

# **Chapter-1**

## **Social Development**

### **Conceptual Framework**

---

All modern nation states - as they profess to be democratic and are elected on the basis of the promises made to all their constituencies – have to carry out social welfare and developmental functions. This they are expected to do by regulating the social and economic relations so as to ensure the wellbeing of all its citizens. Social Workers, while meeting people’s individual, group, community and societal needs independently, partner with their governments in ensuring that right kind of social policies are framed and implemented effectively through proper planning so that people are not just relieved of their penury but are also enabled to lead an empowered and dignified life. Hence, through the methods such as Community Organization, Social Work Administration, Social Action and Social Work Research, professional Social Workers have ample opportunity to realize their social work goals by influencing social policies and planning from micro to macro levels.

Social Development through framing appropriate social policies and planning is expected of the governments as modern nation states have an unsaid social contract with their citizens which they must fulfill if they have to remain relevant and in power. This is because, feelings of nationalism and patriotism are not mere emotions; they influence state policy and relations with other states. State autonomy and its capacity to be influenced from social forces has also been a defining factor. In this regard, the state has been seen in relation to other institutions within society and has also been viewed as being above all

societal linkages. State-society linkages have thus provided an interesting insight into the exploration of associational behaviour. With state membership and citizenship, there are associated values of equality, liberty, justice and freedom. Regime types also determine the nature of the state: the democratic state seeks to ensure equality, justice and similar liberal ideals to all its citizens.

Given the fact that the Indian state has a developmental promise to fulfill in a diverse multicultural society, negotiations with dominant classes were necessary in order to ensure continuing legitimacy accorded to the state. However, these negotiations served to protect only the elite and vast tracts of deprivation and neglect soon became obvious.

India has been experiencing a consistently high growth rate during the post-liberalisation period following the implementation of economic reforms in the early 1990s. It has achieved excellence in several key areas ranging from information technology and pharmaceuticals to automotive parts, and is now considered as one of the fastest growing economies of the world. Despite these positive developments, India is still among the countries with some of the lowest indicators of human development. Its levels of malnutrition, illiteracy and poverty are unacceptably high. The rise in income inequalities and regional disparities is also a matter of concern. Employment has grown, but the jobs created are not of high quality. Although there has been an expansion in several social services like health, nutrition and education, the quality of most of these services remains poor in most of the rural areas. And above all, an overwhelming majority of the population is deprived of basic social protection. Policy-makers are thus faced with a paradox—the persistence of deprivations and increasing insecurities among a large section of the population amidst growing affluence and prosperity for some. The Eleventh and

Twelfth Five-Year Plans have also reflected upon these concerns and have highlighted the need for balanced and 'inclusive growth'.

Prof. Nayyar (Institute for Human Development, 2010) opines that economic growth cannot be completely disengaged from social development, since such a growth would neither be possible nor sustainable in the long run. Hence, let us, first try to understand the theoretical contours of 'development' in general and 'social development' in particular.

### **The Development Debate**

We frequently come across the words 'growth' and 'development' while talking about society. Growth is a quantitative concept whereas development incorporates qualitative aspects. Some perceive development in terms of better roads, electricity, markets, buildings, vehicles etc. while some others understand it in terms of removal of poverty, unemployment, insecurity, illiteracy, ill health and so on. What constitutes development can be a matter of debate, and opinions may vary. Lately, there has been a realization that development does not just comprise of economic growth or physical infrastructure development, but it should also show in terms of improvements in people's lives. So development has now come to be evaluated in terms of human wellbeing or human development. We all know the age-old proverb 'health is wealth'. A person who is not healthy cannot have happiness and meaning in life even if he/she is rich. Similarly, nations cannot be said to be healthy and happy only because they are wealthy. It has to be visible in spheres other than economic prosperity.

After winning independence from colonial powers in the 1950s and 1960s, many of the countries (called Third World) chose the growth oriented approach of development through industrial and agricultural expansion, aided by technology

transfer and financial assistance from the industrialized countries as well as international financial institutions. The growth-led developmental experience of industrialized countries served as the models of their future. The decade of 1960s was characterized by the predominance of “growth models” of development. Such models proposed that increasing the growth of these economies through investments would lead to higher growth, the benefits would ‘trickle down’ to the masses and there would be economic development.

Many of these economies achieved growth. The per capita income of a number of countries had grown over this period and health and education levels had improved; yet in a number of countries which had experienced a rise in their GNP, the standard of living did not improve for a vast majority of the population. In fact, many millions joined the already hundreds of millions of people in absolute poverty (Webster, 1997).

In many countries, sharp inequalities appeared with the rich minority growing richer and the poor majority becoming poorer. In other words, the “trickle down” had not occurred. This necessitated a reexamination of the concept of development. In this context, Seers (1969) asked three important questions regarding development: “What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? If all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt this has been a period of development for the country concerned.

If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all three have, it would be strange to call the result ‘development’ even if per capita income doubled.”

Critics of growth-oriented approach argued that such a situation arose because sufficient attention was not paid to real human welfare. It was argued that a complete change of approach for third world development was needed. Economists like Streeten and Seers advocated for a programme that had its

essential ingredient a redistribution of income and resources downwards. This led to the strategy of “redistribution with growth”, and later the “basic needs strategy” of development. The basic needs strategy was concerned with two things: i) providing all human beings, particularly the poor and deprived in the third world countries, with material needs like food, clothing, shelter and fuel; and ii) alleviating absolute poverty as quickly as possible. It had elements of social justice.

Gradually, it was realized that development must focus beyond meeting the basic needs of people in poor countries. It should encompass all the opportunities needed to live a fuller human life. Also, human beings should not be seen as recipients of development benefits, but as the goals of development. And while discussing human well being, it is the poorest and the weakest sections that must be especially taken into consideration. With this, the preoccupation with growth is replaced by a holistic idea of human welfare or wellbeing as the central concern of development. Growth is meaningful if it enhances human well being. This approach is known as the human development approach.

As defined in the Oxford English Dictionary, development means a gradual unfolding; a fuller working out, of the details of anything; the growth of what is in the germ. Thus, we can apply the term to understand the development of a child or of a disease. However, its usage in the last five decades in social sciences has been quite different and complex. It has been used in different ways by different people. Development inevitably means different things for different individuals and social groups. Due to different assumptions made about the nature of the development process, various words are frequently used to describe the process. Areas where development is slow, for instance, the economically backward areas are termed as less developed, developing, underdeveloped, and traditional.

**a) Development as Industrialization and Technological Advancement**

The term development has been used to make a distinction between the prosperous industrial societies versus the rest of the societies and also to describe the process of industrialization and modernization. This usage has several distinctive features and does not take into consideration the general theories like the theory of social evolution. It takes into account only a specific kind of changes, which occur either at the present time or took place in the recent past.

Three terms are commonly used to indicate the stage of development: traditional societies, transitional societies, and modern societies. Growth of knowledge and control over nature, which in other words, means development of human powers of production, is treated as the most significant element in the transformation of a society. Technological determinism and industrialization are the important features of this type of development.

Industrialization, urbanization and development are related processes. Increasing urbanization and rising number of factories and movement of goods and labour from rural areas to urban areas are the inevitable consequences of these processes. Industrialization, in fact, is a phase of economic development in which capital and labour resources shift both relatively and absolutely from agricultural activities to industry. Industrial production can be contrasted with craft production in terms of its scale; employment of a large number of workers; use of machinery; and the resulting geographical concentrations and production for a large market. Thus, the key elements of an industrial society seem to be the type of technology employed in production, the scale of organization of labour in relation to that technology, and the extent of specialization leading to various types of changes in society. With the introduction of

new technologies, less labour is required for agricultural production and more for industry. The industries being more concentrated in the urban areas the surplus of rural agricultural labour migrates to the urban areas. The migrated population has to find new ways of earning a livelihood with new rules. These changes, besides technological changes, include changes in the way people come to see themselves and others and changes in the ideological framework. In the process, a contradiction is said to exist between the forces of production, such as technology, technical knowledge, and crafts, and their relationships with production like legal arrangements, social organizations, forms of contracts, forms of distribution, etc.

Modernization theory, building on the ideas of Durkheim and Weber, emphasizes that industrialization involves changes in people's attitudes and expectations as well as in the structure of their relationships. Planned changes in economic, social, political and other spheres have been more recently defined as development.

### **b) Development as Socio-Cultural Development**

Since the 1960s there is an increasing emphasis by sociologists to look at development from a 'holistic' point of view. This means, defining development not only in terms of industrialization or economic dimensions but also in terms of socio-cultural dimensions. Until recently, the popular notion was that economic growth was a sufficient and necessary condition to stimulate development in all other sections of society. This has been proved incorrect.

Economic advancement of one group of people has not and does not trickle down to all other groups in a society. Also the achievement of high levels of economic advancement by some countries has not helped to solve some of their serious social problems. It is therefore, increasingly being emphasised that the

ultimate aim of development is the improvement of the quality of life of every human being in society. Development is multidimensional. It takes into consideration matters like equity, social participation, environmental sustainability, decentralization, self-reliance, basic human needs satisfaction etc.

Some sociologists emphasize that improvement in quality of life involves psychological, social and moral dimensions apart from political, economic and cultural dimensions. For instance, they point out that an improvement in the psychological quality of life entails the idea of life satisfaction including positive mental health. This requires a proper balance between material and non-material life goals of a people. The improvement in social quality of life means an increase in the strength of family stability, interpersonal bonds and social solidarity. An improvement in the moral quality of life means developing a concern for others and not merely a concern for self. (Sharma 1986: 20). Thus the sociological approach to development looks at this process as alterations that affect the whole socio-cultural matrix of society. Development has come to mean a planned, stimulated movement of all sectors of a social system in the direction of the overall desired goals set by a society.

Today Sociology of Development attempts to understand development and experiences of masses in a particular society in respect of their struggle to survive and change. One of the important aspects of Sociology and Development is to understand how transition occurs in society from one stage to another.

In the contemporary world, ecological perspectives and social aspects are of equal concern alongside economic issues, in the concept of Development.

In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), gave this definition: "Economic and



social development that meets the needs of the current generation without undermining the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.

There are many other understandings of “Sustainable Development”. Among them, the following are noteworthy:

- Sustainable development refers to maintaining a delicate balance between the human need to improve lifestyles and feeling of well-being on one hand, and preserving natural resources and ecosystems, on which we and future generations depend.
- Sustainable development is that development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
- Sustainable development refers to economic growth together with the protection of environmental quality, each reinforcing the other, i.e. development of a stable relationship between human activities and the natural world, which does not diminish the prospects for future generations to enjoy a quality of life at least as good as our own.
- If the development has to be sustainable people must share with each other and care for the Earth. Humanity must take no more from nature than nature can replenish. This in turn means adopting lifestyles and development paths that respect and work within nature’s limits.
- Sustainable development meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainable development respects the limited capacity of an ecosystem to absorb the impact of human activities.
- Sustainable development refers to achieving economic and social development in ways that do not exhaust a country’s natural resources.

- Sustainable development is a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientation of technological development, and institutional change are made consistent with the future as well as present needs.

The goal of sustainable development, while implicit in many national policies, gained global recognition and commitment following the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), otherwise known as the Earth Summit, held in 1992 at Rio de Janeiro.

Many of the ideas that are now embedded in the concept of sustainable development have been around for a long time – from as long ago as the work of Malthus on population growth in the late 1700s. But the concept really only emerged during debates in the early 1970s following a range of key publications drawing attention to man's over-exploitation of the environment, focusing on economic development and the growing global concern about development objectives and environmental constraints, and examining the inextricable links between environment and development.

A Global Commitment to Sustainable Development was made during the 1992 Earth Summit, which approved a set of five agreements, and although they all deal with the sustainable use of the environment, Agenda 21 focuses on social aspects, and lays out a global plan of action.

Agenda 21 says that human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.

The five agreements covered at the Earth Summit are:

- Agenda 21: a global plan of action for sustainable development, containing over 100 programme areas, ranging from trade and environment, through agriculture and desertification to capacity building and technology transfer.

- The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development - a statement of 27 key principles to guide the integration of environment and development policies (including the polluter pays, prevention, precautionary and participation principles).
- The Statement of Principles on Forests - the first global consensus on the management, conservation and sustainable development of the world's forests.
- The Framework Convention on Climate Change - a legally-binding agreement to stabilise greenhouse gases in the atmosphere at levels that will not upset the global climate system.
- The Convention on Biological Diversity - a legally-binding agreement to conserve the world's genetic, species and ecosystem diversity and share the benefits of its use in a fair and equitable way.

A commitment to meet the needs of present and future generations has various implications.

“Meeting the needs of the present” means satisfying:

- Economic needs - access to an adequate livelihood or productive assets; and economic security when unemployed, ill, disabled or otherwise unable to secure a livelihood.
- Social, cultural and health needs - a shelter which is healthy, safe, affordable and secure, within a neighbourhood with provision for piped water, drainage, transport, health care, education, child development, and protection from environmental hazards.
- Political needs - freedom to participate in national and local politics and in decisions regarding management and development of one's home and neighbourhood and which ensures respect for civil and political rights and the implementation of environmental legislation.

Meeting such needs “without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” means:

- Minimizing use or waste of non-renewable resources - including minimizing the consumption of fossil fuels and substituting with renewable sources where feasible (reduce use, re-use, recycle, reclaim).
- Sustainable use of renewable resources - including using freshwater, soils and forests in ways that ensure a natural rate of recharge.
- Keeping within the absorptive capacity of local and global sinks for wastes - including the capacity of rivers to break down biodegradable wastes as well as the capacity of global environmental systems, such as climate, to absorb greenhouse gases.

Sustainable development will entail integration of social, economic and ecological objectives. It will be:

- socially desirable, fulfilling people’s cultural, material and spiritual needs in equitable ways.
- economically viable, paying for itself, with costs not exceeding income, and
- ecologically sustainable, maintaining the long-term viability of supporting ecosystems.

We will have to make hard choices and negotiate trade-offs between objectives where integration is not possible. These negotiations will be greatly influenced by factors such as peace and security, prevailing economic interests, political systems, institutional arrangements and cultural norms.

The aim of sustainable development is to optimize the realization of a society’s many social, environmental and economic objectives at one and the same time, preferably through a process of integration, but more usually with bargains (trade-offs) made among different interest groups.

The question then arises: who should make the decisions on trade-offs? This calls for the widest possible participation in

negotiations - international, national, state, panchayats and even in villages (e.g. who should have the power for the allotment of Ashraya houses).

National governments are responsible for providing the conditions which both permit and facilitate the necessary dialogue and negotiation between all sectors and interest groups in society. The development of national strategies for sustainable development, could lead to greater democracy, encourage an overhaul of institutional arrangements, administrative procedures and legislative frameworks, as well as foster consensus among different strata and groupings in society.

### **Defining Social Development**

Development, according to Social Development theorists, is a process of social change, not merely a set of policies and programs instituted for some specific results (International Commission on Peace and Food, 1994).

According to Bilance (1997), "Social Development is the promotion of a sustainable society that is worthy of human dignity by empowering marginalised groups, women and men, to undertake their own development, to improve their social and economic position and to acquire their rightful place in society.....". Amartya Sen (1995) opines that "Social Development is equality of social opportunities".

The Copenhagen Social Summit, 1995 defined Social Development in terms of three basic criteria: i) Poverty Eradication, ii) Employment Generation, and iii) Social Harmony.

Bilance, Holland, a development Agency, speaks of three Components of Social Development. They are i) the fight against Poverty, ii) development by people themselves, and iii) a rightful place in society. It also states three fields of operation within Social Development. These are: i) Basic Services, ii) Means of Existence, and iii) Human Rights and Democratic Domain.

Three fixed measuring points for Social Development, according to Bilance are i) gender, ii) sustainable development, and iii) social cohesion.

While the above definitions and descriptions open us out to the wide horizons of Social Development, we need to develop our own indigenous definitions and indices of Social Development in India by using all the variables deemed appropriate for our specific conditions.

When we talk of “development” in the social development field, we essentially and primarily refer to the development of human beings in a sustainable manner – particularly those who are resource poor, needy and marginalized.

James Midgley (1995) has had a decisive impact on the international discussion on social development. He conceives it 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 1995, p. 25). The goal of social development in the context of modern welfare is to produce a social well-being that makes people capable of acting and making their own decisions in the broadest sense. Midgley’s definition of social development “as a process of promoting people’s welfare” can be elucidated as an enabling perspective, because it focuses attention on the potentials for action without forgetting the structural constraints to which actors are subject. The strengths of social development lie in the fact that its intervention strategies address the macro-, meso-, and micro levels. This means that it draws local communities into its strategy packages just as much as governments and international organizations.

Thus, social development can be understood as a process which results in the transformation of social structures in a manner which improves the capacity of the society to fulfill its aspirations.

For social development we need to listen to poor people and promote their voices in the development process; understanding and addressing their needs, priorities and aspirations; and building formal and informal institutions for this to happen.

### **Measuring Social Development**

Various indicators such as per capita income and GDP are used by economists to measure the development achieved by a country. However, as Prof. Nayyar (Institute for Human Development, 2010) has pointed out, the rise in per capita income and overall GDP growth rates in India during the period 1980–2010 do not reflect the real picture, and being mathematical averages, do not indicate the development index for the poorer sections. It is because India has not been able to meet the basic needs of a vast population of 50 million that continues to live in acute poverty and deplorable conditions. Hence, development experts have tried to develop some other indicators to address critical questions such as, what proportion of the GDP is required to be redistributed to improve this situation; and since 1981 how far have the people above the poverty line moved away? We have tried to present here a few of the significant indicators developed by development experts to measure or assess the level of social or human development achieved by a particular society or community.

### **Human Development Index (HDI)**

The concept of 'human development' was formally launched in 1990 with the publication of Human Development Report by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The conceptualization of human development has been influenced by late economist Mahbub ul Haq and Nobel laureate economist Amartya Sen's ideas of 'capabilities' and 'freedom'. According to Sen, development is the expansion of freedom, well being and dignity on individuals in society.

Human development is concerned primarily with the reduction of human deprivation, the creation of human capability, and unleashing processes that enlarge peoples' choices. India Human Development Report (1999) defines Human Development as "a process of enlarging peoples' choices... The most critical choices that people should have, include a long and healthy life, access to knowledge and income, assets and employment for a decent standard of living... (But) human development concerns more than the formation of human capabilities such as improved health or knowledge. It also concerns the use of these capabilities".

Haq (2000) has given the following main features of human development:

- i) Development must put people at the center of its concerns;
- ii) The purpose of development is to enlarge all human choices, not just income;
- iii) The human development paradigm is concerned both with building up human capabilities (through investment in people) and with using those human capabilities fully (through an enabling framework for growth and employment);
- iv) Human development has four essential components: Equity, Sustainability, Productivity and Empowerment. It regards economic growth as essential but emphasizes on quality and distribution. It also analyses its links with human lives and questions its long-term sustainability; and
- v) The human development paradigm defines the ends of development and analyses sensible options for achieving them.

The Human Development Reports of United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) have developed indices such as the Human Development Index (HDI), the Human Poverty Index (HPI) & the Gender-related Development Index (GDI).



The Human Development Index (HDI) is prepared in terms of capabilities of three basic dimensions of human development: i) life longevity, ii) knowledge (adult literacy and combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment), and iii) decent standard of living (real per capita income).

### **The Human Poverty Index (HPI)**

The Human Poverty Index (HPI), meant for most deprived sections of the community, is based on deprivations in the essential elements of decent human life. These include: i) basic survival (death before age 40, child and maternal mortality), ii) educational levels (% of illiterate adults), iii) overall economic provisioning (% of people without access to health services and safe water), and iv) sustainability (% of underweight children under 5).

### **The Gender-related Development Index (GDI)**

The Gender-related Development Index (GDI) measures the above variables in terms of inequality between women and men.

Gender deprivation and inequality has long been the subject of discussion in development. One of the critiques of HDI was that it did not take into account the differential impact of development on men and women. To address this issue, a new measure was invented in 1995. The Human Development Report of 1995 states that “human development, if not engendered, is endangered”.

For measuring GDI, inequalities between men and women are taken note of and then the overall achievement of men and women in three aspects of HDI — life expectancy, educational attainment, and adjusted real income are considered. On the basis of analysis of GDI values, many meaningful observations have been made such as gender equality is not dependent on the income level of a society. Since 1995, these measures form an integral component of the human development reports.

**Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM)**

The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) focuses on participation - economic, political and professional. It finds out the extent to which women have been empowered or enfranchised to participate in various aspects of public life as compared to men.

Given the large heterogeneous nature of India, national indicators often hide the considerable variations that exist from State to State, region to region. There is also the need to look at relative indices of different groups of people and regions, especially the disadvantaged sections in India. This reality is reflected in the following observations made by India Human Development Report (1999) which reads, “..... Even the average HDI figure masks much of the variation across different regions and groups of people, especially, in large countries such as India. It is thus important to obtain a picture of the levels of living of the disadvantaged regions and groups of people in a country in order to evaluate the success of national development programmes in improving the life of the less well off.... Since practically all human development investments are made by the State Governments in India, substantial inter-State variations in this may be expected.....”

**Theories of Social Development**

Pat Shannon in his book ‘Social Policy’ provides six stances of social policy. These are:

i) Classical Liberalism (Residual Theory), ii) Industrial Society theory (Institutional Theory), iii) Marxist/Socialist Theory (Normative Theory), iv) Radical Reformism, v) Defensive Fabianism, and vi) Welfare Pluralism.

Let us try to briefly understand the meaning of each of them.

**Classical Liberalism**

This theory is primarily concerned with the market as the root of the economic system. The role of government is to stimulate economic growth and recovery. This means that the state will not get involved in providing social welfare services or, where it already does, it withdraws from them.

**Industrial Society Theory**

This viewpoint recognizes an equal balance between economic and political systems and the market as important but in need of regulation. The public policy approach therefore is based on state management, and employment is the key economic and social indicator of how successful this is.

**Marxist/Socialist Theory**

This theory is based on the idea, that one group has all the means of production (the capitalist class) and the other provides the means of labour (the working class). It is a theory based on the idea that workers are exploited. The role of the state is to support capital accumulation through the construction of infrastructure and to provide services – like education and health – that ensure this occurs.

**Radical Reformism**

This theory accepts the social control function of the welfare state. It questions the class-based society and favours a society in which a variety of movements are loosely connected and integrated with a decision making process based on participation.

**Defensive Fabianism**

This theory argues for social/welfare and economic policies to be given equal time and space with equity and redistribution as the goals of social policy. There are however two schools of thought as to how this can be done.

The first is that this is to be achieved through centralized intervention that is agreed to by the state, the business sector and the populace in general who are described as labour/workers. The second is that this is to be achieved through decentralization with better targeting and selectivity of benefits and services.

### **Welfare Pluralism**

This theory is a mix of the Classical Liberalism and Industrial Society Theory where social welfare services are provided by a mix of state, voluntary and commercial organizations.

### **Approaches to Social Development**

Approaches to social development may be briefly categorized as i) Sectoral Approach, ii) Area Development Approach, and iii) Area Development Approach.

- i) Sectoral Development:** Planning for development by individual sectors like education, health, housing and social security are included in sectoral planning. This approach advocates compartmentalization of development in different sectors as if these are watertight compartments and have nothing to do with each other. Its inadequacies stem from this compartmentalized approach. Little attempt is made to integrate them.
- ii) Area Development Approach:** This approach contemplates that development of an area depends not only on the development of an adequate infrastructure network but also the way factors of the local economy are activated around the production infrastructure. In other words, for development of an area, spatial and functional integration is necessary. Thus, while rural growth centers provide ideal locations for the provision of infrastructural facilities, their hinterlands are regarded as basic planning units for integrated multi-sectoral planning to achieve integrated development of an area.

The approach, while taking area poverty into consideration, provides a balance between various sectoral activities as well as spatial pattern of growth; however, it does not ensure that economic growth is being shared by all classes and communities of the rural areas.

**iii) Integrated Development Approach:** In the context of problems in the area development approach as discussed above and the government policy to tackle the problems of rural poverty, a new strategy of development, i.e. the integrated development approach has been developed because the area development approach by and large failed to address the question of inequalities in the distribution of employment, incomes and assets. A mere geographical emphasis, as is the case with the area development approach, has been found to be inadequate in solving the problems.

#### **Some other Approaches to Social Development:**

Three main areas/approaches to social development are:

- i) Social Assistance (non-contributory)
- ii) Social Insurance (contributory)
- iii) Social Defense (protection)

#### **i) Social Assistance**

The beneficiaries do not contribute to it and the benefits are provided as a matter of right and without any “means test”. Whereas in charity or poor relief (different from Social assistance), here is some stigma about them and are generally granted after a “means test”. The examples of social assistance are old age pension, widow pension, assistance to leprosy patients, family planning assistance, etc.

#### **ii) Social Insurance**

The beneficiaries also contribute to it in addition to State and others. Example Life Insurance, Accident Insurance,

Medical Insurance (Mediclaime), ESI Scheme for workers, Crop Insurance, Theft Insurance, Fire Insurance, etc.

The principle behind social insurance is that people earn benefits by contributions, paid while they are at work. The advantages of an insurance scheme are:

- People should feel they are entitled to benefits.
- Contributions are a way of raising money for benefits.
- Because people have paid for their benefits, it is supposed to be difficult to abolish the benefits. (This has been disproved in practice: the government of New Zealand, for example, has replaced insurance-based pensions with means-tested ones.)

The disadvantages are:

- People must work to qualify. This leaves out large numbers of people - unemployed school leavers, women who have been looking after children, chronically sick and disabled people. The insurance system may also distinguish the 'deserving' and the 'undeserving' poor.
- If contributions are set too high people cannot pay them. This may mean benefits are set too low.
- Poor people are less able to afford contributions.

### **iii) Social Defense**

Social Defense refers to mainly the protection of society from anti-social and criminal conducts. The examples would be eradication of beggary, gambling control, prostitution control, welfare of prisoners, anti-dowry measures, suicide counselling, etc.

In sum, social security considers three essential elements viz., security of employment, security of income and security of right to work. This forms the basis for social welfare in industrialized and urbanized economies.

Social security is sometimes used to refer specifically to social insurance, but more generally it is a term used for personal

financial assistance, in whatever form it may take. It is also referred to as “income maintenance”.

The reasons why financial assistance is given include:

- the relief of poverty, and
- social protection.

The idea of ‘social security’ implies that people ought to be able to feel secure. This involves, not only being protected against poverty, but being protected against the hardships that may arise through a change in circumstances. If people become sick, or unemployed, they should not, the argument goes, have to lose their possessions or deprive themselves as a result.

Social protection or social security provide a set of instruments to bridge the gap between vulnerable groups and the non-vulnerable by diminishing people’s exposure to risks and enhancing their capacity to protect themselves against hazards/loss of income. Because of the strong redistributive character of most social protection policies, they were not favoured by conventional approaches during the 1980s-90s (except pension reform projects); in extreme cases like Bolivia, the Ministry of Social Security was closed down. However, social protection is necessary in any society because the benefits of growth do not reach all, and people do not have the same capacity to overcome risks. Given the urgency to eradicate poverty, social protection is currently at the forefront of the social development agenda.

### **Social Exclusion and Inclusive Development**

Several research studies show that even in this century many people are excluded from development because of their gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, disability or poverty. The effects of such exclusion are staggering, deepening inequality across the world. The richest ten percent of people in the world own 85 percent of all assets, while the poorest 50 percent own only one percent.

Development can be inclusive - and reduce poverty - only if all groups of people contribute to creating opportunities, share the benefits of development and participate in decision-making. Inclusive development follows UNDP's human development approach and integrates the standards and principles of human rights: participation, non-discrimination and accountability.

Social exclusion can be understood within three levels: individual, community, and global -structural/policies. Although examples are listed within these three specific levels, one must recognize the intersecting nature of social exclusion and its capacity to overlap within each.

#### **Exclusion at the Individual Level**

Marginalization at the individual level results in an individual's exclusion from meaningful participation in society. An example of marginalization at the individual level is the exclusion of single mothers from the welfare system prior to the welfare reform of the 1990s. The welfare system is based on the concept of the universal worker; entitlement to welfare is based on one's contribution to society in the form of employment. A single mother's contribution to society is not based on employment resulting in the mother's ineligibility of social assistance for many decades. In modern society, caring work is devalued and motherhood is seen as a barrier to employment. Single mothers are marginalized for their significant role in the socializing of children and due to views that an individual can only contribute meaningfully to society through employment. As a result single mothers continue to suffer from material deprivation, as well as their children. Another example of individual marginalization is the exclusion of individuals with disabilities from the labour force. Grandz discusses an employer viewpoint in hiring individuals living with disabilities as jeopardizing productivity, increasing the rate of absenteeism, and creating more accidents in the workplace. Cantor also discusses employer concern of



the excessive high cost of accommodating people with disabilities. The marginalization of individuals with disabilities is prevalent today despite the Canadian Human Rights Act, the Employment Equity Act, academic achievement, skills and training.

### **Exclusion at the Community Level**

Many communities experience marginalization, with particular focus in this section on Aboriginal communities and women. Marginalization of Aboriginal communities is a product of colonization. As a result of colonialism, Aboriginal communities lost their land, were forced into destitute areas, lost their sources of income, and were excluded from the labour market. Additionally, Aboriginal communities lost their culture and values through forced assimilation and lost their rights in society. Today various communities continue to be marginalized from society due to the development of practices, policies and programs that “met the needs of white people and not the needs of the marginalized groups themselves”. Yee also connects marginalization to minority communities when describing the concept of whiteness as maintaining and enforcing dominant norms and discourse. A second example of marginalization at the community level is the marginalization of women. Moosa-Mitha discusses the feminist movement as a direct reaction to the marginalization of white women in society. Women were excluded from the labor force and their work in the home was not valued. Feminists argued that men and women should equally participate in the labor force, the public and private sector, and in the home. They also focused on labour laws to increase access to employment, as well as recognize childrearing as a valuable form of labour. Today women are still marginalized from executive positions and continue to earn less than men in upper management positions.

**Exclusion at the Global and Structural Level**

Globalization (global-capitalism), immigration, social welfare and policy are broader social structures that have the potential to contribute negatively to one's access to resources and services, resulting in marginalization of individuals and groups. Globalization impacts the lives of individuals and groups in many capacities with the influx of capitalism, information technology, company outsourcing/job insecurity, and the widening gap between the rich and the poor. Alphonse, George and Moffat discuss how globalization sets forth a decrease in the role of the state with an increase in support from various "corporate sectors resulting in gross inequalities, injustices and marginalization of various vulnerable groups". Companies are outsourcing, jobs are lost, the cost of living continues to rise, and land is being expropriated by large companies. Material goods are made in large abundances and sold at cheaper costs, while in India for example, the poverty line is lowered in order to mask the number of individuals who are actually living in poverty as a result of globalization. Globalization and structural forces aggravate poverty and continue to push individuals to the margins of society, while governments and large corporations do not address the issues. Certain language and the meaning attached to language can cause universalizing discourses that are influenced by the Western world, which is what Sewpaul describes as the "potential to dilute or even annihilate local cultures and traditions and to deny context specific realities". What Sewpaul is implying is that the effect of dominant global discourses can cause individual and cultural displacement, as well as an experience of "de-localization", as individual notions of security and safety are jeopardized. Insecurity and fear of an unknown future and instability can result in displacement, exclusion, and forced assimilation into the dominant group. For

many, it further pushes them to the margins of society or enlists new members to the outskirts because of global-capitalism and dominant discourses. With the prevailing notion of globalization, we now see the rise of immigration as the world gets smaller and smaller with millions of individuals relocating each year. This is not without hardship and struggle of what a newcomer thought was going to be a new life with new opportunities. Ferguson, Lavalette, and Whitmore discuss how immigration has had a strong link to access of welfare support programs. New comers are constantly bombarded with the inability to access a country's resources because they are seen as "undeserving foreigners". With this comes a denial of access to public housing, health care benefits, employment support services, and social security benefits. Newcomers are seen as undeserving, or that they must prove their entitlement in order to gain access to basic support necessities. It is clear that individuals are exploited and marginalized within the country they have emigrated. Welfare states and social policies can also exclude individuals from basic necessities and support programs. Welfare payments were proposed to assist individuals in accessing a small amount of material wealth. Young further discusses how "the provision of the welfare itself produces new injustice by depriving those dependent on it of rights and freedoms that others have...marginalization is unjust because it blocks the opportunity to exercise capacities in socially defined and recognized way". There is the notion that by providing a minimal amount of welfare support, an individual will be free from marginalization. In fact, welfare support programs further lead to injustices by restricting certain behaviour, as well the individual is mandated to other agencies. The individual is forced into a new system of rules while facing social stigma and stereotypes from the dominant group in society,

further marginalizing and excluding individuals. Thus, social policy and welfare provisions reflect the dominant notions in society by constructing and reinforcing categories of people and their needs. It ignores the unique-subjective human essence, further continuing the cycle of dominance.

We have tried to understand the theoretical contours of social development in this chapter. In the next chapter of this book we shall strive to understand the historical evolution of the idea of social development and the rationale for the continuance of social policy and planning in the contemporary world.

## **Chapter-2**

### **Historical Progress and Contemporary Relevance**

---

The concept of social development has a long history. We shall try to understand its historical progress in the Western world first and then in the Indian context.

#### **History of Social Development in the West**

The idea of social development has been part of western social thought for more than 2500 years. However, the need for Social Development was realized and discussed in the wake of myriad problems experienced by vulnerable communities in the era of industrialization and urbanization which were the inevitable part of the developmental agenda known popularly as 'modernization'.

England was the first European country to come under the spell of industrialisation. As a consequence, it took the lead in modern institutions like democracy and a modern representative state system. England also had a long tradition of charity. These features placed England at the centre of any debate on welfare state.

#### **Elizabethan Poor Laws**

The European experience has been heavily influenced by the experience of Britain which has had a long history of public assistance to the poor and private charity. The poor were in earlier times wards of the Church but by Elizabethan period in the sixteenth century laws were enacted to establish a national system of relief that provided legal and compulsory help to the poor. The Poor Laws were codified in 1597-1598 and reenacted

in 1601. Under these laws the parish became the basic unit of administration to manage relief work. A compulsory tax was imposed on each household and this money was used to provide relief to the aged, the infirm but not to the 'sturdy beggar'.

Under Elizabethan Poor Laws, able-bodied poor were punished. Social reformers and social legislation was concerned with discouraging dependence on charity that would lead to idleness. They did this through forced work or punishments such as whipping. The principle that the poor laws were based on was 'work for those that will labour, punishment for those that will not, and bread for those who cannot.'

In economic thought the idle poor also represented an intolerable drain on the wealth of the nation and consequently many schemes were devised to put them to work. Reformers wrote about workhouses and labour camps and the condition in the workhouses was designed to be worse than outside.

It was this background that put England far ahead of the other European states in its concern and policies for the poor. Many travellers were impressed and wrote glowingly of these policies. Benjamin Franklin came to England in 1766 and praised the way England looked after her poor but he also raised the question that was much debated in contemporary England, and which continues to evoke a debate even today. He wrote, "There is no country in the world where so many provisions are established for them [the poor]; hospitals, almshouses, a tax for the support of the poor...In short, you offered a premium for the encouragement of idleness, and you should not now wonder that it has had its effect in the increase of poverty".

He was astonished because he saw England as a developed, prosperous country, the very "Eden of modern civilisation" and noted that other European countries were poorer and the poor in England rich compared to the European poor but English poverty was of a different type. This poverty amidst plenty had nothing to do with subsistence but for the English "the lack of

a multitude of things causes poverty”. This was, he wrote, also accompanied by a commitment to alleviate poverty for ‘society believes itself bound to come to the aid of those who lack them. These changes brought about a more reasoned and systematic form of social action to mitigate poverty. It transformed what was private charity given out of a moral duty into a legal obligation.

### **From Organized Charity to Social Policies**

Economic development as well as social dislocation marked the capitalist transformation of the world between 1750 and 1850. In this situation ideas about relief and charity also began to change. The reform sentiment that gathered momentum during this period effected a range of social policies but perhaps the movement against slavery was the most dramatic of these. Electoral reforms allowed greater participation and in turn parliament was made more sensitive to popular opinion and became the vehicle for realising social legislation. The reforms of 1834 set up a Central Poor Commission to supervise the administration of poor relief that had become inefficient and corrupt. The able-bodied poor were kept out of relief system through the workhouse test since conditions in the workhouse were always harsher than outside. Yet these reforms did establish a system that carried social legislation further by regulating hours and conditions of work in factories and mines.

Concern for public health had become particularly necessary because of the cholera epidemics of 1831-3 and 1847-8 but the untiring efforts of Edwin Chadwick were equally important for a better organisation of urban life. An Act of 1848 established a central board of health on the lines of the Poor Law Commissioners that had the power to establish local boards. Other Acts enforced regulations governing education, prison conditions, and working conditions for children and women. The New Poor Laws gave rise to intense debates that centre

around a distinction between the poor and the pauper. The laws it was argued was 'pauperising the poor'. This was because the laws gave an allowance to the poor. The funds for this allowance were generated through extra rates levied on tax payers. It was argued that not only did this work as a disincentive to work but it drove wages down, led to a fall in productivity, and was a burden on those who paid the extra rates but did not benefit from it. Because of this burden these people were driven to swell the ranks of unemployed agricultural labour.

The question of who are the poor was central to much of the debates and proposals for social legislation. At the end of the eighteenth century Edmund Burke had objected to the phrase 'labouring poor' arguing that there were 'labouring poor' who worked for their subsistence and the 'poor' who were the sick, infirm, or those orphaned in their infancy or incapacitated by old age. The Church had given alms regardless of whether the recipient laboured or not as did the Elizabethan poor laws. It was John Malthus who introduced an idea of ambiguity. Malthus argued against the idea that an expanding industrial economy would produce sufficient wealth to provide for the 'happiness and comfort of the lower orders of society'. Industrial growth would lead to a growth in population but agricultural production would not rise leading to a worsening of conditions for those struggling for subsistence. Any relief given to these paupers would increase their population and consequently worsen the situation as there would be a decrease in food available for the entire poor population. The only way to break out of this vicious cycle was through the exercise of 'moral restraint'.

It was this type of thinking that supported and sustained programmes of social amelioration and created a division among social reformers. It was this thinking and these debates that are reflected in Disraeli's comment that in England now "Poverty is a crime" or in Thomas Carlyle's statement that these laws put a 'bounty on unthrift, idleness, dastardly and beer drinking.'



### **Social Development as a Social Obligation**

The debates however, also had a positive effect as they shifted concerns from poverty narrowly defined to larger issues of the obligations of state and society, of the causes of social inequality, the basis of law and obligation. Thinkers such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels argued that inequities in the system could only be changed through revolutionary change that would give the full value of his labour to the worker, others sought to return to the old community based systems that had disintegrated and some others sought to bring about legal restrictions that would regulate factory work, public health and mitigate the effects of early industrialization.

As the general condition of the working class began to improve the stigma attached to poverty began to change and disappear. It was now narrowly focused on the urban vagrant whom Henry Mayhew characterised as the 'peculiar poor' marked by a 'distinctive moral physiognomy'. This differentiation of the poor was taken further by Charles Booth who through careful household surveys, (published as *Life and Labour of the People of London* between 1889-1903 in 14 volumes) made a distinction between the very poor (paupers, street folk) and the comfortable working class. He drew a poverty line and laid the basis for providing social legislation to help this category of deserving poor and they benefited from subsequent legislation such as the Old Age Pensions Act of 1898 or the National Insurance Act of 1911.

Poverty and its relief were now transformed into a social problem that required a different approach. It was no longer a matter of providing relief but services and these not just to a particular group of people but to all citizens. Moreover, these were not the bare minimum required but would soon be set at what the 1945 Labour Party manifesto called the 'optimum standard'. Comprehensive social legislation was made a reality with the Liberal party in 1905 under the leadership of the

younger generations of liberals, Herbert Asquith, David Lloyd George and Winston Churchill and the pressure of trade unions. They were committed to waging a war against misery and squalor. Under their leadership an impressive array of legislation was enacted: Workers Compensation Act

(1906), Old Age Pension Laws (1908), Trade Board Acts (1909) that was empowered to set up special commissions to fix a minimum wage for workers. The National Insurance

Act (1911) which was a contributory scheme for all workers was modeled on Bismarck's scheme of 1883-9 and made friendly societies and trade unions 'approved societies' to administer the scheme reflecting the cooperation between state and voluntary bodies.

Similarly measures for town planning were influenced by German laws and the Education Act of 1902 was an attempt to catch up with the German and French systems that were far more advanced.

The Liberals also enacted laws to clear slums and build proper houses for the poor in 1909. This aside from improving living conditions also fuelled a construction boom in the coming years. Lloyd George's proposed budget of 1909 which was defeated in the House of Lords was written reflecting this new philosophy of welfare. He provided for an increase in income tax as well as a super tax on the incomes of the rich. He proposed to confiscate 20 per cent from unearned increment of land values as well as levied a heavy tax on undeveloped land. These revenues were to be used for old age pensions as well as other forms of social insurance. They would also go towards changing the social structure by breaking the monopoly of the rich nobility. There were many big landowners among the nobility, for instance the Duke of Westminster owned over 600 acres in London at this time. Though defeated the Liberals managed to enact many of these measures when they came back to power in 1910.

The post war years influenced by the economic crisis and

unemployment before the war and this sense of crisis during the war fuelled the resurgence of left wing movements all over Europe. People increasingly demanded that the state had an obligation to secure the well being of its citizens. In 1942 Sir William Beveridge's Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services (1942) laid out a practical plan for a comprehensive public protection of the individual. It was on the basis of this that the Labour government of 1945 enacted laws that ended the old poor law system and created a social security system that brought together earlier elements as well as allowed for voluntary schemes as well. Education had been reorganized through the Butler Act of 1944 and in 1945 a system of family allowances was started.

### **Diversity in Approaches**

The path to Social Development through social policy and planning did not follow a uniform pattern in all the countries of the Western world. In Germany and Japan social legislation became a vital element in the policy of social control. In this welfare legislation was a way of strengthening national power. However, the general democratization of politics and greater political participation through the electoral process changed the forms of social control and placed greater reliance on internalized moral and cultural mechanisms. Relief and charity expanded and were transformed through social legislation that sought to provide for the needs of all its citizens from 'cradle to grave'.

The World Summit on Social Development held in Copenhagen in 1995 came out with a declaration in which ten commitments were made by the participating world leaders. This includes, eradicate absolute poverty, support full employment, promote social integration based on the enhancement and protection of all human rights; achieve equality between men and women, accelerate the development of Africa and the least developed countries, ensure that structural

adjustment programmes include social development goals, increase resources allocation to social development, create an economic, political, social, cultural, and legal environment, that will enable people to achieve social development, attain universal and equitable access to education and primary health care and strengthen cooperation for social development through the UN.

### **History of Social Development in India**

Even in India the ideas to initiate social change in the social fabric of society in rudimentary form could be even traced from the Buddhist period. And later on the different attempts were done to improve the plight of especially weak, downtrodden, and exploited class of the society (Bhattacharya, 2003). Mahatma Gandhi's vision of development was in the form of rural development as goal of Sarvodaya i.e. Welfare of All or Samagra Gram Seva. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar on the other hand stressed the need for social and economic redistribution of resources in favour of equality and justice and argued in favour of affirmative action to correct the injustice perpetuated in the name of superiority and purity of certain castes.

At the time of Independence from colonial rule in the mid twentieth century, there was broad social consensus in India on the role of the state as a crucial player in the development process. State led capitalism and state intervention in various ways were seen as essential instruments for the development of a relatively autonomous Indian capitalism, displacing metropolitan capital from the pre-eminent position it had occupied in the colonial economy. The economic policy regime that was erected in the 1950s had its roots in the nationalist freedom struggle, which emphasized that freedom meant freedom not only from political control, but also from external economic domination. It was felt that this could not be ensured without giving the state in independent India a major role in building up infrastructure, expanding and strengthening the

productive base of the economy, setting up new financial institutions and regulating and coordinating economic activity. This was recognized to be necessary for building capitalism itself, though some no doubt entertained the fond hope that all this would add up to an eventual transition to socialism.

However, there were a number of features of India's post-Independence growth strategy that structurally limited the potential of the economic system to expand in a sustainable manner. Many of these features, which stemmed from the political economy of class configurations at the time, contributed in turn to the specific manner in which the development process unfolded and to the limitations of social policy in accelerating the process of development. The most significant such feature was the inability of the Indian state in general to address the most basic form of inequality in the country, that over the ownership and control over land. Despite the overt declarations regarding the need for land reforms and for curbing the concentration of economic power, relatively little was done to attack or redress asset and income inequality. Similarly, while some monopolistic practices were curbed, private asset concentration in the industrial sector was never really challenged. In fact, state intervention became yet another mechanism for existing monopolists to consolidate their positions.

One consequence of the associated persistence of asset and income inequality was that there were definite limits to the expansion of the market for mass consumption goods in the country. This in turn meant that employment and income growth in the private sector was limited. The absence of any radical land redistribution meant that the domestic market, especially for manufactured goods, remained socially narrowly based. It also meant that the growth of agricultural output, though far greater than in the colonial period, remained well below potential.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the scope of social policy, focused

on delivery of limited services and welfare, was insufficient to achieve balanced social and economic development. Social policy was considered residual, secondary to the focus on growth as then mainstream development theory focused on “economic growth first”. As such, social policy was given lesser importance and funding, and often was centred on mitigating the unintended consequences of economic change.

This residual approach was dominant for about two decades, and led to increasing social tensions and malaise. For example, after the attainment of independence in 1947, the formation of planning commission and the launch of Five Year Plans was initiated. In 1952 A massive programme of Community Development and National Extension Service programmes were started for the development of rural communities in India. The system of panchayat raj were introduced in order to give power to the people at the grass- root level and enable them to take decision in their own interest. The land reform measures introduced to protect the interest poor, small and marginalized farmers. The central social welfare board stated in the year 1953 to help non government organizations the financial benefits to undertake various programmes of social welfare. Further in subsequent plan period the programmes of nation development to improve quality of human life in different spectrum attempted by enacting social and labour legislations. In 1975, the twenty point programme, IRDP programme and even many other programmes were started to improve the living conditions of people. The programme of achieve near full employment, eliminate poverty, satisfaction of basic need like food, clothing, shelter, and provide health for all by 2000 were the activities parts of Seventh Five Year Plan between 1985-1990.

After having been pared to a minimum, social policies were reconsidered during the 1990s with the renewed attention of development policies to poverty reduction. Even then, social policies were treated as marginal, reduced to little more than

the idea of social safety nets in times of economic crisis as in the Asian Financial Crisis and the extension of basic education elsewhere, often left to donor -funded social investment programmes. These were well-intentioned initiatives by committed professionals but not adequate as lasting solutions. These interventions did not address the structural causes of social tensions or build institutions to ensure equitable and sustainable development, decent work and social cohesion.

A considerable amount of recent research shows that economic growth and social development policies must be pursued simultaneously, rather than sequentially, as:

- Poverty and inequality inhibit growth, depress domestic demand and hinder national economic development. Developing countries with high inequality tend to grow slower.
- A low -wage policy has adverse effects on productivity, encouraging countries to compete on the basis of cheap labour, in a “race to the bottom”, further depressing real wage levels.
- While sustained high rapid growth may lift people out of poverty, growing inequality may undermine its impact on poverty reduction, as in China recently. For the vast majority of developing countries, more modest growth and growing inequality have limited, even no, poverty reduction impact.
- The greater the inequality, the less the “trickle -down” effect.
- Only 4.2 percent of the world’s growth reaches the poorer half of the world’s population.
- Poverty and inequality is an obstacle to social progress, and can lead to social conflict and political instability.

In 1991 new economic policy of globalization, privatization and liberalization adopted in India and steps were further undertaken to remove unnecessary restrictions that were

imposed on industries and business which thwarted their development were removed. During the year 1992 the 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments were made which widen the people participation especially SCs and STs and OBCs and women, in local self- government were ensured. In the Ninth plan 1997 -2002 Nabhi's approach emphasized human development food and nutritional security to all particularly the vulnerable sections of society. Provision of basic minimum services of safe drinking water, primary health centre facilities, universal primary education, shelter and connectivity to all, curb the rate of growth of population, environmental friendly development, promotion and protection of the interests of the disadvantaged groups, development of institutions of people's participation such as panchayat Raj institutions, cooperative and self- Help Groups were all these attempted in different period as a quest to develop the society (Surendra Singh, 2008).

This change from a time when charity and relief provided by the family, community or Church to social welfare is seen as the process by which the modern Western European State has progressed and this history is inextricably linked with the creation of a modern sensibility. In the pre-modern period, it is argued, the individual could only appeal to the Church or religious groups, family or the community when faced with poverty or illness and the causes of poverty were often seen either in fate or in individual failure. Communities or individuals in distress could then appeal to the charity or benevolence of the rulers or that of their family or community.

There is now a consensus on the urgency to promote robust social and economic policies in parallel, in a complementary and mutually reinforcing manner. Economic growth permits sustained investments in social development; and human development raises the capacities of people to contribute to growth. Sustainable growth and poverty reduction require socially inclusive National Development Strategies.



In the early 21st century, a consensus has emerged that social policy is part of the primary function of the state, and that social policy is more than a limited set of safety nets and services to cover market failure. Well-designed and implemented social policies can powerfully shape countries, foster employment and development, eradicate marginalization and overcome conflict. They are an essential part of any National Development Strategy to achieve growth and equitable social outcomes. Thus, we can say that India's social policy has attempted to emphasize socio-cultural development and not merely on economic development.

### **Relevance of Social Development to Contemporary Context**

Social policy is also necessary in a globalizing world. The extreme inequality in the world distribution of income and assets seriously undermines the effectiveness of global growth in reducing poverty. The magnitude of distribution asymmetries is significant. In 2000, the richest 1 per cent of adults alone owned 40 per cent of global assets, and the richest 10 per cent of adults accounted for 85 per cent of total world assets. In contrast, the bottom half of the world adult population owned barely 1 per cent of global wealth. This urgent need to reduce poverty, exclusion and conflict has brought social policy to the forefront of the development agenda.

There is a real need for strengthening the 'inclusive perspective' to professional social work education and practice in India. Even though the entire philosophy and practice of professional social work, right from its inception, has been addressing issues of marginalization, alienation, oppression and various forms of social exclusion and its resultant detrimental effects on vulnerable and affected groups, there is not much of concentration, in the professional training and practice in India, on the theoretical constructs of 'social exclusion', 'inclusion' and related concepts such as 'inclusive development' or

'inclusive growth' besides the policy issues. It is highly imperative that social work education and training have to be geared to consciously and comprehensively address social exclusion, inclusive policy and related issues with the ultimate objective of enabling 'professional social workers' to get a proper understanding and develop genuine appreciation of the need for an 'inclusive perspective' to the professional domains of training, practice and research in the field of social work. For this, the first and foremost requirement is that social workers, whether budding or full-fledged, should develop an 'inclusive mindset' in its real sense.

The questions that were raised when these policies were initially formulated still remain, namely, does state support lead to dependence and loss of initiative, are the financial costs placing an unacceptable burden on those who do not benefit from these policies, and do entitlements or reservations create special interest groups. These questions are still with us and are far from resolved, one way or the other. Even though we do not have the answer, we at least know that these questions are important even today and will continue to attract attention so long as economic disparities persist in the world.