African experience co-incides pretty closely with the experience in general of the outcome of strategies of development based on the "trickle-down" assumption. The challenge has been to distribute the increased national income so as to improve the standard of living and the quality of life of the population as a whole. It was, after a time, internationally realized that growth alone is not enough. It should be linked with plans to distribute the products of growth.

The dependency theory was developed to account for the persistence of poverty and underdevelopment. To understand the persistence of poverty, says the theory, we need to focus on international economic and political systems. Countries do not operate in isolation. External factors, and links with the global economic system, are increasingly present. Accordingly, poverty cannot be addressed at the national level only. With South Africa now joining the international arena after a period of sanctions and isolation, this reality should be borne in mind.
Because modernization did not bring about equitable distribution of resources, alternative approaches to address poverty were explored. The emphasis shifted to State involvement in meeting basic needs. The Basic Needs Approach was seen as a politically more appropriate development strategy, in which State involvement was advocated, so as to ensure a more equitable distribution of the fruits of development. The Basic Needs Approach seeks to attend to the immediate needs of individuals and families. Central to the approach is the desire for social justice. The idea is that basic needs themselves should be the central theme of the development process, which implies that the basic needs of the poor become the core of development planning and policy.

More recently Neo-liberalism and Structural Adjustment Programmes advocated a shift away from State involvement towards greater reliance on market solutions, and on development initiated in the private sector. This school of thought suggests that the State withdraw from areas where it is least competent. Instead, the State should concentrate on creating an enabling environment, political stability, a sound policy framework aimed on strengthening the workings of the market, plus the economic and social infrastructure needed for development. With Structural Adjustment we are back with the modernization approach, but this time with a strong emphasis on deregulation and privatization. Structural Adjustment is not actually a development approach nor a mechanism to promote the welfare of people. Rather it is a mechanism of control (due to a lack of sound governance and macro-economic management) to deal with balance-of-payment problems, and increasing debt. Adjustment programmes have a narrow economic focus, with the emphasis on restructuring of industry on "free market" principles, and as prescribed by international donors. Thus, Structural Adjustment is a strategy of privatization, reducing the State's involvement in the economy and in the redistribution of resources. It is regarded as a short-term stabilization programme, while its long-term impact on the structure of State and society is not recognized. This Programme is an example of the impact and power of international economic forces impinging on the national economy. The local economy is controlled by international donor organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which prescribe to Developing Countries. These realities should be taken into account in any South African development strategy that tries to promote the welfare of the local population.
From the overview it appears that Structural Adjustment has not achieved any really meaningful results where development is the criterion. Studies indicate that this strategy has had an adverse effect on the poor. There is evidence that it has negatively affected human welfare, with a sharp decline in living standards. Some critics have argued that Structural Adjustment Programmes have a devastating affect on social services and that the poor have become poorer, both relatively and absolutely (Korten 1991).

Contrary to what some experts say, economic growth to many seems to be associated with a deepening of the crisis rather than with its solution. "The harder we push our efforts to increase total economic output as the solution to poverty, the more the gap between rich and poor grows and the faster the pace of our collective march toward ultimate ecological disaster" (Korten 1991: 3). Less and less support is found for growth as a solution. It is argued that if it were the solution, we should by now have seen dramatic progress in terms of decline of poverty, and improvement in standards of living. Instead, we have seen an increase in absolute poverty and a persistent pattern of social disintegration. In other words, it appears possible for a country to grow economically, while the well-being of its people declines. (A critique of economic development to alleviate poverty does not however mean that it is not appropriate, nor that economic development has not achieved success in certain societies. Time, place, and the issues faced, are critical factors to consider.)

The overview in Chapter Two indicated that development is often thought of as economic development, namely progress and expansion in labour and capital. The result is that policy-makers tend to neglect the human being in the development debate. Critics argue that development should be defined in such a way that it includes both economic growth and human resource development. Development therefore has to be redefined in each policy context, bearing in mind all the components and factors involved. Hence, the emphasis shifted to social development, a strategy strongly favoured by the World Bank. It is said that development should also promote social justice and include redistribution as a central objective.

What do we have in mind when we talk about social development, and how does this perspective differ from other development perspectives? The traditional conception of social development
is that it is concerned with the needs of certain deprived sections of society. The aim is to "develop" them and to bring them up to a desired level of human and social functioning. Another view is that it means "evenly shared, balanced progress of entire populations towards enhancement of the circumstances of living, the quality of life, and the quality of human relations" (Gil 1976: 86). Conceptions of social development differ in their underlying assumptions and values. There are those who acknowledge humanistic, egalitarian, and a democratic values as ultimate goals of social development, while others use these values as "guiding principles and evaluative criteria when formulating policies in the present" (Ibid: 92). According to Gil, social development is only possible when it is based upon social policies shaped by a humanistic, egalitarian, and democratic philosophy (Ibid). The mere fact that different perspectives exist on social development is an indication that the whole question of development is a constant search for the right kind of priorities. Gil continues by saying:

"For evenly-shared progress can materialize only when social policies are designed consciously to treat every human as a subject of intrinsically equal worth, entitled to equal social, economic, civil and political rights, liberties, responsibilities, and recognition" (Ibid).

He says further:

"Hence, whenever institutional structures and dynamics of a society are in conflict with such a philosophy, initiating and maintaining the momentum of social development requires fundamental transformation of the institutional order and of the value premises that sustain and reinforce that order" (Ibid).

Elaborating on the meaning of social development, some critics have proposed "people-centred development" as opposed to "growth-centred development". According to Korten there is a fundamental difference between these two. When growth theorists direct their attention to economics, he says, their conceptual frameworks allow them to think of people's participation only in terms of their economic functions as labourers or consumers, while people-centred development involves "authentic" development which is based on three basic principles, i.e. justice, sustainability, and inclusiveness (Korten 1991: 1). Korten continues by saying:

"[the] concern here is with the articulation of a vision of transformational global
change addressed to the underlying problems of a world that is sinking ever deeper into crisis" (Ibid).

He argues that economic values should be replaced by non-economic values. He says:

"In our quest for economic growth, we have seen the economic values that drive our collective process of resource exploitation and wealth creation gain ever greater dominance over the non-economic values that sustain the social fabric of family and community - - the building blocks of human civilization" (Ibid).

This view is not only a critique of conventional development theory, but an attempt to move away from the notion that equates growth in economic output with human progress and welfare.

In terms of these views it appears that the social development paradigm includes both socialist and social democratic perspectives.

7.4.1 Social Democratic Perspective

The over-all view of social development is that it encompasses a development approach to meeting human needs, a material advancement in terms of increased per capita income, agricultural production, and non-material advancements in terms of desirable changes in value orientation, attitudes and patterns of behaviour. A distinction is therefore made between economic resource development and human resource development. Social development concentrates more on the needs of people and on promoting their self-reliance. Conscious efforts are made through rational planning and programmes of development to fulfil the expectations of the people to the extent feasible from the point of view of available resources. It is in the formulation of such policies that the role of social research in terms of gathering the relevant data and social facts becomes crucial.

Social development is a broad concept which includes economic development and which emphasises the development of the totality, including political, social, and cultural aspects. Social development embraces development in all its varied facets. A broad and inclusive perspective is that of the International Council on Social Welfare:
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"Social development is considered as that aspect of over-all development which encompasses social relationships and social systems, and the values attached to these. Social development is essentially concerned with what people consider, on balance, to be improvements in their social conditions. The focus may be on small social structures, like the family, or more commonly upon large ones, even the world society" (1971: 3).

Social development strategies are generally described as improvement in health, nutrition, education, and housing, as well as the redistribution of income and the provision of substantial employment opportunities (Gokhale 1972: 36). Although economic objectives are regarded as being ultimately subservient to fundamental social goals, the distinction between social and economic objectives is neither clear-cut nor easy to make. Planned social development has the primary aim of directly contributing to the attainment of social goals. Social development is therefore a process, a method consciously used, or a particular social outcome beneficial to the welfare of people.

Based on this inclusive conception, social development adopts a strong human resource development approach. The focus here is on the development of the human being in relation to his/her environment. The recently re-emerging concept of human development, according to Braidotti, "focuses on indemnifying past failures of development practice and denotes a human needs-oriented development model which encompasses more humane values and respect for human life" (Braidotti et al 1994: 19). The framework for human resource development revolves around two main themes: investment in people, and human-centred development. It emphasizes the development of people as a prerequisite for sustained economic growth. Development is centred in people, not people in development. The idea is to go beyond mere capital investment towards increased investment in human capabilities in the form of equitable distribution of wealth and income, social justice, and improvement in education, health and social welfare. Growth policies are coupled with distribution policies in an attempt to increase the productivity of the poor. This mode of development "encompasses a range of objectives beyond economic growth which are intended to enable people to participate actively and creatively in the development process" (Braidotti et al 1994: 19). This indicates that in any form of development there should be a balance between economic, social, and physical development. However, social development is an important pre-requisite and is the basis for economic, physical, and institutional development.
Social development improves the quality of life, accepts the potential of people, and respects the dignity of the person. It covers a wide area, viz health, welfare, education, training, housing, recreation, culture, sport, etc. Consequently, social development breaks away from narrow economic development and is inextricably linked to other forms of development, like the inherent capabilities of people.

In human resource development, education should play a vital role, particularly in the acquisition of knowledge and skills for employment. The aim is to develop "the capacity of each individual to reach his[her] own potential, to develop his[her] own creative ability, to fulfil him[her]self and to find satisfaction in commitments to a purpose, an ideal, an objective, which challenges him[her] to even greater effort" (International Council on Social Welfare 1971: 104). In this way the individual becomes self-reliant, and a constructive, self-sufficient citizen of society.

Social development implies that qualitative and structural changes in society must go hand in hand with rapid economic growth and amelioration of existing disparities. These objectives are both determining factors and end results of social development. They should therefore be viewed as integrated parts of the same dynamic process and would require a unified approach. However, in practice there is a big contrast between the objectives as spelled out in this strategy and social development trends in society. The objectives of social development seem to have no significant impact on actual policies in reality. Social injustices and economic inequality persist while extreme poverty increases. It is also evident that social development objectives and economic growth do not necessarily go together. "There can be considerable social development during periods of relatively rapid growth as well as during periods of slow growth, while there can be a deterioration of social conditions in countries where GNP is growing rapidly as well as in those where it is stagnant. The problem is not so much one of productive capacity and its rates of growth as of the character and composition of production and its distribution" (United Nations Institute for Social Development 1979: 4). Reasons cited for the paradox between social objectives and trends of economic growth are varied and at different levels. "They bear on the international order itself, on national societies, on policy making and planning mechanisms and methodologies, and on administrative systems" (Ibid: 5).
7.4.2 Social Transformation Perspective

The transformation perspective is more committed to a socialist development pattern. National liberation and development are linked to a transition to socialism. It appeared from the responses of some organizations that a particular model of socialism adapted to local conditions is envisaged. In terms of these views, "democratic socialism" is seen as the ultimate ideal and vision of a post-apartheid South Africa - the achievement of a modern, developed, democratic socialist society. Concepts cited in this regard are "scientific socialism", or "socialism with a human face", which entails a vision of an egalitarian future society. It is argued that, for this vision to materialize, it is necessary that natural science, technology, and social science knowledge be applied in the interest of humanity and social goals. Furthermore, that socialist values, socialist consciousness, and socialist ethos be created and promoted.

Within the socialist paradigm, the concept of "democratic socialism" seems to offer a way out of the failure of conventional socialism. The view is that a democratic socialist society would signify a decisive break with capitalism and oppression. The views of Howe are significant in this regard. He says:

"Socialism strives to abolish exploitation and inequality. It seeks a society where merit and character are the only marks of distinction; where economic resources are controlled by public agencies, themselves under public scrutiny; where production is geared to the human needs of all and the product is distributed equitably; a society, finally, when man is no longer utilized as a means for purposes alien to him" (1982: 42).

Socialism, viewed from the perspective of social welfare, is seen as the ultimate objective. In that sense it is seen as "another kind of society", not just an improved Welfare State. The social democratic system on which the Welfare State is based, is seen as a stage of capitalist development that must transcend to socialism - a stage designating "a new chapter in human history" (Ibid: 172). Elaborating on the socialist perspective, David Gil places the emphasis on the analysis and development of social policy strategies. In discussing strategies for social development, he asks the question what specific policies can be expected to set in motion and maintain the momentum of processes of social development. He then says:
"When social development means evenly shared, balanced progress of entire populations towards enhancement of the circumstances of living, the quality of life, and the quality of human relations, it is predicated upon social policies shaped by a humanistic, egalitarian, and democratic philosophy" (1976: 86).

From this view it appeared that for "evenly-shared progress" to take place, social policies should be designed with that intention in mind. This type of policy takes the human person as its starting point. However, such policies should be "designed consciously to treat every human as a subject of intrinsically equal worth, entitled to equal social, economic, civil and political rights, liberties, responsibilities, and recognition" (Ibid). Gil continues by saying:

"Whenever institutional structures and dynamics of a society are in conflict with such a philosophy, initiating and maintaining the momentum of social development requires fundamental transformations of the institutional order and of the value premises that sustain and reinforce that order" (Ibid).

Specific policies are therefore required as necessary components of a strategy towards social development. The combined impact of these policy strategies should bring about the fundamental transformation of social values, structures, and dynamics implicit in the notion of social development. Policies which are developed for social development should therefore constantly apply humanistic, egalitarian, and democratic values and principles. It applies in particular to "the major domains of human existence and social organization, namely, the control and allocation of all productive resources, the design of productive processes and criteria for production priorities, the division of labour and the organization and valuation of work, the distribution of rights and claims to shares of the aggregate social product, and . . . the design of political institutions" (Gil 1976: 92). Accordingly, the different institutions of society cannot function as isolated fragments. They should all operate as an integrated whole to ensure genuine social development.

These views demonstrate that social development should be based on the avoidance of exploitation and domination of human beings and natural resources in the name of development. Internal processes of social development should get preference over development beyond a society's boundaries . . . "since foreign exploitation and domination always involve exploitative and domineering human relations within a society by powerful, ruling elites towards large
segments of their own people" (Ibid). Critics argue that internal and external exploitation and oppression complement and reinforce each other. Genuine social development can never result from such attitudes and actions. It can only represent a pseudo-type or illusion of true social development.

The value of socialist development, so the proponents of this approach argue, is the fact that no special privileges will be available for anyone on the basis of interest, race, class or colour. Production is based on and expanded to meet the needs of all working people. This prospect will inevitably lead to a confrontation with business and industry which operate on different values. The socialist alternative is not only a vision of a democratic, non-racial capitalist society for South Africa. "The alternative is grounded... in the understanding that the irreconcilable clash over the question of democracy in South Africa is rooted, not in inherent racial (or cultural) antagonism, but in an irreconcilable conflict of class interest... between the interest of the capitalist class in maintaining a system of profit to benefit the few, and the interest of the working people (and, for that matter most of the middle class) in a planned and democratically organized economy to serve the needs of the overwhelming majority" (Legassick 1985: 589). In South Africa ownership of production is not only concentrated in the hands of the White minority, it is also controlled by a minority of industrial-mining-financial monopolies. Taking these productive resources as well as the land into "democratic social ownership will be the key to transforming the economy" (Ibid: 592). This trend, not to only dismantling apartheid, but also to end capitalism, is not only evident amongst organized worker unions and youth movements; it also transpired during interviews with some stakeholders in the welfare arena. Capitalism has been identified as the enemy of the Black working class (The Star: 2 May 1985). Apartheid is seen as a "means of sustaining the profits, domination, and survival of the capitalist class and its system" (Legassick 1985: 589).

The socialist vision is rooted in the widespread identification of apartheid and capitalism as the basic problem in South Africa. Considering these alternatives against the background of the often stated concept of a "Workers' State", then the aspirations are clearly for a socialist alternative, although it might not always be called so. The final objective of the struggle for democracy and liberation is for a government capable of removing poverty, low wages, lack of jobs and homes, inferior education, health and welfare services, which are direct consequences of apartheid and
capitalism together. Legassick says "the point about socialist reconstruction is not merely that it serves the redistribution of wealth, but that it provides for the expanded production of wealth, by breaking the fetters imposed by capitalism" (Ibid: 592).

The critical question concerning socialist development is whether the conditions for the unfolding of such a system are present. The dominant beliefs and values of a society, and the customs and traditions which derive from them, exert a significant influence on what we can do to restructure society. At the moment South Africa operates on a capitalist base, with capitalist values. The other question is to what extent would external factors allow a socialist alternative to emerge and develop in South Africa? Moreover, countries which have applied the socialist alternative have serious growth problems. In fact, in most instances the system has collapsed.

7.4.3 The development dilemma: Some explanations

Despite the fact that economic factors are central determinants of the quality of life, the circumstances of living, and human relationships within society, there seems to be various reasons for the failure of development strategies to effectively eliminate poverty. Experience has shown that economic issues should not operate in isolation from social policies. Thus, social policy should operate within the context of public policy in general, but in particular within the framework of economic policy. Growth without redistribution of resources in the wider society has been identified as a major problem.

Another related problem is power and influence. The tendency is to "allocate the use of resources away from meeting the economically low-value needs of the poor and the powerless in order to devote them to meeting the economically higher value wants of the wealthy and the powerful" (Korten 1991: 3). In so doing, the poor have been marginalized in ever-growing numbers. Recent adjustments in the development arena, where the market is supposed to play a more-and-more important role, offer no real solution to the dilemma. The question is: Who owns the market? And the answer is: The wealthy and the powerful. Moreover, the market constitutes new powerful forces "that are working inexorably to transfer economic and political power away from people and even governments to the impersonal and wholly unaccountable institutions that control
transnational flows of capital" (Korten 1991: 4).

International power relations also play their part. Factors impinging on national affairs are: International Corporations, world capitalism, and the influence of powerful countries. These factors determine State dependency in political-economic terms. Without going into the whole issue of "contemporary imperialism", it is necessary to repeat that countries are dependent upon one another to an ever-growing extent. "The political decisions of a State's leaders are never taken in isolation. Each country affects and is affected by others, and today in even more subtle and significant ways" (Pettman 1976: 1).

Global interconnections and interdependence are critical factors. Although the reality of the State in terms of its territorial boundaries might give the impression of independence, the single locus of authority, i.e formal recognition by other States, is essential. The world is a complex web of human relations, defined not only in territorial State terms, but also in others. Besides State involvement in the affairs of other States, overt or covert, directly or indirectly, there are other groups and international organizations that also impinge on what leaders can do, and that influence the autonomy of a country. This type of dependence and interdependence affects a country's decision-making capacity. No country can implement its own policies without taking into account outside influence. "In the long term the equation may be quite complex, since a country that pursues autonomy by, for example, cutting itself away from world trade or diplomatic exchange, may so weaken its comparative economic or military position as to jeopardise absolutely its very existence" (Pettman 1976: 3). Pettman continues by saying:

"In general, however, a country that can operate independent of events, actions, or processes in the rest of the world is one, we may assume, that is comparatively independent of others for its resources or its ideological rationale" (Ibid).

It is therefore possible that States might sacrifice their economic autonomy, and this will ultimately impinge upon their political autonomy. Any individual country's social and political policy has global implications.

Other variables influencing national affairs may be termed "transnational actors". World capitalism has been called "contemporary imperialism". "Capitalism came to encompass the globe and in
doing so established a predominant influence over world development and the pattern of social and political relationships therein" (Pettman 1976: 5). Harry Magdoff summarizes:

"The more powerful capitalist nations grafted their mode of production onto the rest of the world. They thus went beyond the traditional looting and tribute-gathering of former empires, arrangements which merely drained off the surplus of often relatively stagnant colonial production systems. The imposition of capitalist relations, by force and overwhelming economic power, created sources of expanding production and surplus value of continuous benefit to the leading capitalist nations. The world capitalist system which evolved . . . had two historically new features; (a) the institution of an international division of labour between manufacturing nations and those that mainly supply raw materials and food; and (b) the creation of a hierarchy in which the overwhelming majority of nations and people were, to a greater or lesser degree, economically and financially dependent on a few centres of industry and banking" (1972: 4).

Korten agrees that the capitalist economy, which operates on the principle of private ownership, creates a problem. Inherently, private ownership is not in itself bad, Korten explains. The difference nowadays he says seems to be that traditionally the owner of private assets was an identifiable person, known to the people of his/her community, was presumed to control the use of capital, and ultimately to be accountable under the law for its use. What we have at present is the professionalization of corporate management, a broadening of participation in stock ownership, and the emergence of investment funds and institutions that manage other people's money. These developments have contributed to separating the management of capital from its ownership. A further stage in the process of professionalization and institutionalization is the transnationalization of capital. Korten continues:

"This new stage has given birth to transnational capital as a largely autonomous force that transcends national interests, has allegiance to no State, and is committed primarily to the search for new market shares" (Ibid: 4).

He says further:

"Accountable only to itself, transnational capital represents free-floating economic power, unattached to people or place, mocking the power of both State and people, and rendering democratic institutions impotent as instruments of citizen control" (Ibid).
This situation, according to Korten, represents the ultimate separation of power from place and people.

This assessment demonstrates that theories of development can make a major contribution to improve the quality of life, but that they are seriously constrained by power relations, national and international factors.

7.5 VIEWS ON POST-APARTHEID SOCIAL WELFARE

The author now goes on to evaluate the views as expressed by stakeholders in the welfare field. These views are assessed in terms of their viability and their appropriateness to address post-apartheid issues and problems. When assessing the views of stakeholders, it is important to bear in mind the time and context in which they were expressed. The government at the time of the interviews had little legitimacy in the eyes of the disenfranchised majority. This resulted in a rejection of virtually every policy direction attempted by the government within the apartheid ideological frame of reference.

Respondents focused in particular on the shortcomings of social welfare and adopted a strong normative approach in terms of the contributions that it can make to improve the quality of life. Social welfare, in the opinion of so many interviewees, is in need of a completely new orientation if it is to contribute to social development. While social welfare had tremendous potential for redistributing resources and addressing basic human needs, it can only do so if it adopts a comprehensive and coherent approach. Apart from basic needs, social welfare should also concern itself with long-term developmental goals. Should social welfare continue to operate according to its traditional and conventional values, its contribution will be severely limited. Critics argued that social welfare, in its traditional and current approaches, entrenched poverty and inequalities. In this way it creates dependency and alienation of service users. Moreover, social welfare deals with symptoms rather than root causes. Respondents did not deny that the present system has utility, but its inherent ability to deal with poverty and inequality was doubted. How was the present system to be transformed so as to rid it of previous practices and make it responsive to contemporary realities?
Social welfare will be severely constrained as long as it is viewed in isolation from prevailing economic and political systems of the country. The problem seems to be a structural one, and it is questioned whether social welfare is indeed able to solve problems which have a structural cause. Thus the tendency of social welfare is to deal with the symptoms of problems, rather than their causes in a preventive way.

Because of its limitations mentioned, social welfare tends to respond in a technical fashion to human needs instead of concerning itself with development and enablement. The impact of social welfare would be much more effective if a stronger people-centred approach (as advocated by the RDP) were adopted.

A number of principles and philosophies were raised in this regard. It was suggested that social welfare should:

- operate as a system to meet basic human needs, to eradicate inequalities, and pursue development goals;

- abandon the residual principle and move towards a more social democratic philosophy;

- be based and operate on humanitarian and egalitarian principles;

- not only respect human dignity, but also restore human dignity and self-reliance;

- be a mutual endeavour, with meaningful participation of all stakeholders and beneficiaries;

- divert from its short-term crisis orientation to an enabling approach;

- be transformed to adapt to the new political frame of reference.
Meaningful participation, and partnerships between all stakeholders in the welfare field, were emphasized as a good welfare principle. The State should however take over-all and primary responsibility for social welfare. Privatization was not rejected, but it should operate within a legitimate political framework and in consultation with the State and other stakeholders. Where social welfare functions are merely transferred to the market, the impact will be restraint. The private market is not accountable to the public, and therefore should not be entrusted with this kind of responsibility.

Various ideas and suggestions were brought forward for improving the potential of social welfare. To deal with the legacies of the past, a two-pronged approach would be necessary, first to respond immediately to the basic needs of those who have been neglected, and secondly to introduce social development approaches. Notwithstanding the limitations highlighted, a particularly important role was envisaged for social welfare during post-apartheid reconstruction and development.

On an intermediate and short-term basis, social welfare should continue to respond to basic human needs and pursue social development approaches. In the long term, social welfare should adopt a new approach, operating as a mechanism that redistributes economic resources, simultaneously pursuing developmental goals. Once basic needs have been met, then we need to devise models for sustainable development and distribution of resources on a continuous basis.

That social welfare should move away from its residual, short-term, crisis orientation to a well-planned long-term developmental and preventive approach was recurrently sounded throughout the field research. Developmental Social Welfare was not only seen as a goal, it was emphasized as a guiding principle for a post-apartheid South Africa, including development, empowerment, enabling, prevention, and self-reliance. "A new welfare system should be aimed at building the community, building the family, and enhancing the family's ability to provide for themselves" (Wilgerspruit Fellowship Centre, Johannesburg). For Developmental Social Welfare to be successful, it should be structured within the broader framework of development theories.
Nation-building was emphasized as a key element of Developmental Social Welfare. Nation-building, it was believed, would deal with the legacies of the past, unite a divided society, develop a common value-base, develop human resources, and ensure self-reliance. The participation of people in all aspects of their welfare, including the designing and implementation of social welfare policy, was desirable.

Another issue that should be taken into account within the developmental approach is what is usually termed the "First-World Third-World dichotomy". "While Blacks are still at the level of basic needs, Whites are at the level of social needs". This raised basic questions, in particular with regard to the structuring and concentration of welfare services. A basic needs approach would imply some kind of differentiation, in practice (if not in theory) on race grounds, something rejected in a non-racial democracy and the Interim Constitution. Policy and planning should therefore operate at the central level, but with implementation and provision on regional and local levels. It might (initially) however be necessary for the central government to focus particularly on certain regions in order to address the grossest of the imbalances.

Partnerships in the provision and rendering of social services should assist the government in its welfare task. A particular role is foreseen for organized business and for NGO's. Organized business and other employers should not only contribute to economic growth and development, but should play a central role in promoting social welfare. This can only materialize when employers look beyond their own workers and the workplace. However, it is realized that this is a thorny issue. Employers operate on business principles in a capitalist market, not on social welfare values. Their role and contribution will differ from that of the government. It might take a long time to bring about a re-orientation in this respect, if indeed it were possible at all.

The view was also expressed that welfare should be a central issue for trade unions. Workers should have a say in how wealth should be redistributed through a system of social welfare. Trade unions should be the guardians of the people's welfare. They should apply their bargaining power acquired during the struggle against apartheid to improve the welfare of members.
Against this background, it seems obvious that welfare organizations will have to redefine their roles and develop a vision of the kind of society that we want to live in, and work for it. This also applies to social workers and training institutions. (In summarizing what the research respondents have said on such and several points, the author's comment is that their views were sometimes, if not Utopian, then unrealistic.)

Divergent views were raised concerning a Welfare State for a post-apartheid South Africa. While there was agreement that the State should provide some basic services to all citizens, it was said that education, housing, and health care are basic rights, and the State should ensure that everybody is provided with these. Here again, some thought such services should be provided by the State, while others felt that people should be enabled, through development, to provide for themselves. So, on the whole, there seemed to be qualified support for a Welfare State of some kind.

Assessing these views, there seems to be a paradox between the visions expressed for social welfare and practical mechanisms proposed for meeting needs. A theme which came through very strongly was that social welfare should adopt a developmental approach. This approach is necessary to ensure self-reliance and to empower those who have been neglected historically. How this should take place, and exactly what is meant by it, is not clear. At the same time a Welfare State approach is emphasized as a distributive mechanism to meet basic human needs. A Welfare State approach has the potential to create dependency and may have serious problems if there is not sufficient economic growth.

7.6 SOLUTIONS OFFERED BY THE RDP

Political transformation and the establishment of an inclusive democracy in South Africa is creating tremendous expectations for a better life over the entire spectrum of society. Legacies of the past include extreme social and economic inequalities, and chronic poverty among a large section of the population. Can these expectations be met? How are poverty and inequality to be ameliorated? How are the basic needs of people to be met? The Reconstruction and Development Programme was formulated in the expectation that it would provide answers. The
programme has particular relevance for social welfare as a system, and for social work as a profession.

The RDP is a comprehensive approach. It claims to be an integrated, coherent, socio-economic policy framework in which the needs of people and resources are matched. Within this framework the government aims to develop a detailed legislative programme. In a real sense the RDP represents a package of government policies and programmes which has emerged through a process of consultation with a wide range of Non-Governmental Organizations and research organizations. It is not clear to what extent business and industry have been consulted in a similar way, nor their role in drawing up the programme. This may be a weakness since the economic sector is supposed to provide the resources to be distributed by the RDP. This causes a dilemma for its economic feasibility and has the potential for conflict with the economic sector. It also has implications for the successful implementation of the programme. Nonetheless, it is envisaged that this process of consultation and joint policy formulation will be ongoing, as the RDP develops into an effective programme of the government. The RDP, an inclusive approach to development and the implementation of policy, represents a unique South African development approach, designed by South Africans. Previous development attempts, based as they were on the apartheid ideology, had very limited success. It is claimed that the RDP is designed to be a programme that is achievable and sustainable, meeting the objectives of freedom and improved standards of living for all South Africans, within a peaceful and stable society.

Six basic ideas underlie the political and economic philosophy of the RDP.

* An integrated and sustainable programme

It is recognized that the legacies of the past cannot be overcome with piece-meal and unco-ordinated policies. The RDP is supposed to bring together strategies and resources in a coherent and purposeful effort that can be sustained in the future. It is envisaged that these strategies will be implemented at the national, Provincial, and local levels by government, parastatals, and organizations within civil society working within the framework of the RDP. To achieve the objectives of the RDP, a partnership is envisaged between the State and the private sector.
* The programme is essentially a people-driven process

It is recognized that its people are the country's most important asset. The RDP therefore is focused on people's most immediate needs. In turn, it relies on their energies to drive the process of meeting these needs. This development process is to take place regardless of race or sex, or whether people are rural or urban, rich or poor. Together, South Africans must shape their future. Development envisaged by the RDP is not about the delivery of goods or hand-outs, it is about active involvement and growing empowerment of the citizenry.

* The programme is closely bound up with peace and security

Peace and security must involve all people and must build on and expand the National Peace Initiative. Addressing the basic needs of people implies also addressing issues of peace and security. Security forces have found it difficult to perform their duties in the past, since they were so closely linked with the apartheid system. The intention is that reconstruction and development should give them legitimacy, and reflect the national and gender character of the country. Non-partisan, professional security forces should uphold the Constitution and respect human rights. The judicial system must reflect society's racial and gender composition, and provide fairness and equality before the law.

* It is a programme of nation-building

The policies of the past might no longer be those of the new government, but the structures of society with their divisions and inequalities, poverty, and illiteracy still exist. The RDP is saying that we cannot perpetuate these divisions and disparities. Nation-building seeks to build a South Africa that can support the development of the whole Southern African region. Nation-building is also the basis on which the country is to take up an effective role within the world community.

* The RDP links Reconstruction and Development

Reconstruction and development are regarded as parts of an integrated development process. This is in contrast to the commonly held view that growth and development, or growth and redistribution, are processes that contradict each other and operate separately.
The RDP intends to break decisively with this approach. It attempts to integrate growth, development, reconstruction, and redistribution into a unified programme. This calls for an infrastructure that will provide people's access to modern and effective services like electricity, water, telecommunications, transport, health, education, and training. The emphasis is strongly on human resource development, which in turn should lead to increased output in all sectors of the economy. The RDP argues that success in linking reconstruction and development is essential if we are to achieve peace and security for all.

* The RDP is based on thorough-going democratization of South Africa

Minority control and privilege in every facet of society are regarded as the main obstructions to developing an integrated programme. Thorough-going democratization of society is integral to the whole RDP. Fundamental changes are envisaged in the way that policies are made and programmes implemented. According to the RDP, the people affected must participate in decision-making. This should apply not only to the State, but also in civil society. Democracy in this regard is seen as an active process of enabling everybody to contribute to reconstruction and development.

Based on the above principal ideas, five major policy programmes are envisaged.

* Meeting basic human needs

The first priority would be to meet the basic needs of people. These include jobs, land, housing, water, a clean and healthy environment, nutrition, health care, and social welfare. Such would be the beginning in rebuilding family and community life. Programmes are set out for the next five years in which the people will be involved in decision-making.

* Developing of human resources

The RDP attempts to be a people-centred programme, involving citizens in decision-making, in implementation, in new job opportunities requiring new skills, and in managing and governing society. Education and training programmes are regarded as crucial. Objectives cover education from primary to tertiary level, from child care to advanced scientific and technological training. The underlying approach is that education and
training should be available to all from cradle to grave. Furthermore, the RDP takes a broad view of education and training, seeing it not only as what occurs in schools and colleges, but in all areas of society - - the home, workplaces, public works, and youth programmes in urban and rural areas.

* Building the economy
Economic growth and development constitute the broad framework for social reform. The aim is to promote a strong economy and to address serious weaknesses such as racial and gender inequalities in ownership, in employment and in skills. Central to building the economy, is the question of worker rights. Imbalances of power between employers and workers need remedy. Structures should be created to ensure that labour plays an effective role in the RDP. The RDP itself envisages that the rebuilding of the South African economy cannot take place in isolation from the country's Southern African neighbours.

* Democratizing the State and Society
Democratization is integral to the RDP, democracy, development, and a people-centred approach forming its core. The role of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is set out, as are the roles of national, Provincial and local government, the administration of justice, the public sector, parastatals, the police and security forces, NGOs, and a democratic information system.

* Implementing the RDP
Implementation raises many challenges. It involves processes and forms of participation that are very different from the old South African order. A major question concerning the RDP is the cost implications for its successful implementation. On how costs are to be covered, the RDP is less explicit.

Where social welfare policy is concerned, the RDP places it in the context of social reconstruction, development, and affirmative action. It is envisaged that social welfare would empower people, and assist them to become active participants. The State, operating at national, Provincial, district, and community levels, has a key role, as following:
* The responsibility for setting, monitoring, and maintaining national standards for the provision of social services, and for the education and training of staff

* Co-ordinating the provision of services and the most effective use of resources, in active partnership with communities, service users, families, care givers, and with the voluntary sector

* The responsibility for ensuring that the different structures within the public sector operate in a coherent and co-ordinated way

* The State Department of Social Welfare and Development should have a strategic role to play in implementing the RDP, ensuring that, through the employment of development workers, there is direct communication between communities and government in meeting needs

* Social welfare is to be a comprehensive, integrated system of social services and benefits, acting as a redistribution mechanism in bringing about progressive change in the social, economic, political, cultural, and physical conditions of people, especially the poorest

* Social welfare therefore includes the basic right to shelter, food, health, employment, education, and to those aspects that promote the physical, social, and emotional well-being of all the people in society.

Social welfare policy in the RDP is based on the human dignity of all in South Africa and on the importance of the family. Within this value framework, the goals of social welfare will include the following:

* The attainment of basic social welfare rights for all South Africans, irrespective of race, colour, religion, gender, or physical disability, through the establishment of a democratically-determined, just, and effective social delivery system
* The redressing of past imbalances through a deliberate process of affirmative action in respect of those who have been historically disadvantaged.

* The empowerment of individuals, families, and communities to participate in the process of deciding on the range of needs and problems to be addressed through local, provincial, and national initiatives.

The values and principles underpinning Developmental Social Welfare, are the following:

* Equity
People have the right to fair treatment, based on their past and present contributions to society, except where the inability of individuals to contribute to society, by work or in other ways, is beyond their control.

* Accessibility
Services must be accessible, not only in terms of physical proximity, but also in terms of language and the elimination of bureaucratic red tape.

* Democracy
The interests and needs of all should be represented, planned for, and implemented through a democratic process, opportunities being offered through local district and Provincial social welfare and development structures.

* Community Participation
People affected by social problems or needs must have access to and be part of decision-making structures which attempt to resolve these problems.

* Accountability
Officials and civil servants will be accountable for the quality of services rendered.

* Equality
Benefits will be allocated in a way which will help to equalize the distribution of resources and opportunities in society

* Social services as a right
All those who require services should feel free to apply for them without fear of being treated as second class citizens

* Decentralization
Services will be planned and developed at as local a level as possible, to allow for maximum community user participation and access; decentralization, however, will have to be balanced by the need to redistribute resources from areas with greater resources to areas with fewer resources.

These goals and principles of Developmental Social Welfare as envisaged by the RDP are broad and general. However the role of social welfare may become clearer when we answer the question on the mechanisms for achieving the RDP goals.

To ensure that social welfare accomplish the anticipated objectives will require a comprehensive review of all policies and legislation regulating social welfare, social work, and social security. In particular the National Welfare Act, the Fund-Raising Act, the South African Social Work Act, and Acts dealing with child and family welfare, will have to be reviewed. New umbrella legislation, providing the framework for a development-oriented social welfare system based on principles of equality, equity, access, user involvement and empowerment, and public accountability, must be developed.

Although divergent views exist on development, the advantage with the RDP is the common understanding of the realities that it should resolve. There is wide consensus that backlogs should be eradicated. Widespread agreement about the specific social needs which the policy aims to meet is a very important starting point. However, while the RDP provides us with a broad frame of reference to deal with basic needs and issues of development, some believe that the RDP lacks a sound theoretical base, and therefore they raise questions about its viability and sustainability.
It is said that while the moral and ethical rationale of the RDP are clearly defined, the theoretical assumptions are not clearly framed.

The RDP returns to the notion of the basic needs approach with government intervention to effect it (See Chapter Two). The assumption is that the market is incapable of dealing with a legacy where people have been systematically deprived of rights, opportunities, and resources to satisfy their basic needs. The question now is how far should the government get involved and what should be the role of the market? Can the meeting of basic needs be left to the market, or should the government regulate it? It is interesting to note in this regard that "the RDP is by no means anti-market, but it realistically accepts that the market is incapable of effecting major structural reform". It says "to rely solely on the market at present would be to continue the path of stagnation . . . The RDP seeks to develop conditions that will allow market forces to be more effective within a larger and restructured economy" (South African Labour Bulletin 1994: 42). A major dilemma of the RDP is the fact that it is based on an economic system (capitalism) which is hostile to social welfare.

There is a danger that the RDP, with its strong emphasis on basic needs and material means, may focus too much on technical ways of dealing with poverty. Although this approach is indeed important, alternative means need to be explored and evaluated in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. However, unless the underlying theory, goals and values are clear, and are constantly kept in mind as main criteria for policy evaluation and development, the current status quo may soon return. Addressing poverty, particularly structural poverty, is not only a matter of income and wealth distribution. It requires restructuring of social and economic relations, and progressive social policies based on theories of growth and sustainable development.

The RDP's basic needs approach is certainly a welfare approach. This approach has certain limitations which should be taken into account. Some of the limitations and criticisms of a basic needs approach have been highlighted, inter alia:

* Attention is directed away from some more fundamental issues, focusing only on the
Another criticism is "that it is often conceptually imprecise in certain respects, especially in relation to mass participation and the redistribution of power, political and administrative problems of transition, and to class and group conflicts" (Beg et al 1980: 756).

Marginal policies designed to improve basic needs in isolation of other aspects of the economic, political, and social system are unlikely to have lasting success, and are particularly unlikely to result in a sustained redistribution of income (Standing and Szal 1979: 12).

The basic needs approach cannot work unless the basic and structural causes of poverty and inequality are addressed. Since there are structural factors that create, intensify, and perpetuate poverty and inequality, these should be dealt with in terms of specific policies.

"Unless the social relationships of production and distribution were changed, even a comprehensive redistribution of income would soon give way to a pattern of inequality which that redistribution was designed to overcome" (Ibid). Unless there is a focus on structural issues, piece-meal policies and the provision of services are unlikely to bring about fundamental change.

In Guyana it was found that the welfare of the people did not improve even though the government applied the basic needs approach. Poverty and inequality persisted, and reflected "the barriers to the transformation of the economic and social structure erected in the course of the contrived stagnation of Guyana before independence" (Ibid: 77).

When we adopt the basic needs approach, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the international arena there is a declining interest in basic needs (Vos 1987: 38). Critics often express this view in any one of the following statements:
* Basic needs strategies do not work in practice

* Priority should be given to stabilization and adjustment rather than to development and redistribution

* Development policies should be more market-oriented

* A trade-off exists between basic needs and growth (Ibid).

Diagnosis of the basic needs to be satisfied, and the relevant policies in this regard, are essential. The fundamental task is to organize systems in society in such a way that the needs of all are met adequately, not only the needs of some.

The central idea of the RDP, as stated, is capacity-building and empowerment. Access to and control over resources are consequently important principles for empowerment and human resource development. The question that needs to be answered is whether these objectives can be obtained by the basic needs approach? The aim with this approach seems to be in the first place to address backlogs, and secondly also to tackle structural poverty and institutionalized inequality. This to my mind is an anomaly. How is the RDP to address structural issues with a basic needs approach? The significance of the RDP however seems to be the fact that social welfare as a system would not operate in isolation from other systems providing for basic human needs. The RDP attempts to integrate social welfare into a comprehensive strategy for socio-economic and political development. It meaningfully links social welfare with other sectors such as education, health, housing, agriculture, etc. It is envisaged that all these sectors would now operate as an integrated whole for development.

The basic needs approach has some potential only if it is productivity-oriented, aiming at increasing the productive income of the poor and strengthening the basis for long-term self-generating development (Maurice Williams as quoted by Madison 1980: 59).
Some of the requirements needed for the basic needs approach to succeed are that people should have the opportunity to articulate their needs to the authorities. They must be free to take action to satisfy these needs, and if necessary assisted to do so. The question remains: What are the basic needs, experienced by whom, and defined by whom? In this regard there appear to be two levels of needs, material and social.

Planning is vital if growth and redistribution is to take place. Distribution of the benefits of growth should get greater attention. Since certain basic needs are best satisfied within the confines of the market, income is necessary. There are however some needs that can be satisfied outside the market by the people themselves. Access to the land therefore is necessary for subsistence. So are increased employment and income-earning opportunities for rural inhabitants.

A further and most important question is: does the country possess sufficient potential and the actual resources to satisfy the basic needs of the population as envisaged by the RDP, or is an increase in production required? If sufficient resources exist, then we may look for a more equitable distribution of income and resources. In that sense the RDP will be useful since the main emphasis of this programme seems to be on resource redistribution rather than resource generating. The RDP is not a resource-generating programme, at least not in its initial stages, though in the long run it might well be. "Once primed and the process of social advancement begun, there is reason to believe that a more fully employed, better educated and housed, better fed and healthier population will be more creative, energetic and productive" (Jones 1990: 286).

Another short-coming of the RDP is that its ideas are very much goal-directed, instead of principally focusing on how anticipated objectives are to be achieved. There seems to be a paradox between the underlying philosophy of people-centred development and the provision of tangible goods and services (e.g. houses, clinics, and schools) within a specific period. Moreover, the way the ideals of the RDP are stated suggests that the government is to be responsible for the provision of all these services.

While there is wide consensus on what the RDP says about the meeting of basic needs and developing of human resources, this is not matched by consensus on industrial policy and the financial sector (Business Mail 1994). Although production and growth are critical issues to make
resources available, the RDP talks vaguely about economic growth and development. It does not say how growth and development are going to take place. Consequently, despite the fact that the RDP is all about the distribution of economic resources, it does not have a clear and explicit economic framework for generating these resources. This weakness of the RDP puts into question its attainability and sustainability. A delicate balance needs to be established between the aims of the RDP to meet basic needs and the productive base to produce the resources. While some seem to recognize this reality, others are of the opinion that the objectives of the RDP should not be watered down. There is also a concern that the RDP might become limited to be only a social net to cushion the effect of economic, political, and social transformation.

In addition to the economic viability of the RDP, other issues of major importance are bureaucratic constraints. There is a long and complicated process between policy statement, policy implementation, the actual delivery of the services, and the results of that policy. Within this context we need to bear in mind the politics of policy implementation as an important constraining factor.

With its emphasis on backlogs and basic needs, the question is whether the RDP can bring about development or will it become "institutionalized charity"? Although the RDP is clear about empowerment and people-centred development, it is not clear how this will come about. This is a basic question for the RDP and Developmental Social Welfare to answer. For many years social welfare grappled with this question. In practice the easy option seems to be handing out, instead of development. Development does not only take time and effort, it requires a different approach. These are critical choices which arise from the people-centred vision of the RDP.

Development requires the stimulation of people's inherent capabilities and the acquiring of skills to help themselves. "A central proposition of this approach is that development occurs inside people; either they do it themselves or it does not happen at all. It follows that it is simply not possible to give or to hand out 'development' to people. People can indeed be given objects (goods and services) but if 'development' is to occur they have to get actively involved themselves. In short, they have to learn to 'deliver' their own development i.e. to become more self-reliant" (van Zyl 1994: 194). This approach to development is in sharp contrast to
"institutionalized charity". What is required here is "a radical change in mind set about development, away from the traditional authoritarian style of previous governments, towards a bottom-up, enabling and people-centred approach" (Ibid: 199).

There are probably various ways to realize the RDP objectives. We might rely on the goodwill of all sectors or else we might revert to coercion or social engineering as was done under apartheid. Currently it appears that there is wide agreement about the vision and the objectives of the RDP. But can the anticipated objectives actually be realized? The mere fact that so many agree with the RDP objectives might well turn out to be a weakness of the RDP. As Saul says:

"The RDP's picture of the South African development effort is relatively contradiction-free; everyone, capitalists and shanty-town dwellers alike, has more or less the same interests and can be served by more or less the same policies" (1994: 38)

A dilemma for the achievement of its objectives is the fact that the RDP is faced with structural realities and political compromises, both being characteristics of post-apartheid South Africa. These are major impediments in attaining the specific objectives of the RDP.

Furthermore, the RDP seems to rely strongly on a common vision. But the question is whether South Africa has reached the high level of social discipline, of accord between State and citizens, that normally exists in more homogeneous societies. What is necessary is a common commitment and constructive debate. But what if this common commitment is not there? I argue that we can only succeed in realizing the objectives of the RDP if good policies are designed and if they are implemented effectively. Such policies should be based on sound theoretical foundations.

This overview clearly reveals the RDP to be an ambitious plan to deal with the legacies of apartheid. The vision of the RDP is the kind of ideal that everybody would embrace, but is it possible? Moreover, these are not entirely new policy objectives. Similar services have been provided in the past and are still being provided. Questions that need to be answered are: What exactly are the short-comings, and how were funds allocated and used in the past? According to Godsell "the sooner the dialogue produces a clearer delineation of the problems, a realistic understanding of alternative solutions, and a collective will to act to solve the issues, the sooner
we will arm a democratic government to properly play its leadership role in creating not only a new South Africa, but also a better South Africa" (1994: 47).

7.7 CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing has illustrated that there are different approaches in dealing with poverty, inequality, and related problems. These approaches, though able to contribute in this regard, are also restricted in many respects. It is difficult to single out one as the "correct" approach. An idea that was raised repeatedly is that social welfare should adopt "a developmental approach". This approach sounds appealing, but it is not clear what exactly people have in mind, nor how the approach should be applied in practice. Presumably, such an approach would require a clear political commitment, a policy framework, and tangible operational activities which are distinguished from present ways of dealing with social issues.

Proposing post-apartheid policy directions may prove to be very complex. In South Africa, we are faced with additional difficulties, some of which are outlined below.

* Lack of common values
Cultural and ethnic heterogeneity is a reality in South Africa. Historically, culturally, ethnically, and racially, South Africa is a heterogenous society. It was exactly for this reason that apartheid was introduced and built up. Certain perceptions, attitudes, and customs exist, which cannot be disregarded. Heterogeneity contains the seeds of conflict. To unite the nation now, and to treat everybody as intrinsically of equal worth, will take time. For this a common value base (as far as possible) will be needed.

* Ideological factors
Ideological and political allegiances are key determinants of social welfare policy. People have different outlooks on life and therefore also have different solutions for problems. However, there is evidence that, for the interim and in the immediate future, basic needs satisfaction, with social welfare taking a central role, is recognized by the majority of people as a sensible strategy.
* Constitutional and institutional reconstruction

The Interim Constitution provides a framework for institutional reconstruction. This is presupposed by the new approaches in social welfare. But such institutional reconstruction has barely begun. Many welfare organizations are still operating within the old parameters. What else are they meanwhile to do? That frustration and uncertainty will develop is predictable. Social change is neither simple, nor easy, and seldom rapid.

* Various models of welfare

Despite different views on how to solve problems, there appears considerable consensus on the role of social welfare in post-apartheid South Africa. There also seems to be wide agreement on the type of welfare model. A recurrent theme was that an integrated welfare system, operating within a broad economic policy and planning framework, was needed. Developmental Social Welfare was emphasised as a guiding principle, basic human needs being addressed and resources being redistributed.

* Different levels of welfare

In the RDP there is a strong emphasis on the meeting of basic needs. But there had been a system of meeting practical basic needs. The dilemma was the unequal basis on which this was done over the years. The issue of concern here is different conceptions of basic needs and the living standards of Whites and their needs. Although the basic needs of everybody should be met, Whites mostly are not at the level of basic needs. They have other social needs. At their level, goods and services no longer satisfy needs directly. Another level or dimension is required to come in between human needs describing the quality of life and economic goods for basic needs. Most Blacks, on the other hand, are short on basic needs, with other needs being seen as secondary. Since basic needs satisfaction will imply some kind of differentiation, how is this issue to be dealt with? It poses a tremendous challenge to policy and planning. Affirmative action is suggested as a possible strategy to deal with the issue. However, there seems to be a contradiction here; while no discrimination on the basis of race is emphasized, affirmative action has strong racial undertones.
* Redistribution of economic resources

Growth and redistribution have been identified as basic welfare principles. How is distribution going to take place, and what should be the role of social welfare?

* Equalization and homogenization

Especially in contemporaneous South Africa, there is a drive for equalization and homogenization of everything in society. Will there be sufficient resources to achieve this and how long will it take? Furthermore, is equalization and homogenization possible in all respects? Has there ever been, anywhere, a truly egalitarian society? It was Rousseau's view that men are born equal. Geneticists do not agree.

* The integration and equalization of different welfare systems into a unitary system under one department

How are different welfare systems to be integrated and equalized? Will there be sufficient resources to do this soon?

* The financial implications for new approaches in social welfare

Development approaches in social welfare may not necessarily have additional financial implications. Instead, in the long run financial dependence might be reduced. However, attending to basic needs, and responding to a wider spectrum of needs and assistance, are almost certain to have financial implications.

* Staff implications for new welfare approaches

Adopting a developmental welfare approach would require from welfare personnel a fundamental refocusing and orientation of their work. New approaches may create uncertainties which might result in resistance. Training and retraining would therefore be required. The RDP makes mention of the deployment of development workers. However at the moment we only have social workers trained in the traditional fashion, who will be largely responsible for the implementation of the RDP in the welfare sector.
* Public policy-making and policy implementation.

Public policy-making is a complex process, requiring different role players. If a common vision is lacking, it will take time to reach consensus. The role of the bureaucracy will be crucial. If public servants do not have the commitment and the vision, new policy directions might not succeed.

* The place of NGOs

NGOs have played a vital role in the past. Not only did they render valuable services, some of them have actively participated in the dismantling of apartheid. Their place and role should be clarified within the new context. Widespread consultation with them will be necessary, and encouragement to perform their functions within a new policy-framework.

* External factors

External factors impinge on the activities and policies of a country in various ways. Big companies and powerful countries dictate to a large extent what policies and approaches are applied. With South Africa now joining the international community, the influence of such factors will increase.

The basic question now is what have we learned from this assessment and what kind of social policies will be appropriate and may be considered. There seems to be wide agreement on the merits of an integrated policy framework for development and the redistribution of the products of such development. In terms of the theories that were covered as well as the views expressed, it is clear that social welfare in South Africa needs to be restructured and refocussed. Restructuring of social welfare will primarily involve an emphasis away from the current residual, therapeutic-oriented model of practice towards a social democratic model with a strong developmental orientation. Developmental Social Welfare with the emphasis on human resource development was highlighted in particular by stakeholders as a serious policy option. The results of the study indicated indisputably that social welfare will have to adopt a developmental approach. This would require a different welfare philosophy as well as a paradigm shift. This paradigm shift is necessary if social welfare wants to make a contribution within a broader
development policy framework. The recommendations are for pro-active, long-term strategies, as well as short-term initiatives. Developmental Social Welfare is emphasized as a process for empowering and liberation, a process that enables people to develop skills and capabilities which increase their control over decisions, resources and structures affecting their lives - the involvement of people in their own development. However, it should be emphasized that the development approach by itself is not the panacea for all problems. We need to plan and replan. Furthermore, given the realities pointed out above, we will have to guard against a single-minded approach. Within our diversified society with its different levels of welfare, this broad developmental approach should provide for integrated welfare strategies. We are now faced with the question pertaining to the potential, viability, and the policy implications of such approaches in welfare.

Although the developmental approach seems to be also the direction preferred by the ROP, the place of social welfare as defined here should be clarified within the context of the ROP. Is social welfare going to operate as a separate system, or will it be integrated into the wider Reconstruction and Development Programme? A study of the ROP reveals that social welfare in South Africa requires fundamental restructuring. This would mean a completely new orientation of social workers and welfare organizations. It seems apparent that welfare agencies would qualify for State subsidization only to the extent that their activities promote the objectives of the RDP in general and Developmental Social Welfare in particular. This would require a different mode of operation in terms of goal achievement. Social workers will have to be trained and retrained in order to equip them for developmental approaches in social welfare.

A rationale for social planning and social development has been established. What is required now are more specific policy directions, in which the content and structures are clearer. Some of these policy directions and principles will be dealt with in Chapter Eight.
8.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the author seeks to answer the questions about policies and strategies which need to be considered when dealing with the issues highlighted in the present work. The chapter sets out guidelines upon which to base a framework for social welfare policy, i.e. for "governmental decisions designed to deal with social problems on which governmental action is considered desirable" (Nagel 1982: xiii). The intention is to examine policy strategies so as to achieve anticipated objectives. Although all relevant factors can of course not be covered, alternative policy objectives and their implications are critical issues to consider.

Public policy-making is a complex process. Many actors are involved, and many factors may affect the outcome. Amid many choices, there are sometimes no dominant guidelines to follow. In designing public policy, one should guard against quick answers, or over-simplification. Much information about, and insight into, prevailing ideologies, dominant values, the nature and operation of the economy, the political system, and political processes in general is required. We therefore need to move beyond a micro-perspective and survey broad political and economic processes in the country.

Public policy-making is not only complex; it is a continuous process. Policies will, in a democracy, be challenged and probably reformulated. Thus, policies can be based only on broad guidelines and basic principles, not on blueprints. After a policy has been adopted and implemented, evaluation and feedback should occur, and changes or adjustments made. Further implementation follows, with more evaluation and feedback, and so the process continues. It might also be necessary to redefine the problems to which the policy is directed. Thus policy-making processes are repetitive. Rational choices and decisions are made continuously. When conditions change, substantial change in the thrust and content of the policy might result. So, when we talk about policy, we have in mind "a continuous and deliberate activity aimed at a remote purpose or ideal which becomes realized progressively according to circumstances,
policies, resistances, stimulating forces and counter forces" (Ponsioen 1962: 18). In this sense policy can be pursued by an individual, an agency or a public authority. Ponsioen further says that social policy can be defined as "a policy which aims at a continual reform of society in order to eliminate weaknesses of individuals or groups in that society. In its progressive realization it assists the weak people, prevents weaknesses, and constructs or ameliorates good situations" (Ibid).

In this respect it is necessary to explore both the potential and the limitations of Developmental Social Welfare in South Africa, including the required policy strategies, guidelines, and operational activities. Questions that need to be considered are: What is meant by a developmental approach to combat poverty, and secondly, what exactly does Developmental Social Welfare mean in practice? Basic questions and issues are raised here in order to develop a framework for policy formation.

8.2 FRAMEWORK FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE SOCIAL POLICIES

This research project had its origin in the extra-parliamentary movement in response to a crisis in social welfare as fundamental social and political changes dawned in South Africa. The crisis revolved around critical issues such as a lack of coherent welfare policies manifested in a fragmented system of welfare, different models of social welfare, racial inequalities in the allocation of welfare resources, and different levels of welfare. The purpose of the inquiry was to conduct a policy-oriented research into social welfare as a system, identifying main issues that would need to be taken into account in designing welfare policy for the future. As Majchrzak says:

"Policy research . . . is the process of conducting research on, or analysis of a fundamental social problem in order to provide policymakers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem" (1984 :12).

Various themes pertaining to social welfare were studied. Chapter Two contains an overview of broad theories within which social welfare operates. This overview forms the framework for the study. In Chapter Three a comprehensive study was undertaken of social welfare as a system to
meet human needs. Using these theoretical foundations, a special study was then made of the emergence and establishment of social welfare in South Africa (see Chapters 4 and 5). Views were collected from stakeholders on post-apartheid welfare policy. Chapter 6 describes this process and its findings. The theories and perspectives that emerged are taken as starting points to propose guidelines for the formulation of social policy. This is done bearing in mind Midgley's point of view that, despite the concern of development theories with progress, they do not provide an adequate basis for social welfare policy in the Third World (1984).

At the outset the point was made that the process of reconstruction can only start after apartheid has been dismantled and replaced by alternative social values and policies. Reconstruction inevitably requires a fundamental transformation of social values and a redistribution of political and economic power. Although a fundamental shift has now occurred in the balance of political power with the establishment of an inclusive democracy, this change needs to be infused with value systems and policies which would ensure that the process of transformation is of real benefit to all citizens in the country. A new thinking is required, rooted in social values that would affect the process of change and the nature of the new society. The political change has created an opportunity for the analysis and development of alternative social policies.

The post-apartheid vision postulated at the beginning of this study implies a desire to replace the old order with one based on social, economic, civil, and political equality, as well as on humanistic values. Apartheid values, it was argued, need to be replaced by alternative values - - - a commitment to an explicit set of values relevant to social policy. Such a commitment is to a large extent ideal-typical. In real life it can take years, even decades, to realize such an ideal. The only advantage is that we are currently passing through a process of fundamental change which gives us the opportunity to consider at the same time value premises which, under different circumstances, would be much more difficult to introduce. Developing alternative social policies, and understanding their dynamics and consequences, are only first steps toward comprehensive, internally consistent, and humanly satisfying social policies. These steps must be followed by strategies and consistent political action, continuous planning, and rigorous evaluation.
Since the uncertainties of the past have cleared up to the extent that we have achieved a negotiated political settlement, a clearer picture of political scenarios and social realities has emerged. The fundamental question that now needs to be answered is how to convert these scenarios and realities into policy strategies. It is of paramount importance for developmental approaches to include justice, equity, and the involvement of people in their own development. Social development has been identified as a process for empowerment and liberation, a process that enables people to develop skills and capabilities which increase their control over decisions, resources, and structures affecting their lives. In practice this potential seems to be severely constrained. It is important to recognize both the potential and the limitations of social development in bringing about "authentic" development.

In this study the concepts reconstruction, transformation, and restructuring are used interchangeably. The question is: What do they mean for social welfare? Judging by what stakeholders in the welfare field say, they want to "restructure" social welfare away from the apartheid ideological framework to a non-discriminatory, egalitarian, developmental frame of reference. It has been argued in this study that traditional welfare approaches, and in particular the apartheid ideological framework, not only failed to meet the basic needs of a large section of the population, but were ineffective, discriminatory, and favoured one section of society. Against this backdrop, restructuring aims to rearrange traditional approaches, give new content to existing systems of social welfare, and to introduce developmental approaches. Thus, by restructuring is meant a process of reorganization of services, and a re-allocation of resources, applying innovative approaches in order to make the existing system of social welfare more functional and efficient. In this sense, restructuring does not really alter the substance of the existing system. Instead, it reorganizes social services, adjusting them in response to the prevailing issues and new objectives. Since restructuring does not have fundamental transformation as its objective, it may be regarded as conservative and piece-meal. Restructuring should therefore be merely seen as an important starting point towards a more fundamental transformation of social welfare.

Various factors shape the policy-making process. In most circumstances political and economic constraints narrow the range of policy options. Political feasibility and economic affordability are critical factors. However, no one factor or constraint is dominant enough to substantially ease the
task of policy-makers (Edwards et al 1978: 263). Because of this dilemma, policy-makers adopt an incrementalist approach to policy formation. Incremental changes are relatively easy to make. A restricted number of alternatives are considered at a time, while policy is made and remade continuously in a chain of incremental steps. The problem with this type of policy-making is that policy-makers do not really solve problems through such decisions, they just try to make improvements. Incremental changes seldom come near to fundamental changes or "issues of ultimate principle".

The development of alternative social policies involves determining the nature and scope of issues and needs. Key variables are resource development, status allocation of those at whom the policy is aimed, and the distribution of rights in order to achieve selected policy objectives. These must be applied in substantive strategies and programmes which in turn must be incorporated into the newly-generated policies.

Broadly speaking, the process of policy analysis and development is to be carried out on three levels:

(i) The specification of policy objectives with reference to the issues identified;

(ii) How specific policies are to bring about a modification in the over-all quality of life, the circumstances of living, and the intra-societal human relations, including key processes through which this should take place;

(iii) Interaction between specific policies and the forces affecting their development and implementation. (It is important to anticipate the fate of proposed policies in a given context. Newly proposed policies need to take into account power relations and political forces which may promote or resist such policies.)

Discussion of a framework for the development of alternative social policies should focus on various issues and principles. In starting the policy process, decision-makers need solid evidence (facts or data) on the nature of the issues, and the anticipated impact of the policy. To deal with
all these issues and questions in detail will be an enormous task. The aim in the present study therefore is merely to identify and highlight some main policy-directions. These need to be researched and discussed in greater detail.

What now is the process and what are the criteria to bring about the restructuring of social welfare? Some of the key issues are identified and discussed.

8.2.1 The Specific Issues and Needs which the Policy aims to resolve

Basic questions here are: What are the specific issues and needs which this policy aims to resolve and what constitutes its focus? Is there consensus about these issues? If there is not consensus, who advocates the policy and why? Policy-makers must have a clear notion of problems as they exist at present and how they may possibly change when the new policies are implemented. Should there be any disagreement concerning the problems that exist, it is likely that there will also be different views on the best way to deal with them.

The analysis and development of alternative social policies is a systematic process which starts with valid and reliable information concerning clearly identified societal issues, followed by specific policies to deal with them. The objective of policy development is either to design alternative policies to achieve the same objectives more efficiently, or to achieve different objectives which derive from different value premises.

Policy-making is often regarded as a rational process in which policy-makers identify social issues, explore all the alternative solutions, forecast all the benefits and costs of each alternative solution, compare benefits to costs for each solution, and then select the best ratio of benefits to costs (DiNitto and Dye 1983: 2). Policy formulation based on rational analysis will probably need to follow procedures such as outlined below.

* Identify the problem and its causes. State whether there is a problem, why is it a problem, and agree that there is a need to resolve the problem.
* All the values of society must be known and weighed.

* Clarify and rank goals. What should be done about the problem?

* Collect the relevant data for meeting the goal.

* Identify alternatives, predict the consequences of each alternative, and assess them according to efficiency and equity.

* Having considered all possible alternatives, select the alternative that comes closest to achieving the goal, taking into account costs and equity.

In practice such a rational and orderly process is hardly followed. In fact it is virtually impossible to work with social realities in such a clinical fashion. "Instead, policy-making is an ambiguous, complex, and conflictual process which cannot be broken down into neat categories" (Edwards et al 1978: 7). Due to the political barriers to rational policy-making, we need to go into the strengths and weaknesses of such a rational model. Technical rationality and political conflicts are often intermingled. The technical rationality and political conflict dichotomy is also complicated by the fact that there might not be agreement about existing conditions, or the goals, or the remedies to deal with them. Technical rationality is further "complicated by the need to make estimates about the future and the lack of certainty that lies just beneath the surface of those estimates" (Ibid: 9).

Calculations of economic costs and benefits depend on the money available, production, resources, and projections of population growth. Each point of uncertainty may become a source of dispute among technical experts on the one hand, who have different perspectives, and, on the other hand, between experts and politicians. Furthermore, when it comes to policy implementation, we may find that different parties involved in the shaping and making of the policy have different goals, objectives, and purposes in mind. The stated intentions of the legislation may also be quite different from what government agencies actually do (DiNitto and Dye 1983: 3).
The rational approach and the political approach are emphasized as two major theoretical approaches to policy formation by DiNitto and Dye (Ibid: 4). This does not imply that other approaches to the study of social policy (inter alia, institutionalism, élité theory, group theory, systems theory, game theory, and incrementalism) are not equally relevant (Dye 1984: Chapter 2). DiNitto and Dye continue by saying that although there are elements of rationalism in policy-making, the policy process is largely political. Our abilities to develop policies rationally are constrained because we cannot agree on what constitutes social problems and on what, if anything, should be done to alleviate these problems (1983: 18). We therefore need to understand the political nature of policy processes and work within them if we want to shape social policy.

Poverty, both absolute and relative, is a reality of the South African society as has been documented and highlighted extensively by the Second Carnegie Investigation into Poverty in South Africa (Wilson and Ramphela 1989). The RDP base document stresses that "poverty is the single greatest burden on the people of South Africa". It is argued that in its present form, poverty is a legacy of the apartheid system and of the resultant grossly skewed nature of economic development and underdevelopment. The result of this situation is that the basic needs of many are not met systematically and consistently. Large numbers of people are marginalized and practically live from day to day. Welfare service as a "safety net" on its own is therefore not only inappropriate, but also precludes a large section of the society from realizing its full potential as human beings. It is in the light of this that the RDP proposes a number of social policies in order to deal with poverty and stimulate development. A prime concern of the RDP is a rapid and sustainable reduction in the level of poverty in the country.

Referring only to issues of poverty and inequalities is to adopt a broad and sometimes vague perspective. To solve problems effectively, it will be necessary to identify specific issues and then to state explicitly what should be done about them (e.g. what is to be done about illiteracy; unemployment or underemployment; lack of water, sanitation, and housing; inadequate transport; lack of health care; lack of an appropriate education system; persons with disabilities and those who are unemployable; alcohol abuse; squatting; etc.). The policy should not only spell out what should be done, but whether it can be done and when — furthermore, whether there are the means, the resources, the money, and the infrastructure. Poverty is a multi-faceted problem with
a variety of causes which cannot be eliminated by targeting only one aspect. To uproot poverty
the government will have to move on a number of fronts.

8.2.2 Policy Objectives and Underlying Theoretical Assumptions

The basic question here is: What are the objectives of the proposed policies and what do they aim
to achieve? Clarity of objectives must underlie any purposeful examination of alternative policies.
This is followed by appropriate and relevant activities to prevent us from adopting alternative
policies which may ultimately prove to be no improvement at all. Policy formulation can be
viewed as involving two types of activities. One is to decide what should be done concerning a
particular problem, and the other the actual drafting of the legislation. Answering the first
question should lay down general principles. These in turn are reflected in the legislation. The
importance of drafting legislation should not be underestimated because the way a bill is written,
and the specific provisions it contains, can have a substantial effect on the actual content of public
policy and its implementation.

A valid question to attend to at the outset is to determine the aims of social policy. In this regard
George and Wilding state the following:

"The aims of social policy are what social policies intend or hope to achieve" (1984: 1).

Such a description does not help much. Because these concepts are so vague, inevitably there is
going to be disagreement among different groups about the aims of social policy. Groups may
agree on the desirability of a piece of legislation, and yet disagree about its aims. Furthermore,
there may be the stated aims of social policy and the unstated aims. The stated aims given by
Ministers and those responsible for the legislation may not necessarily be the real aims. "There is
a tendency for governments to glorify the aims of social policy and to make little or no reference
to less popular aims" (Ibid: 2).

Although there may be general consensus on policy objectives, there is not always agreement on
strategies to achieve the objectives. It is the theoretical frame of reference of policy-makers which
determines the way social problems are perceived and the social policies proposed to solve them.
George and Wilding give a broad overview of possible aims of social policy (1984). These are the achievement of minimum standards, eradication of inequalities, the encouragement of economic growth, and the achievement of political stability. With regard to minimum standards they say it has been the central aim of social policy over the years in Britain to achieve minimum standards. Although much has been achieved in many respects, a great deal needs to be done. The achievement of universal minimum standards therefore remains a difficult issue.

The main aim of social policy has been identified as the eradication of inequalities. This is not only a very difficult issue to resolve, it is also complex. "Inequality has always been a politically contested issue for it is related to the distribution of power and resources in society" (George and Wilding 1984: 66). It may therefore be necessary to distinguish between inequalities which are natural, and inequalities which are socially determined. The concern of social policy is obviously with those inequalities which are socially determined. "It is this retreat from natural to social justifications of inequality that provides some hope for egalitarians in future" (Ibid).

There can be no disagreement that inequality is a major problem in general, but in particular in South Africa. Although it has been reduced in some areas, it is particularly evident in education, health, housing, work, and income. Whether the anticipated objectives can be achieved through social services and whether a more equal society can thus be created, remains a major question. Even with a more progressive policy of affirmative action, it is doubtful whether geographical and racial inequalities will be overcome within a specific time-frame. In practice social policy tends to operate in terms of a specific range of services either provided directly by the government or for which the government accepts certain responsibilities.

A fundamental question is whether social programmes undermine economic growth or whether they encourage economic growth. A view strongly held is that social services are a form of consumption and investment in both the individual and in economic growth. It is assumed that social programmes contribute to the enrichment of the quality of life of individuals and contribute to the general economic development of society. Logical as it may sound, this view is fraught with contradictions. Economic growth is required to provide the funds for the provision of social services, while the distribution of economic resources should contribute to higher production to
maintain the balance. So, when we plan from the perspective of social policy, we need to consider the contribution it can make to economic growth. We also need to consider the contribution of increased economic growth in raising the level of personal consumption and welfare.

The contributions that social policy can make to economic growth take several forms which are both complex and controversial (George and Wilding 1984: 118). These contributions George and Wilding grouped under three headings: improvement of the quality of labour, or the human capital theory; promotion of the mobility of industry and labour; and encouragement of production and employment through increased consumption (Ibid). These suggestions are not unproblematic, neither are they the only ways in which social services encourage economic growth.

A well-documented notion is that social services (and the social policy on which they are based) contribute to political stability. Political stability was a factor in the development of the Elizabethan Poor Law and in maintaining political stability after World War II in Western Countries. However, it was the Beveridge Report which emphasized the contribution that social services could make to social and political integration. Political stability may be one of the unstated aims of social policy. The view that the government is doing something about social issues has an impact on the mood of the population and its political stability. George and Wilding state:

"The first and perhaps most important way in which social services contribute to political stability is through the amelioration or solution - or seeming attempt at amelioration and solution - of problems which could provoke serious discontent and might be used as an indictment of the existing economic and political order" (1984: 189).

There are several ways in which social policy impacts on political stability. These include the easing of potentially disruptive problems; the provision of definitions of social problems which do not challenge the economic and social order; the encouragement, reward, and punishment of certain values and forms of behaviour; the support that social services provide for authority and hierarchy in society; and the support of social services in transforming class conflict into less threatening group conflict (Ibid: 188).
How do social policies influence the over-all quality of life, the circumstances of living, and intrasocietal relations? Gil says this comes about through one or more of the following processes (described as "interrelated and universal"):

(a) "Development of material or symbolic life-sustaining and life-enhancing resources

(b) Division of labour, or the allocation of individuals and groups to specific 'statuses' within the total array of societal tasks and functions, involving corresponding roles and prerogatives intrinsic to these roles

(c) Distribution to individuals and groups of specific rights to material and symbolic life-sustaining and life-enhancing resources, to goods and services through general entitlements, to 'status' - specific rewards, and to general or specific constraints" (Gil 1972:19).

In addition to removing inequalities, a major purpose of social welfare policy in a world-wide perspective is the prevention, amelioration, or elimination of poverty. The over-all objective of social welfare and development policies in South Africa will have to be the same. Meeting basic needs has been targeted as a priority, but this should be seen as no more than a starting point from which to pursue longterm developmental goals. Implicit in the RDP base document is an integrated anti-poverty policy. The policy objectives of the RDP are explicit, but are somewhat ambitious. The main RDP objectives are summarized below.

* A minimum of ten years of free schooling for all South Africans, including a national basic education and skills training programme, and the integration of different education systems into one national system.

* A public works programme to create 300,000 - 500,000 jobs within five years. These jobs would include the youth (through a national youth service programme) and communities (through a Community Development Fund). A central goal of the mixed economy will be job creation.
* The construction of 250,000 houses per year to eliminate a shortage of 4,000,000 houses.

* Redistribution of 30% of agricultural land.

* Access to electricity for 2,500,000 households.

* Providing health, welfare, food, and water is equally important. This would include:
  - clean drinking water for over 12,000,000 South Africans and sanitation facilities for 21,000,000 people at present without such services,
  - health spending to emphasize preventive primary health care rather than curative care. For instance, free health care for under fives at government clinics and health centres is a need. So is a programme for early detection and treatment of diseases such as tuberculosis and cervical cancer and an expanded programme of immunization to cover 95% of the population within five years.
  - a range of services should be available to the aged, disabled, and the unemployed.
  - services to children should include a regular maintenance benefit for all under five, and efforts to reintegrate street children into society.
  - food security for all South Africans could be achieved through job creation programmes, land reform, economic restructuring, and food subsidies.

* The training of at least 3,000 community development workers within 5 years.

* The training of district health personnel.

The RDP implies a collective effort by organizations and individuals, plus the application of resources, to improve the quality of life. It seeks to set in motion the widest possible array of resources and organizations within the government and civil society. However, it is not clear how this tremendous task is to be done. These are explicit policy objectives, but how realistically achievable are they, and how will they be funded?
Policy-making is not only constrained by the complexities of the process, but also by the actions of politicians, by legacies of the past, by the nature of government organization, and by economic considerations. Governmental fragmentation imposes yet another constraint on policy-makers by denying them the possibility of dealing with problems comprehensively. Economic factors are important because they supply the resources and the money that make certain policies possible. The relative scarcity of these resources limits policy options.

The results of these constraints are that "policy-makers do not simply follow public opinion nor do they act strictly according to the rational model. Often they neither specify nor agree with each other on the nature of problems, nor do they explicitly state goals and establish priorities among themselves. Moreover, they usually consider only a few alternatives and only a limited amount of information on them, and they seldom rigorously analyze the projected consequences of alternatives" (Edwards et al 1978: 11). They rely heavily on "decision rules" and are more concerned with the political and economic feasibility of public policies.

Nevertheless, it is possible for policy-makers to engage in "innovation". Some of the factors which contribute to this include "aggressive leadership, professionally oriented bureaucracies, sharp public demands, the development of new technologies, or the successful introduction of an innovative policy in another governmental jurisdiction - or some combination of these influences" (Ibid: 12).

At the strategic level, the solution to poverty and human misery must involve an equitable distribution of income, goods, services, and opportunities. This does not happen automatically; it implies clear policy guidelines and the involvement of citizens. If the ultimate aim of social development is to improve the quality of life, then a prerequisite of social development is the participation of all citizens in building the nation, and simultaneously enjoying the benefits of progress. To achieve social development objectives, it is necessary that people play an active role in planning and decision-making. A valid question here may be whether people are equipped to play that role, and whether the institutions and infrastructure do exist to make it possible? This is where education, and in particular adult education, can play an important role.
When we consider policies to deal with issues like unemployment, poverty, meeting basic needs, and inequality, social welfare policy might not be an appropriate policy instrument. It was for instance discovered that "full employment contributes significantly to the reduction of poverty", more so than social programmes that attempt to address poverty directly (Weale 1983: 4). The creation of jobs and employability should be our first priority. Concrete policy approaches to deal with poverty are:

* Rapid employment generating growth;

* Provision in the basic needs of the poor;

* An appropriate support system for those confronted by survival-threatening poverty.

### 8.2.3 The Philosophy, Principles, and Underlying Values of the Proposed Policies

What should be the philosophy of social welfare if it is to address poverty and minimize inequalities? What should be the underlying value assumptions of the policy, and what the ideological orientations underlying the policy objectives? Underlying values are important bases for welfare ethics. According to George and Wilding "the thrust of welfare policy has been hopelessly weakened because of the absence of a set of values which support and legitimate welfare policy" (1976: 129). Any policy strategy should spell out right at the outset the vision, the mission, values, beliefs, and guiding principles of that policy. Some of these have been highlighted by stakeholders in the welfare field and by the RDP. Anderson argues that there are basically four categories of values that may serve to guide the behaviour of decision-makers. He says policy makers may evaluate alternatives by taking what follows into account.

* Political values of the governing party.

* Organizational values. Decision-makers, particularly bureaucrats, may be influenced by organizational values, hence they are likely to act accordingly. "To the extent this occurs, the individual's decisions may be guided by such considerations as the desire to see his
organization survive, to enhance or expand its programs and activities, or to maintain its power and prerogatives" (Anderson 1979: 16).

* Personal values. The desire "to protect or promote one's physical or financial well-being, reputation, or historical position may also serve as decision criteria" (Ibid).

* Policy values. "Decision-makers may act on the basis of their perceptions of the public interest or beliefs concerning what is proper or morally correct public policy" (Ibid). Values such as equality, justice, democracy (or the contrary) will be involved.

* Ideological values. In this case decision-makers act on the basis of "logically related values and beliefs which present simplified pictures of the world and serve as guides to action for people" (Ibid).

The dominant beliefs and values of society, and the customs and traditions derived from them, exert a significant influence on all decisions concerning the development of social policies. "Consequently, any specific configuration of these processes and the resulting system of social policies tend to reflect the dominant value positions of a society concerning such policy-relevant dimensions as individualism-collectivism, competition-collaboration, inequality-equality" (Gil 1972: 22). A society's dominant beliefs and values thus constitute crucial constraining variables which impinge on its processes of resource development, status allocation, and rights distribution as well as the social policies derived from them. "Thus a society which stresses individualism, pursuit of self-interest, and competitiveness, and which has come to consider inequality of circumstances of living and rights as a natural order of human existence, will tend to pursue structured inequalities through its processes of status allocation and rights distribution, while one which stresses collective values and co-operation and which is truly committed to . . . the notion that 'all men are created equal', will tend to develop a system of policies which assures to all its members equal access to all statuses, and equal rights to material and symbolic life-sustaining and life-enhancing resources, goods and services" (Ibid: 22). While beliefs, values, customs, and traditions are not fixed, changing them is not a simple matter. They tend to be shaped and preserved by the powerful and influential members of society. Not unexpectedly, these beliefs and
values seem therefore to reflect and support the interests of these groups. Changing a society's dominant values and beliefs is a complicated undertaking since these values pervade all aspects of its culture, as well as its institutional structures and attitudes. Given the history of South Africa, this will be a critical issue to bear in mind in the post-apartheid context.

Several questions come to mind. Social values are not static, but at what pace do they change? What would be the underlying social values of the post-apartheid society? "The prevailing social philosophy can never be static. The total value framework pertaining to a particular society changes over time with respect to its content, the rank order of its constituent elements, and its inclusiveness, that is, the circle of people who are regarded as rightfully sharing this set of values" (Dixon 1981: 3). Consequently there is always the potential for change in the dominant beliefs and values of a society, the attitudes of people, and in social policies. Changing current welfare approaches in South Africa will imply value changes. The philosophy and social objectives of a welfare system are not applied in a vacuum. A particular welfare system is introduced and operates within an ideological context prevailing in that society. An understanding of these issues, as well as economic and political factors, are necessary for the design and implementation of a particular welfare system.

Guiding principles and basic values are crucial for the structuring of society and for formulating policy objectives. The economic structure in Sweden, for instance, is based on the concept of solidarity, "a concept that implies unity of purpose and [which] acts as an incentive for productivity for the benefit of all, as opposed to productivity for personal gain" (Nikelly 1987: 119). Solidarity also implies the sharing of material wealth, and the right of everyone to equal access to the resources of society. Resources are thus distributed to bring about an economically homogeneous population by eliminating extreme poverty and wealth. "Hence, wage differentials have been reduced and profits distributed to the consumer in salaries and subsidies. As a result, a new morality has emerged in Sweden, one that is directed against competition, individualism, and consumerism" (Ibid). There is a strong emphasis on prevention while "harmful living conditions are corrected by social policies that support a homogeneous economic prosperity for all persons" (Ibid). The distribution of material benefits has largely eliminated inequalities, created material security, and has reduced unemployment. (Whether this is likely to remain true for
Sweden, is another matter. Already there are signs to the contrary. Recently unemployment has increased from 2% to 8%.

In Cuba the State has embarked on a process in developing a humane society by stressing "a commitment to collective well-being of the society" (Ibid: 122). The society tried to develop social consciousness as an expressed goal, as well as the ideals of common purpose and communal activity. The system provides for the basic needs of all citizens while work is geared toward collective goals. (Yet thousands try all manner of means to flee that country.)

In South Africa we will have to search for a common value base, not only for economic growth and distribution, but as a foundation for the guiding principles upon which to restructure the South African society. National reconciliation and nation-building have been identified as critical elements in this regard.

8.2.4 Policy Priorities and Strategies

Important questions spring to mind: What are the policy priorities and strategies? Whom is the policy aimed at? The target groups at whom the policy is primarily aimed, in qualitative and quantitative terms, should be identified. What operational activities are necessary and what provision will be made to address identified needs? Exactly what should be done to resolve the issues and to achieve the anticipated objectives? Against the backdrop of the post-apartheid South Africa, social welfare has a key function in the total social, economic, physical, and educational development of individuals, families, and communities.

Certain policy directions have been identified and highlighted by the RDP as well as stakeholders in the welfare field. A major objective of the RDP is to deal with poverty and the needs of the poor by adopting a developmental approach. The developmental approach seems also to be favoured for social welfare. On the other hand the need for a social security system is equally important. A social safety support system is of particular relevance in times of social and economic change when vulnerable groups may suffer. This dual approach to social issues may create some tension between the transfer of income (which may be seen as "hand-outs") and
developmental approaches. What is practically possible and what are concrete policy measures to meet needs and to deal effectively with poverty? Some key policy measures are now briefly summarized and discussed.

(a) Basic needs satisfaction

When it comes to policy priorities, the RDP has clearly identified the basic needs of those who have been neglected over the years. This is an important starting point, but it has implications in terms of providing resources.

Meeting the basic needs of people seems to be the cornerstone of the new government's economic policy. The assumption is that ultimately such investment will more than pay for itself. Consequently it must be assumed that the RDP's stress on meeting basic needs and on achievement of socio-economic goals will lay the foundation for economic growth to sustain the programme. This view is supported by theory and practice. It presupposes that welfare provision in fact can facilitate economic development in the long-term. Jones says:

"According to this view, better health and nutrition mean a more vigorous people; and education gives them the knowledge and skills they need in order to achieve growth. There is also a gain in grasp and vision. Raise the people just a little and further progress begins to seem possible to them" (1990: 7).

However, it should be realized that this is a long-term policy objective which needs time to bear fruit.

Meeting the basic needs of the poor is absolutely necessary, but how is it to be done? The challenge for the State seems to be two-fold:

(i) Reducing poverty through economic growth processes (income and its distribution),

(ii) Meeting needs and aspirations through non-discriminatory social services (Van der Berg 1990/91: 61-63).
(b) Employment Generating Growth

In order to reduce poverty through economic processes, employment generating growth is crucial. Employment generating growth has been identified by various stakeholders as a high priority for basic needs satisfaction and for sustainable development. In the South African Living Standards Survey, two thirds of urban and three quarters of metropolitan African households mentioned jobs as a priority for public action (Le Roux 1994: 4). Employment status is, as is to be expected, a very significant determinant of per capita income and welfare. The housing and health conditions of families with regular employment is also much better than that of households where unemployment is rife. This of course is partly a reflection of the ability of households with employment income to pay for better housing and health services. Employment status, including self-employment, is an important factor in determining a household’s welfare.

In the agricultural sector the precondition for sustainable self-employment at a reasonable standard of living is permanent access to agricultural land which has been effectively denied to most Black South Africans. Land redistribution can on a sustained basis improve the position of the poor.

Economic growth which is employment-creating is of crucial importance if poverty is to be permanently reduced. Sustained economic growth is recognized as important by the RDP, not only because of the employment it creates, but also because it provides a broader fiscal base from which to finance the funding for meeting the basic social needs and developing the safety net. On the other hand, it is also emphasized that meeting basic needs and investment in human capital create the conditions which enhance economic growth. Employment-generated growth therefore seems to be the only sustainable way to meet basic needs effectively. However, in the real world there are always groups that need assistance from the State. In this respect a system of social security is required.

(c) Social Security

As market forces alone would not be able to meet all the needs of the poor, pressure to reduce disparities and to meet needs through fiscal processes would increase. Society will always be
faced with the reality of vulnerable groups such as the aged, the sick and disabled, the unemployable, the temporarily unemployed, and single-parent families where mothers have to stay at home to take care of young children. The needy in these categories should be supported by a social security system. However, within the developmental paradigm, social assistance should be seen as a means to an end, not an end in itself. Specific questions that need to be answered here are: Should the South African fiscal pay out as much as it does in social pensions, what is the scope for an expansion of social spending so as to introduce parity, can we afford maintaining the mother and child maintenance grant in its current form, even if we change it to a family allowance for all racial groups? Furthermore, what should be the criteria for the payment of disability grants, or are there other ways to assist disabled persons more effectively? The employment of disabled persons within government and the private sector needs to be explored at every level, with government taking a leading role by employing a certain percentage of disabled people as civil servants. It seems quite clear that more research will have to be done on these burning issues to find the correct approach.

Although there may be valid arguments for the extension of social security, a fundamental problem with social security seems to be how extensive a social net can actually be without undermining economic growth. It is clear that strong economies can give significant support to the poor. However, over-ambitious schemes may contribute to a general collapse in the economy. The crucial question is how much social welfare the South African economy could deliver, given the commitment of the RDP. There is limited scope for further increases in social spending at the expense of other public spending programmes. The real challenge is to restructure social expenditure itself and to introduce developmental approaches as a central element of social policy.

A fundamental problem with social security is how it could be transformed to prevent greater dependency on the State and in the process undermine economic growth. The real challenge for the future is to combine social security with development strategies to ensure self-reliance and capacity-building.
Although the merits of a system of social assistance cannot be disputed, a review of some of the specific programmes may be required. The critical issue here is going to be affordability. It is estimated that more than 80% of the money spent on all policy initiatives as part of the integrated anti-poverty programmes goes into social pensions and child and mother maintenance grants (Le Roux 1994: 17). (We should also not forget that the RDP promises a regular maintenance benefit for all under five.) In evaluating the impact of these two programmes, the following questions are relevant: can the funding be well targeted; how much of it actually reaches those for which it is intended; is it the type of programme which creates dependency or does it encourage development and self-sufficiency; is it a programme which is financially sustainable? By far the most significant social transfer in South Africa is the old age pension. Virtually three quarters of the Department of Social Welfare's R12 billion budget is spent on social old age pensions (Ibid).

In the case of social old age pensions there are two crucial questions to be asked: What proportion of the money allocated to social pensions actually reaches the old people, and, within the household, how much of the money goes to the support of other members of the household? It could be argued that old age pensions are not only a major source of income of many extended families but that they are broadly used for developmental purposes. Children are fed and sent to school out of this pension money, and in general it is crucial for the very survival of communities. Given the fact that old age pensions can be so well targeted and reach proportionally so many of the really poor families, (see Le Roux 1994) it could well be the best method of having a developmental impact on the poorer communities. The question however is how sustainable are social pensions, and will it be possible and desirable to continue giving social pensions as high a priority relative to other social and developmental expenditures? It seems evident that expenditures on social old age pensions will continue to increase steadily if present trends continue. In the longer run, however, it will be crucial to ensure that those who are employed do contribute to their own pension schemes, and a national pension scheme be developed as proposed by the RDP base document, particularly for the lower income workers.

(d) Human Resource Development

In contrast to earlier perceptions of development (i.e. economic development), increasing
attention nowadays is given to alternative approaches. These are referred to by several names: the human factor in development, the social aspects of development, paradigm shift, humans in development, integrated development, or value shifts (Cummings 1983: 13). Development is seen as synonymous with the development of human beings. The participation of people is considered to be central. The goal is effectively to empower people to cope with the forces that affect their daily lives. This represents a shift from a social welfare focus to a focus upon integrated development. Cummings is of the opinion that this shift requires a redefinition of social development as a function of "human activity". He says that this paradigm of development has the following characteristics:

(i) a concern with economic and political systems;

(ii) a concern with science and technology as ways of promoting human functioning;

(iii) a concern with the success or failure of welfare institutions within a system;

(iv) a concern for finding means for the establishment of humanistic social policies;

(v) a concern for the transformation of individual values and behaviour into more humanistic levels of social functioning;

(vi) the establishment of partnership relationships which promote social functioning -- skills training and literacy programmes are seen as critical components of human resource development.

Within the framework of human resource development may also be included a policy of population development. Regarding population development, welfare planning which makes provision for services to meet needs constitutes only one aspect. Family planning is necessary for both the relief of poverty and the improvement of health. A governmental population development policy becomes essential.
An Integrated Developmental Approach to Social Problems

In this study Developmental Social Welfare has been emphasized as the direction for the future. Despite the general use of the concept, it is not given a specific content. What does a developmental approach to social problems imply? How should current welfare approaches be changed? What are to be the operational activities of Developmental Social Welfare? For answers to these questions, we need to consider a range of issues, viz. vision, policies, infrastructure, training, and personnel.

The concept of a developmental approach to social welfare gained momentum when disillusionment set in with the three broad approaches to social programmes (Le Roux 1994: 13). These approaches, according to Le Roux, are the conservative approach, the socialist approach, and the social democratic approach. The conservative approach, best represented by Thatcherism, was clearly not succeeding, while most of the socialist countries on the other hand were in an economic and political crisis which would soon lead to the demise of many of their social systems. Most of the social democracies, such as in the case of the Scandinavian countries, had developed very impressive systems indeed, but were finding that their programmes were unsustainable, and were often not experiencing the benefits intended. Against this background many countries began to refer to the necessity of a developmental approach to social problems.

Developmental Social Welfare is regarded "as an integral part of over-all development, compatible with - but not synonymous with - the broader process of social development, and firmly rooted in operational realities" (United Nations Economic Council 1981: 8). In practice this would mean an institutional model responsible for human resources development operating within a wider developmental framework. Since there is a need for a concrete expression of Developmental Social Welfare, the integration of various approaches seems to be a policy direction to pursue. Policies in this regard should seek to enable people to participate in the making of decisions which affect their lives. A developmental approach should also integrate the needs and concerns of people in rural areas and informal settlements with those of the greater metropolitan areas, with the active participation of all concerned.
Three issues appear cardinal in a developmental approach to social welfare.

(i) To consider development of social policies, not just the development of services. Policies must be devised and synchronized to further objectives which have hitherto been regarded as no more than goals of particular services.

(ii) The focus should be on economic and social policies as two elements of a single whole. Economic growth does not of itself eliminate social problems; it might even contribute to their persistence. Tackling social policies without economic growth is however unlikely to produce the desired results.

(iii) The creation of work and full employment is a crucial element in human welfare.

In the South African context, the developmental approach to social problems is highlighted as a central concern for the post-apartheid society. During the field interviews stakeholders constantly referred to it as a policy direction for the post-apartheid South Africa. A developmental policy is also central to the RDP. However, cognizance should be taken of the fact that a dichotomy seems to exist. For some, a developmental approach means that extensive State support in the social sphere is essential, and that it should lead to social development. It should not foster dependency. Those who are committed to this approach wish to repeat the successes of the social democracies, while avoiding their failures. In particular they caution against the consequences of earlier welfare programmes in South Africa. They are thus committed to social policies that are sustainable and developmental. The other perspective of developmental social welfare emerged from a more radical school of thought. Although it broadly supports the former view, at the same time it holds that social policies should be conducted with a more radical long-term vision which in the long run will make a socialist transformation possible. Both these views can be read into the RDP base document which is a compromise between the two traditions.

When the aim is to regard social welfare as an integrated system, a holistic systems approach is indicated to examine State institutions, to construct scenarios, and to formulate social welfare policies. This appears a relevant methodology "for attacking complexity through scientific
knowledge and using that knowledge to correct social ills" (Allen 1978: 15). However, a
distinction should be made between a methodology that has as its aim the gathering and testing
of data, and a methodology that is philosophically committed to serve as a guide for action. "The
first is concerned with building up the body of knowledge in an area or discipline and constructing
theory. The second is primarily concerned with providing information relevant to a policy-decision
that must be made" (Ibid :9). In other words, the one is designed to advance knowledge of a
scientific discipline, and the other to serve as a guide for social action. If social science is to make
a contribution to solving social problems such as poverty, a methodology of researching whole
systems may be applied. The whole here refers to a system whose components are non-separable.
Social welfare policy which operates as a part of the State system cannot be viewed or designed
in isolation from other State systems. If we want to change policy or design new policies, then the
whole system must be dealt with. Thus a holistic methodology is implied. In this respect Allen
noted:

"Holistic methodology, with its orientation toward methods of inquiry rather than
tools or techniques per se, is concerned with the basic conceptualization or
definition of problems -- especially nonlinear multi-feedback loop systems
requiring policy action. Holistic methodology does not begin, 'given a system', as
normal or traditional social science begins, 'given a hypothesis', but actually begins
by trying to define the components or parts of a nonseparable system. Essentially
it begins conceptualizing the parts of the system, its boundaries, its interface with
other systems, the feedback loops, and other supra- and subsystems to which it is
connected" (1978: 9-10).

The advantage of systems is that they are not permanent structures as products of nature, they are
mental creations, i.e. man-made. Therefore, "if our social systems, while physically real, are also
mental constructs, it is crucial in our understanding and manipulation of them that we be
reasonably correct in our conceptualizing about them" (Ibid). But we are faced with a problem.
People describe or conceptualize the same system differently. It is therefore necessary to state the
theoretical frame of reference and philosophical approach. The holistic methodology takes
cognizance of this problem and is at least aware of different conceptualizations of the same
system.

The integrated systems approach is favoured for various reasons. All social policies are concerned
with the same underlying domain of societal existence, and are operating through the same basic
processes, in spite of variations in content, objectives, and scope. They are all dealing with one or more of the following interrelated elements of societal existence:

* The over-all quality of life in a society;

* The circumstances of living of individuals and groups; and

* The nature of intra-societal human relations among individuals, groups, and society as a whole (Gil 1972: 18).

In all social policies these elements constitute the general sphere of concern, the common domain, or the output of society's system of social policies. They are consequently the core-elements of all social policies. It follows that they are not independent, but interact with each other. "All extant social policies of a given society are thus to be viewed as constituting a comprehensive system, which influences the common domain through its aggregate effects. Every specific social policy influences a certain segment of the general domain and thus contributes to the aggregate effect" (Gil 1972: 17-18). It should however be noted that, while all social policies are viewed as components of one system with reference to their underlying common domain, they are not necessarily consistent with each other. "Rather, considerable inconsistency tends to prevail among these policies because of their origin in conflicts of interests among a society's sub-systems" (Ibid).

Depending on emerging realities and contextual issues, human society should continuously shape and transform this component. However, it should be noted that although economic factors are intrinsic aspects of the common domain of social welfare and social policies, they tend to dominate the field, because they are important determinants of the over-all quality of life in a society, the circumstances of living of its members, and their relationship to each other and to society as a whole. By including economic issues within the common domain of all social policies, "the widespread conceptual confusion resulting from the arbitrary division between economic and special policies can be avoided" (Gil 1972: 18).

From this overview it appears that the objectives of social welfare can be better met by more effectively integrating mutually supportive economic and social development policies. Social
welfare and related social support systems need to be re-oriented so as to make a more positive contribution to over-all development with an appropriately long-term perspective and continuity of policy objectives.

8.2.5 Organizational Structure for the Implementation of the Proposed Policies

For the implementation of alternative social policies, we need to identify the kind of structural and institutional changes required to address the backlogs as well as emerging needs of the post-apartheid society. The methodology of planning institutional change does not only involve policy, but also programming, administering, organization, and evaluation. Appropriate infrastructure, general management, organization, information systems, and communication, are critical for the success. The State has a major responsibility through central and provincial authorities for the provision, financing, and delivery of social services. Such services are essential at every level of structural change and social reconstruction. Beside the necessary infrastructure of the State, the question arises whether the State has the capacity to deal with all the issues on its own. The private sector should also play its part. It will be crucially important to bring together all the key players in the social welfare and development field. This requires a functional relationship between institutions of the State and organizations in civil society.

Social welfare of the future is going to be a "mixed economy of welfare". The notion that the State should and could do everything is not realistic. The vital role of the family, voluntary organizations, the market, and occupationally-related welfare is increasingly recognized and should constitute an integral component of Developmental Social Welfare. This obviously would require the development of new partnerships between various societal institutions, statutory and voluntary, formal and informal, the family, and the State.

Partnership between the State and NGOs in South Africa, especially since the 1970s, has been problematic. There is, in the changed circumstances now extant, an opportunity to redefine this relationship. Partnership and voluntarism should be promoted in the interest of development and self-reliance.
After a policy has been adopted and introduced, policy implementation becomes a crucial issue. A wide variety of factors influence it. Some of these are the availability of sufficient resources, the structure of inter-governmental relations, the commitment of officials, reporting mechanisms within the bureaucracy, evaluation, and political leverage of opponents of the policy. Important factors such as these might intervene between the formulation of policy goals and their actual achievement. These factors also bear upon the extent to which the policies adopted and the actual services delivered correspond.

Although policy formation ends when a decision is legitimized by formal governmental approval, policy implementation involves far more than a mechanical translation of goals into action and solution. It involves fundamental questions about conflict and decision-making, and who gets what. These issues do not only shape policy, they also have a direct influence on the anticipated outcomes of policies. For the successful implementation of Developmental Social Welfare, a policy that provides for the mobilization of resources is vitally important. This mobilization once again illustrates the importance of partnership between the State and the private sector in the interest of development and welfare. However, it remains true that the government has the overall responsibility for social welfare policy and the way it is carried out; also for the setting of priorities and standards. The broad objectives and direction of the government should be made clear through policy statements, legislation, or national plans. Non-governmental and voluntary organizations, trade unions, co-operatives, community and social action groups, are however all major sponsors of social welfare programmes. These organizations must be recognized, consulted, and supported. The involvement of such a diversity of participants might create a need for better co-ordination of programmes. There might also be a need for a clearer delineation of areas of responsibility and functions. Non-governmental organizations, co-operating with the government, will need to work within frameworks, standards, and guidelines established by governmental policies. Within such partnership the government should recognize, acknowledge, and encourage the contributions of non-governmental organizations. It is the duty of the government to make every effort to involve them in the planning and implementation of programmes both at the local and national level.
Another important requirement for successful implementation of Developmental Social Welfare is the training and employment of suitable personnel. Education of social workers, and the training of welfare personnel, community developers, volunteers, as well as governmental personnel and community leaders, call for high priority. Responsibilities within Developmental Social Welfare are diverse and complex, ranging from direct service delivery to policy formation and planning. A thorough knowledge is required of human behaviour, social structures, social needs, community organization, and intervention techniques. Because a wide range of skills is required, comprehensive training programmes should receive high priority. Social work education should be firmly based on the realities of field practice and local cultural traditions, while fully taking account of emerging social issues and trends.

When we consider alternative social policies and their implementation, the power and influence of public administrators are important factors to bear in mind. Public officials are involved in the making of policy in its formative as well as its implementation stages. They are therefore able to influence policy through selective presentation and interpretation of technical information, and through their own programme designs, strategies, and tactics. They are in a position to influence, rearrange, or modify policy proposals as well as legislation. In many respects public officials are in a unique position to shape public policies. They have the experience, they are skilled in policy formation, and they ought to be particularly concerned about the implications for their work and interests. In fact, they are knowledgeable about the contextual environment of public policies and their influence and power within that environment (Gilbert 1984: 2). Bureaucrats draw their power from the expertise and skills they bring into government decision-making. Governments are unable to cope without the technical and professional skills of bureaucrats, because governments come and go while bureaucrats provide continuity of office. Francis Rourke summarizes the position of public officials and states that they get their experiences essentially from two sources:

(i) government agencies are major employers of skilled professions in various fields,

(ii) these organizations operate through a division of labour that enables even unskilled workers to achieve results as a group that they could never attain while...
Thus the expertise of the bureaucracy comes both from its structure and the proficiency of the people it employs.

The attitudes of public officials could therefore be a major problem in the implementation of alternative policies. In practice it might happen that a politician is faced with a trained and experienced official in the management of administration. The question now is who advises and who leads? One of the principal roles of bureaucrats is to give advice to Ministers on what course of action to follow in dealing with problems and in designing policy. "Professionals at high levels within bureaucracy shape political officeholders' views of the world by providing the information on which these officeholders rely in making decisions on the myriad questions that come before them" (Rourke 1986: 59). These officials are in a position to evaluate information and decide upon what should be presented to the Minister for his/her decision. Political control over bureaucracy is therefore indispensable for a democratic government.

The power and functions of bureaucratic organizations in public policy-making and implementation are ramified. The sources from which they are derived are everyday experiences and access to information. These powers are used to shape the direction and development of public policy. In some areas of policy their expertise may even entitle bureaucrats to act at their own discretion. The power base of public officials may be so great that it threatens the ability of the public and its elected representatives to control policy directions and the decisions of the government. The question is to what extent does State bureaucracy promote democracy, to whom is it accountable, and how?

Bureaucrats are expected to serve the public and are charged with carrying out government wishes as formulated in public policy. Once a policy has been devised and has gained government approval, the bureaucracy is responsible for putting it into effect. In other words, it is the bureaucracy that ensures that a policy achieves its desired goals. However, officials are in a strategic position not only to propose public policy, but also to shape and to influence it. Their actual role may deviate from their theoretical functions as servants of the public and implementors
Organizational arrangements for policy implementation are not neutral, neither do they operate in a vacuum. Such arrangements are a way of expressing national commitment, influencing programme direction, ordering priorities, and achieving policy objectives. This requires structural arrangements, as well as the personnel to fill the positions in the structure.

8.2.6 Implementation of Policies and the Allocation of Resources

How will policy strategies be implemented and how will resources be allocated? Systems and agencies are required for this. Education, jobs, and housing were identified as priorities by the RDP. Policies must be designed to provide them, and resources generated for allocation and distribution. Fundamental questions here are whether we have the necessary resources, and what processes will be required to provide all these services?

The development of resources and their distribution to target groups constitute the key processes of social policies. Gil elaborates by saying:

"Processes of resource development, status allocation, and rights distribution, and the interactions between these processes are consequently the underlying key variables of all social policies, and thus constitute the dynamic elements of the proposed conceptual model" (1972: 19).

The ways in which these processes operate and interact in different societies at different times are numerous. So are the variations of specific social policies. Any specific social policy reflects a position on one or more of these key variables, and some kind of interaction between them. "Changes of policies and systems of policies depend, therefore, on changes in one or more of these key variables and in the relations between them" (Ibid). This proposition implies that significant changes in human relations, and in the quality and circumstances of living, will occur only when the society is willing to introduce significant modifications in the scope and quality of the resources it develops, and in the criteria by which it allocates statuses and distributes rights to its members. Such policy changes are viewed as potentially powerful instruments of planned, comprehensive, and systematic social change, rather than merely as reactive measures designed
to ameliorate specific undesirable phenomena in an ad hoc, fragmented fashion (Gil 1972: 20).

This conceptual model of social policies might prove extremely problematic in practice, especially in the connections between status allocation and rights distribution. According to Gil, the linkage between the distribution of rights and the allocation of statuses tends to result in considerable inequality of rights among incumbents of different statuses (Ibid). In our attempt to develop alternative social policies, it is necessary to take cognizance of the "force field affecting and constraining the evolution of social policies" (Gil 1972: 21). Some of the intra- and inter-societal forces identified and highlighted by Gil include the following:

* Intra-societal interest group conflicts

* Society's stage of development in cultural, economic, and technological spheres

* Size and institutional differentiation and complexity of society

* Personal, cultural, economic, and political interaction with intra-societal forces.

The implementation of alternative policies is constrained by forces in the environment. The economy is one such factor that helps regulate what is possible. Indeed, the economy constitutes the basis of all policies. There is a close relationship between public policies themselves and the resources to implement them. We cannot ignore economic constraints, just as we cannot ignore the problems inherent in public policies.

Political factors are also crucial. Some alternatives may not be politically feasible because they violate important values. Like economic constraints, political factors also might circumscribe the options and choices of policy-makers. Some of the factors that determine the political feasibility of alternative policies are:

* the prevailing political culture,
* political bargaining and compromises,

* the impact of history and tradition on public policy (the assumption is that history will have a conservative impact on policy-making).

### 8.2.7 Funding of the Proposed Policies and Strategies

How will the proposed strategies and provisions made by the policies be funded? In attempts to meet the needs of the poor, one needs to consider available resources and their deployment, starting from the constraints and inequalities of the present. "Resources are constrained by South Africa's relatively underdeveloped economy and by poor economic growth prospects: the deployment of resources under apartheid has bred inequality, waste, and duplication; and aspirations are highly inflated due to the demonstration effect of inappropriate and unattainable (for the whole society) standards of living enjoyed by whites under apartheid" (Van der Berg 1990/91: 57). This reality would require great efforts and vast resources. It demands a social policy system based on material provision for the poor, rather than a continuation of ad hoc social policies.

Whether we will be able to finance the proposed policies, and in particular the RDP, is an all-important question. It is the state of the economy and available funds that determine the kind and the extent of social welfare provisions. Budgeting and financing now become critical issues, i.e. budgeting by both the government and the private sector. All sectors have a function in this regard. All will have to unite with one purpose in mind; to improve the quality of life. Here we need to assess the investment costs in terms of human and other resources. Over-all costs and benefits must be reconciled. Options to fund the RDP are either a re-allocation and re-ordering of spending priorities within existing resources, or the generation or acquisition of additional resources. Best of all would be to increase levels of production and employment.

According to the RDP, R37,5 billion from the national budget will be allocated over five years to achieve the anticipated objectives. The question however is: How sustainable is this, and how far will the money stretch? Also, is a separate RDP fund the best way to go? A separate fund has
the potential to reduce the RDP to a marginal programme of a sector of government. A more viable approach may be to implement the RDP through existing State structures and budgets.

In real terms what would be the cost implications of some of the proposed policies? It is estimated that equal expenditure in education at White levels would require a three-and-a-half fold increase in aggregate educational expenditure, from R6.8 billion to R24.2 billion (i.e. from 5.3 to 18.9 percent of GDP) (Van der Berg 1990/91: 63). Parity in other fields, such as social pensions, health, and housing, would follow a similar pattern. In addition to the existing expenditure on social old age pensions there will be a dramatic increase in the demands on the fiscus if the child and maintenance payments made to some population groups are made equally accessible to all South Africans. Given certain quite realistic assumptions, it is estimated that this increase could be R13 billion or more (Le Roux 1994: 11). This type of increase in social transfers will be financially unsustainable and could undermine the developmental thrust of the RDP. Thus, it becomes clear that the cost of introducing parity in all areas at White benefit levels is tremendous. According to Van der Berg social spending in only these four fields (social pensions, health, education, and housing) would have to increase from 10.7 per cent of GDP to between 27 and 35 per cent of GDP (Ibid: 64). Is this really attainable and what are the fiscal consequences? Although there is scope for savings to be made by restructuring the social service system and the elimination of duplication, such savings may not be substantial, given the high real costs of service delivery.

8.2.8 Theories and Structures to Redress Poverty and Inequality Consistently

The alleviation of poverty and the meeting of basic needs "cannot be solely a matter of redistributing more fairly what wealth there already is, but requires . . . that redistribution be incorporated within a policy for economic growth" (Jones 1990: 281). In contrast to what neoliberalism says about development, government intervention seems to be indispensable for growth and for a more equitable and desirable distribution of resources, especially during the reconstruction phase. For this, effective policies are required. In planning, these two aspects (growth and distribution) should be closely integrated.
Redistribution to meet basic needs is important. However, rather than on income maintenance, a development approach should concentrate more on preventive than remedial services. Thus, poverty has to be attacked through education in all its facets, basic health and nutritional services, the pursuit of employment-generating growth, and a more equitable distribution of resources such as land, capital, and a healthy environment. This is not to suggest that curative services are not important. It is a question of priorities. Both preventive and remedial aspects should be integrated into a comprehensive policy.

Growth policies, in so far as they are designed to improve the quality of life of citizens, are extremely important. Economic growth is crucial for meeting basic human needs and to take people's expectations into account. Notwithstanding the controversy surrounding them, the various development theories have validity. They constitute the framework for social and economic development strategies. There might be ongoing debate about theories of development, but this debate does not mean that development policies ignore such theories and perspectives when formulating social policy.

Perceptions of development, as has previously been shown in this study, focus either on economic growth or on human resource development. A rounded and comprehensive approach to development should incorporate both. Development implies both economic growth and other social goals. Since the immediate objective is to improve the quality of life and to promote the welfare of citizens substantially and consistently, it is important to have a vision of development and of the way to give content to that vision. It however remains difficult to spell out what is anticipated, since development is largely the product of human activity. However, for development to take place at all, a supportive socio-political environment is necessary. Furthermore, it should form part of a broad national development strategy to make it more effective.

Evidence has indicated that a major area of concern in development is how to distribute the results of economic growth to the wider population. Redistributive policies should therefore be built into growth policies. Integrated development policies and strategies may offer a solution. Development should not be planned and implemented in a piece-meal fashion, but should be part
of integrated social policy and planning.

Where economic growth and distribution are concerned, the principles upon which the Chinese welfare system is based offers an interesting example. Their welfare system is a comprehensive one with two underlying principles. The first of these is production and distribution, forming the basis of their economic system. "Labour becomes a prime necessity of all members of society and the socialist principle of distribution according to work gives way to the communist principle of distribution according to need" (Dixon 1981: 5). The system makes provision for an equilibrium between work, production, and welfare. This requires a high level of development and the accommodation of the productive forces in society. The system assists those who are unable to care for themselves "by increasing production rather than embarking on a protective policy of income redistribution" (Ibid). The second principle is that social welfare is used as a means to achieve socialist objectives. "Within this context social welfare has been seen as a legitimate device for the promotion of economic development and the consolidation of socialism. Thus social welfare has very much been a means to an end, not an end in itself" (Ibid). (In this case the concept of welfare is incompatible with the Welfare State.) This welfare philosophy can be described as an "incrementalist" system, rather than a "distributive" system. The system solves two major problems pertaining to social welfare, insufficient economic production, and dependency on welfare assistance. Social welfare in China "has been provided in a way that has neither inhibited economic development nor frustrated the consolidation of socialism by fostering a source of welfare dependency" . . . (Ibid).

The Chinese welfare system is mentioned here as an interesting example from which we can learn valuable lessons. To transfer models without rigorous analysis of the context, remains a critical issue.

8.2.9 The Possible Implications and Side-Effects of the Policy

What effects may be expected from the interaction of the policy with various forces within and outside the society? What would be the possible implications or side effects of the proposed policies? To what extent would these policies stabilize or destabilize the equilibrium in society?
What would be the effect on other policies, e.g. economic policies, education policies, health policies, and so forth? Is there a broad, over-all policy framework within which all policies pertaining to specific areas should operate? It is essential that we anticipate both short and long range as well as intended and unintended consequences of the policy on target and non-target segments of the population. The introduction and implementation of alternative policies do not provide a panacea for problematic ills.

When it comes to alternative policies, three issues are important:

* to predict and analyze the consequences of each alternative to determine how it will accomplish the goals it is designed to achieve,

* to compare the benefits and costs of alternative policies so as to discover which provide the most efficient means of achieving those goals,

* to examine to what extent the consequences of the alternative policy will be equally distributed; whether it will benefit or harm a certain section of the population.

In this regard the RDP serves a useful purpose by providing an over-all policy framework.

Another issue of concern is whether there are likely to be any side effects beyond the South African society. Will there be perceptions and reactions which might impinge on the implementation of the proposed policies? What would be the reactions of multi-national companies, or of other countries? Developmental theories have revealed the strong influence of industrialized countries on economic policies in developing countries. For South Africa such policies may also have an effect on neighbouring States.

8.2.10 Alternative Social Policies which could Achieve the Same or Different Objectives

Are there any alternative social policies which could achieve the same or different objectives concerning poverty and inequality? If so, to what extent could these alternative social policies
be more effective? Social policies usually develop in a fragmented fashion in relation to other substantive issues. This reflects their inherent political nature and their roots in conflicts of real or perceived interests among diverse social groups. Analysis of social policies takes place within a political context which obviously influences the outcome. Inadequate comprehension of the generic function and dynamic of social policies, and of the principal variables through which such policies operate, may inhibit effective analysis.

8.2.11 Monitoring and Evaluation of Policies

The designing of policies and their implementation are only first phases. How will the proposed policies be monitored and evaluated? An inherent component of Developmental Social Welfare is policy-related research. This should provide a reliable survey of facts and figures in order to create a solid basis for social policies. Equally important would be evaluative research so that programmes might be measured against specific criteria and objectives.

8.2.12 Appropriate Legislation Flowing from these Policies

Social policy proposals, when adopted, are ultimately reflected in appropriate legislation. Legislation provides the framework for the implementation of the proposed policies and for attaining the anticipated objectives. Such legislation primarily seeks to provide for public programmes that do three things: (I) establish some minimal standard of social functioning, (ii) identify a benefit schedule, and (iii) identify target groups that are to benefit from such public programmes (Heffernan 1979: 10).

Examining legislation in terms of its effectiveness is troublesome, since laws and policies often have multiple goals. The dilemma in post-apartheid South Africa, with its government of national unity, is that policy and legislation will result from a compromise of contending political ideologies. Although this may be good for democracy and political balance, it can seriously frustrate efforts fundamentally to improve the quality of life. However, the purpose of legislation is "that it defines some minimal standard against which to measure the need of some group of people" (Heffernan 1979: 10).
8.3 CONCLUSIONS

Promoting and implementing policies which involve significant departures from the established social order and its dominant value premises will be fraught with obstacles. The central question is what alternative guiding principles for social and political action toward an egalitarian and humanistic social order should be pursued?

Restructuring social welfare for a future society is a matter of rethinking the nature of society, making a start in reshaping it, and defining the place of social welfare as a system. It is not only a matter of replacing apartheid policies and values, but reshaping political, economic, and social structures. This should be based on an underlying egalitarian, humanistic, democratic philosophy, "according to which all humans are intrinsically of equal worth, are entitled to equal rights in every sphere of life, and may not be exploited or dominated by other humans" (Gil 1976: 92). Such a vision, appealing as it might be, will be difficult to realize. The fact that such an ideal might appear remote should not make it less worth striving for, nor should we work less purposefully for its realization.

In designing social development policies, an underlying ethos is necessary. It is the prevailing ethos in society that makes policies and strategies work. Bearing in mind our history and contemporary realities, tolerance and respect for others are needed as a critical value base for a future society. Consequently, there is a need to redefine social welfare outside the parameters of the apartheid ideology and in a different political context. Furthermore, social welfare must be viewed within a total of human services geared towards enhancing and protecting the quality of life. There must be a clear understanding of the locus and function of social welfare within this broader network of social policies and services. The scope of welfare activities, and the areas of co-operation and joint initiatives within such policies and services, should therefore be clear.

Having considered various principles and options, relevant policy strategies seem to be:

* Growth policies with strong built-in distributive mechanisms,
* Integrated development policies based on theories of development which include social welfare policy,

* Social welfare policy focusing on prevention and on the enabling of individuals and families as a concrete expression of Developmental Social Welfare,

* A Welfare State approach focusing on basic human needs as a temporary measure.

As the developmental dimension expands and gains momentum, the Welfare State dimension should decrease. The RDP provides us with a social programme that will have to be applied swiftly to bring about a more equitable and desirable distribution of income and to stimulate social and economic development. However, the State is given the key role as the agent to secure the welfare of its citizens. If the welfare of people is linked only to economic development, there is a danger that it may fluctuate as the economy fluctuates. The involvement of the State ensures a greater amount of stability. The State acts to correct and supplement the market to promote greater equality, democracy, and welfare; it operates to modify injustices caused by the market system of resource distribution; the State stimulates economic growth and facilitates redistributive economic and social policies (Sullivan 1987: 34-35).

Alternative or new policies will not automatically solve issues of poverty and structural inequalities. They will have to be implemented purposefully and monitored rigorously. This requires political will and a driving force to ensure effective implementation. What is done should be realistic, taking into account the available financial resources, and human capacities.
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ANNEXURES

ANNEXURE ONE: LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS

1. Action Group on Social Services, Johannesburg
2. Advice Office Forum (Western Cape)
3. Alliance of Black Reformed Christians in South Africa (ABRESA)
4. Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO)
5. Black Sash
6. Belydende Kring, Johannesburg
7. Black Sash Advice Office, Port Elizabeth
8. Bloemfontein Civic Association
9. Cape Action League
10. Cape Housing Action Committee
11. Cape Flats Distress Organization (CAFDA)
12. Centre for Social and Development Studies, Durban
13. Centre for Social Research, Johannesburg
14. Centre on Black Research, Durban
15. Centre for Labour and Community Research, Johannesburg

16. CHIPROS, Worcester (Community Help and Information Project of Students)

17. Concerned Social Workers, Johannesburg

18. Congress of South African Trade Unions, Eastern Cape (COSATU)

19. Congress of South African Trade Unions, Western Cape (COSATU)

20. Churches Urban Planning Commission (CUPS)

21. Cradock Residence Association (CRADORA)

22. Durban Housing Action League

23. Durban Indian Child and Family Welfare

24. Durban, Regional and Coastal Forum

25. Eastern Cape Teachers Union, Port Elizabeth

26. Ecumenical Action Movement

27. Education Policy Unit, University of Natal

28. Federation of South African Women

29. Federation of Transvaal Women

30. Food and Allied Workers Union, Western Cape
31. GADRA (Grahamstown Area Distress Relief Association)

32. Garment and Allied Workers Union, Western Cape

33. Human Rights Trust, Port Elizabeth

34. Institute for Black Research, Johannesburg

35. Institute for a Democratic Alternative to South Africa, Western Cape (IDASA)

36. Institute for a Democratic Alternative to South Africa, Port Elizabeth (IDASA)

37. Lawyers for Human Rights

38. Montagu en Ashton Gemeenskapsorganisase, Western Cape

39. National Association of Democratic Lawyers (NADEL)

40. Natal Indian Congress

41. National Association for the Physically Disabled

42. National Council for Child and Family Welfare

43. National Council for Mental Health

44. National Council of Trade Unions, Johannesburg (NACTU)

45. National Council of Trade Unions, Western Cape (NACTU)

46. National Council of Women, Cape Town
47. National Forum


49. National Institute for Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation of Offenders, Cape Town (NICRO)

50. National Medical and Dental Association (NAMDA)

51. National Unemployment Workers Union, Western Cape

52. National Education Crisis Committee (NECC)

53. New Unity Movement, Western Cape

54. Office of the Archbishop, Durban

55. Organization for Appropriate Social Services in South Africa (OASSA)

56. Paper, Wood and Allied Workers Union, Western Cape

57. Port Elizabeth Advice Office

58. Port Elizabeth Black Civic Organization (PEBCO)

59. Ravensmead Advice Office

60. Ravensmead Welfare Organization

61. South African Commission on Higher Education (SACHED)
62. South African Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU)

63. South African Black Social Workers Association, Johannesburg

64. South African Council of Churches (SACC)

65. Southern Cape Council of Churches, Oudtshoorn

66. South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg

67. South African Institute of Race Relations, Cape Town

68. South African Municipal Workers Union, Western Cape

69. South African National Council on Alcoholism

70. South African National Council for the Blind

71. South African National Epilepsy League, Cape Town

72. South African National Students Congress

73. South African Council for the Aged

74. South African National Council for the Deaf

75. South African National Tuberculosis Association (SANTA)

76. South African Youth Congress

77. United Democratic Front, Western Cape (UDF)
78. United Democratic Front, Durban (UDF)

79. United Women's Congress

80. Wilgerspruit Fellowship Centre, Johannesburg

81. Worcester Civic Association

82. World Vision, Western Cape
ANNEXURE TWO: INTERVIEWING SCHEDULE

VIEWS ON POST-APARTHEID WELFARE POLICY

In this interview the following areas will be covered:

I. Views on present welfare policies,

II. Views on post-apartheid welfare policies,

III. Views on future political scenarios,

IV. Views on transitional strategies to a post-apartheid society.

In all cases where respondents require their identities not to be revealed or their views to be treated with confidentiality, their wish will be respected.

1. VIEWS WITH REGARD TO THE GOVERNMENT'S PRESENT WELFARE POLICIES

1. What would you say should the goals of social welfare in society be?

2. With reference to what you regard as the goals of welfare policies, what are your views on present welfare policies in South Africa?

3. What are your views with regard to the following:

   (a) The argument that the family, the church or charitable organizations should be primarily responsible for welfare services in South Africa.
(b) The principle that the government and private welfare organizations should work in partnership to render welfare services, now and in a post-apartheid society?

(c) The principle of privatization of welfare services and sections of the economy?

(d) The idea that people should pay for welfare services as part of privatization?

4. Economic scarcity is often used as a reason not to expand welfare services on an equal basis to all population groups. What is your opinion of such a view and how do you think this issue should be dealt with?

5. What are your views with regard to the principle that social pensions and grants are regarded as a supplement to income, not a substitute or a salary?

6. What do you think are the consequences of present welfare policies upon the welfare of people?

7. What kind of co-ordinated action do you think should go out from the welfare community to change present racial welfare policies and to open up new services?

II. VIEWS WITH REGARD TO ALTERNATIVE WELFARE POLICIES

1. What is your organization's welfare policy or philosophical frame of reference from where it operates?

2. Has your organization thought about a welfare policy, or does your organization contribute to a welfare policy for the future? (What are your views in this regard?)

3. What would you regard as guiding principles or dominant values shaping social welfare policies in a post-apartheid South Africa?
4. Do you think that social welfare as a system can make a meaningful contribution in solving some of the problems that we will be faced with in a post-apartheid society? (Elaborate).

5. What are your views with regard to a Welfare State as a system to meet human needs in a post-apartheid South Africa?

6. What do you believe should the role of workers and Trade Unions be with regard to welfare in a post-apartheid society? What can they do now already?

7. What do you see as the role of employers with regard to social welfare services in a post-apartheid South Africa? What should they do now to contribute towards the welfare of the people with the view to a new South Africa?

8. What should the role of voluntary welfare organizations be in a post-apartheid society?

9. Who do you think should determine social welfare policy in a post-apartheid South Africa? Please explain how it should be done.

10. What are your views with regard to the structuring and rendering of welfare services either from a central government department, or decentralized services from a regional or local level?

11. Besides social welfare services, how do you think we should deal with the legacy of apartheid in terms of human needs and problems, and to improve the standard of living of the oppressed majority in a post-apartheid South Africa?

III. VIEWS ON FUTURE POLITICAL SCENARIOS

1. What kind of political scenarios do you envisage in South Africa before apartheid is abolished?

2. What kind of internal and external factors do you think would determine or could play a role towards a post-apartheid South Africa?
3. Given these scenarios, what kind of social welfare policies would be appropriate for reconstructing society and to meet the basic needs of the population?

4. What kind of socio-political and economic system do you think would be appropriate in order to meet the human needs and to secure the welfare of everybody?

5. What do you think is the potential of the Freedom Charter and the ideals envisioned in it to serve as a basis for a future welfare system in South Africa?

IV. VIEWS WITH REGARD TO TRANSITIONAL STRATEGIES TO A POST-APARTHEID SOCIETY

1. It should be clear that the years of apartheid will hamper the transition to and creation of a post-apartheid society. What do you think should be done now to work towards that objective/society?

2. What should be the role of training institutions in training welfare staff?

3. What role do you believe social workers as a professional group should now fulfil in working for a post-apartheid society?
ANNEXTURE THREE: LETTERS TO ORGANIZATIONS
25 March 1988

Dear Sir/Madam

VISIONS ON POST-APARTHEID SOCIAL WELFARE POLICIES

I hereby wish to approach you to assist me with a research project in which I collect the views of community/welfare organizations and persons on alternative social welfare policies in South Africa. Events that have prompted me to do the research were the government’s “reformed” welfare policies that were approved in 1987 and implemented since 1988. Ever since the announcement and implementation of these revised welfare policies, the welfare community protested and rejected them. However, it was also felt that we should be pro-active and explore appropriate alternatives. It was argued that we should spell out clearly to ourselves what we want and what the alternative is to the government’s welfare policies.

It is against this background that I am collecting views on post-apartheid welfare policies. The study is done at the Institute of Social Development (U.W.C.), under the supervision of Prof. A C Redlinghuis. I am thus approaching your organization for your views on welfare policies on a post-apartheid South Africa. For this purpose I need to conduct an interview with members of the Executive where organizations have a collective view on welfare policy. If a welfare policy has not been formulated, or if an interview with the Executive Committee is not feasible, would you please identify or nominate any member of your organization that could give me some perspectives pertaining to social welfare policies/matters? For your convenience I include a copy of the interviewing schedule to be used. May I also ask you to provide me with a copy of your constitution and policy statements that might be relevant to the subject of research?

As soon as I hear from you, a date and venue for the interview can be arranged.

Sincerely

FRANS G KOTZE

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I would like to introduce MR FRANS KOTZE to you. He is a lecturer in the Department of Social Work since 1975. This Department is directly involved with the welfare of the people by training social workers and initiating community projects. Recently the Department revised its curriculum in the light of contemporary issues faced in the welfare field and with a vision to the future South Africa. With the announcement of the government’s “reformed” social welfare policies in 1985, the Department of Social Work did not only oppose these policies, but organized discussions, held information meetings and distributed publications to inform the welfare community in the Western Cape on the issue.

It is against this background that Mr Kotze decided to look at alternative social welfare policies for a post-apartheid South Africa. The importance of this type of research for the future of our country is self-evident. The University sees itself playing an active role in this direction and strongly supports this research project. I ask you to please give your support and assistance to Mr. Kotze in his endeavour to contribute to the future society that we are working for.

Yours sincerely,

G J GERWEL
RECTOR & VICE-CHANCELLOR
GJG/YA