

2011.07.13

南京大学社会学院

穂坂光彦 (Nihon Fukushi University:NFU 日本福祉大学)

hosaka@n-fukushi.ac.jp

Theory of “development of welfare society(发展福利社会)”

MIDGLEY’S “SOCIAL INVESTMENT(社会性投資)” ←請参照中文資料

1. From community development to social development

community development approach invented by colonial social workers in West Africa (mostly Ghana) in 1950s; drew on earlier community development ideas in India (based on work of Gandhi) and on traditional community cooperation; recognized limitations of social welfare approach (covered only urban population, remedial, and very expensive (especially residential care)); need to work on mass poverty in rural areas and contribute to development; began with “mass literacy” but soon expanded to household agricultural projects, crafts, small infrastructure, health and sanitation.

In the 1950s, British called this approach “community development”, and then formally adopted “social development” as guiding policy in their territories; UN actively promoted social development approach in 1950s and 1960s.

2. Integration of economic development studies and social (welfare) policies (*new institutionalism* 新制度派)

Post-war *development* efforts were linked to Cold War and new post-colonial world order; in that context “development” was defined as process of economic growth designed to transform traditional agrarian economies of the Global South into modern industrial mass consumption societies with high standards of living; but “growth model” based on “modernization theory” was increasingly criticized, because of persistence of poverty and widening urban-rural disparity, limited employment opportunities, gender inequality and environmental disruption.

Meanwhile, in the mid-20th century, government *social welfare* services expanded greatly; but particularly in the Global South, their focus on residential care, individual counseling and assistance, and means-tested income transfers of limited scale were criticized for being remedial and concerned with maintenance, having high costs and limited coverage, diverting funds from development projects to consumption (welfare) activities, and non-participatory statist approach.

Midgley attempts to reintegrate development and social welfare and defines *social development* as a process of planned social change designed to promote the well-being of the population as a whole in conjunction with a dynamic process of economic development (Midgley, J. *Social development: The developmental perspective in social welfare*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA. and London, 1995, p.25). He advocates social well-being of people as the explicit goal of economic development, and stresses the government role of coordinating, facilitating and funding.

3. Developmental social welfare(发展型社会福利) (productivism 生産主義)

Esping-Andersen argues that “the Swedish model is unique in its bias toward a “productivistic” and preventive social policy: it spends relatively little on unemployment benefits but invests heavily in employment, training, job mobility, adult education, the prevention of illness and accidents, and family services. It is a welfare state both designed for and dependent upon the minimization of social needs and the maximization of employment. The philosophy is that money spent here creates greater savings elsewhere.”(Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1992) “The making of a social democratic welfare state” in K. Misgeld, K. Molin, and K. Åmark eds. *Creating Social Democracy: A Century of the Social Democratic Labor Party in Sweden*, Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, pp.35-66.)

Midgley applies the concept of productivism to social development in the context of Global South and insists that social welfare expenditure be directed to enhance the productive capacity of individuals and communities as *investments*.

SEN'S CONCEPT OF "DEVELOPMENT AS FREEDOM"

1. Human beings as agents

"I think where the basic needs perspective went wrong was to treat human beings as if they were *patients* rather than *agents*. You know, human beings are agents of change also. So if you have to decide what to be done in slums, that is not a question of finding out what slum dwellers would need. You have to find out what they would do if they have a freedom to do it, and how you could enhance that freedom."

2. A case of participatory housing programme in Sri Lanka

Enabling policy environment refers to a range of institutional re-arrangements that ensure people's access to a variety of resources required for developing themselves. The enabling principle was evident in Sri Lanka's participatory policy framework for urban housing and community development programme in the 1980s. An operational tool to implement the programme was called Community Action Planning (CAP).

The CAP method consists of a structured series of community workshops. A set of workshop modules was prepared, and an appropriate series of workshops were organized in particular communities depending on the local needs and stage of implementation. Normally, an initial two-day workshop is held at a community centre within their settlement (or at a temple or sometimes under trees), for about 30 representatives of the community to identify their socio-economic and physical issues and plan strategies to tackle these. At the end of the workshop, all the families are called upon and workshop conclusions are presented for ratification. The workshop outcomes are printed and distributed to all concerned. This is followed by a variety of one- or half-day issue-specific workshops: a workshop to strengthen the function of Community Development Councils (CDCs); a land regularization workshop for people to lay-out a blocking-out plan; a building guidelines workshop to formulate community-specific building codes; a housing information workshop for introduction of NHDA house loan packages; a community contract workshop familiarizing the community group with procedures to receive contract awards for minor infrastructure works; a women's enterprise support workshop to initiate group credit programmes for income generating activities; etc.

In order to substantiate workshop outcomes, various policy measures were available to and supportive of the urban poor. Government was willing to release public lands, on which squatter residents occupy, for favourable terms of tenure and confirmed its security. Subdivision regulations and building standards could be liberalized for "low-income projects", so as to allow the people to formally agree on their own "community building guidelines" (that was later authorized at the municipal council). Sketchy house plans drawn by people, based on the community building guidelines, were considered practically enough for issuing building permits without going through technically sophisticated procedures. House loans can be provided, once provisional land re-blocking is over (before professional surveyors come and new plots are officially registered). Community contracts may be awarded to CDCs without tendering procedures, as supported by an official resolution. These pro-poor policy-mix provided an framework wherein the "participatory" approach could be meaningful.

Thus, poor people's ability to house themselves was unleashed by the government enabling actions to remove social and institutional barriers that suppress their "freedom to build" (John Turner).

3. Disability and freedom

Look at the picture. Where does his "disability" lie?

How are we "disabled"? How can we be freed from disability?