PART ONE

Social Policy And Social Welfare
A Social Historical Perspective

CHAPTER-1

Introduction

In this brief opening chapter I propose to explain my approach in studying the evolution of social welfare in India and the rationale for it. In the process, I hope to alert the reader to the value-orientation behind this approach, which is vitally important, because I strongly believe that all intellectual endeavors are influenced by ideology.[1]

It is helpful to start with the definition of the terms 'social welfare' and 'social work'. The task is not easy. There have been several unsuccessful attempts to define these terms so that a uniform meaning is attributed to them, both nationally and internationally. Social welfare is used here as a term which is broader in scope than social work. It may be defined as the organised provision of resources and services by the society to deal with social problems. These services may be provided by the state or by voluntary organisations, with a view to ameliorating the conditions of the people affected by the problems as well as to protect others who are likely to be affected in the future. This definition is wide enough to include the traditional and modern views of social welfare, i.e. the residual and developmental concepts of social welfare. It also includes social work. The term 'social work' refers to the work of voluntary social workers, professional social workers and other social work personnel employed in the field of social welfare.

The first part of this book deals with the history of social welfare in India. The subject matter of history is not the frozen and mummified past, but the change and evolution of society. History 'is a

continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past'.[2] The study of any history poses a serious problem because we look at past events through contemporary concepts and mental framework.[3] This tendency cannot altogether be avoided (though it could be kept under check by our awareness of its existence) because 'we can view the past and achieve our understanding of the past, only through the eyes of the present'.

Ahistoricity, both in a literal and a Marxist sense, is characteristic of social welfare literature. It may be asked why one should study history, which is concerned with the 'dead past'. It may even be argued that such an endeavour is undesirable for two reasons: it may lead to nationalistic chauvinism by glorification (even mythologisation) of the past; and it may reinforce the existing orientation to the past when we need an orientation to the future to bring about planned social change. These questions raise very pertinent issues because the dangers referred to are real and not imaginary. Yet, it is both necessary and desirable that we study aspects of Indian history because it provides us 'the key to the understanding of the present'. As pointed out by E.H. Carr, 'The past is intelligible to us only in the light of the present; and we can fully understand the present only in the light of the past. To enable man to understand the society of the past, and to increase his mastery over the society of the present, is the dual function of history.'[4]

There is a special reason why one should study the history of social welfare, 'even if the past does not provide easy and clear lessons'. Clarke Chambers has observed:

Historical study may, for example, remind us of experiments in social welfare or in the delivery of social services which we have forgotten or never fully understand. It may provide educators, administrators, and practitioners with professional models drawn from the past. Apprentice social workers especially, I imagine, need to know that social concern did not begin with themselves ... it is important to sense in both heart and mind that others have gone before, that one

stands in a long and honourable tradition of both social service and social prophecy, for many early social workers laboured to serve those in need while, at the same time, they moved to elaborate public policies which might alleviate and perhaps even resolve [and prevent] the complex social problems which were the source of human need.[5]

In studying the evolution of social welfare in India from ancient times to the present, I have broadly adopted the approach and method of social history. According to Hobsbawm 'social history is at present in fashion', and 'it is a good moment to be a social historian'.[6] But it is not for these reasons that I have tried to follow the approach of social history. An aspect of the tradition of social history is that 'it referred to the history of the poor or lower classes, and more specifically to the history of the movements of the poor ["social movements"]'.[7] In recent years it is also concerned with the study of social structure and its transformation, i.e. the history of societies rather than the dynastic history of rulers, their conquest of new territory and their exploits in war. It is based on the conviction that 'the social or societal aspects of man's being cannot be separated from the other aspects of his being. They cannot, for more than a moment, be separated from the ways in which men get their living and their material environment. They cannot, even for a moment, be separated from their ideas since their relations with one another are expressed and formulated in a language which implies concepts as soon as they open their mouths.'[8]

The study of social structure in its totality is the essence of social history. This is elaborated in the next chapter, which provides the theoretical framework for the remaining chapters (Chapters 3 to 7) which cover the evolution of social welfare in India. If the reader is disappointed in the application of the approach, it is not only due to the lack of time and space, and my intellectual limitations, but also because of the extreme paucity of historical evidence which enable the historian to write reliable social history of the life and movements

of the poor. This deficiency is especially marked in relation to the ancient period and to a lesser extent to the medieval period.[9]

An evolutionary and developmental perspective, is another major aspect of the theoretical approach. Hoogvelt mentions three focal elements of the concept of development:

Development as Process, i.e. as an evolutionary process of growth and change of man's social and cultural organisation (that is of society).

Development as Interaction, i.e. as a process of growth and

change of societies under conditions of interaction with other societies; and

Development as Action, i.e. as a consciously planned and monitored process of growth and change.[10]

The theoretical framework as presented in Chapter 2 is based on Hoogvelt's ideas of development as a process, i.e. as an evolutionary process of development, and development as interaction. I believe that the integration of these two theoretical aspects of development is both appropriate and necessary for the study of the evolution of social welfare in a society which has undergone the process of colonisation. Hoogvelt's concept of development as action forms the basis of the theoretical discussion in Part II.

CHAPTER-2

Towards A Theoretical Frame Work For The Study Of Social Welfare

INTRODUCTION

A survey, whether in India or abroad, reveals the relative absence of theoretical and analytical literature dealing with social welfare-its nature, goal, function and evolution.[1] This is more so with regard to the Indian situation. A limited attempt at the theoretical analysis of social welfare in the Indian social context has been made by only Gore. Explaining his approach to social welfare, Gore makes reference to the relationship between social welfare and social structure in some of his writings.[2] He also states that his approach is sociological.

The main problem in these brief discussions on social structure and social welfare is the lack of a definition of the concept of social structure. Blau writes:

> The concept of social structure is used widely in sociology, often broadly, and with a variety of meanings. It may refer to social differentiation, relations of production, forms of associations, value integration, functional interdependence, status and roles, institutions, or combination of these and other factors. A generic difference is whether social structure is conceived explicitly as being composed of different elements and their interrelations or abstractly as a theoretical construct or model.[3]

We shall view social structure in concrete terms and not as an abstract concept only. In other words, social structure has its parameters.[4] A study of Gore's writings reveals slightly varying views of social structure at different places. In one of his later writings he has used cultural themes in Indian social work as the basis of his discussions.[5] One gets the impression that social structure is conceived in functional terms and that too with great emphasis on norms and normative behavior in society. This is broadly in keeping with the Parsonian functionalist view of social structure.

LIMITATIONS OF FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

In our opinion, the Parsonian view of social structure with its emphasis on the normative system is inadequate for the analysis of social welfare. Firstly, this view of social structure excludes from its considerations the political and economic components which in our view are the most important and dynamic elements. Also, its concern has been with social equilibrium and social order which introduce an implicit and continuing bias towards stability and order as against conflict and change.[6]

The concept of culture is equally, perhaps more, inadequate as an analytical tool for the study of social welfare. In the words of Mills, culture is a spongy concept.[7] What is more, culture as a concept originated in a certain historical context which has influenced its subsequent evolution considerably.

> The concept of culture, as used in the parlance of the human science, arose from a great human confrontation. The idea of culture was one of the principle intellectual outgrowths of the worldwide meeting between the expansionist West and exotic non-Western peoples. The configuration began with the contacts of exploration and matured into the relationships of empire. From this experience the West derived a growing need to find order in its increasing knowledge of immensely varied human lifeways. As the emerging science of anthropology developed the culture concept, it thereby provided an important means to this end of discovering order in variation.[8]

In other words, the concept of culture, though very comprehensive in its scope as used by anthropologists, suffers from the same ideological bias as the functional concept of social structure.[9] For this very reason it shall not serve our purpose.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE: A DYNAMIC VIEW

The concept of social structure is likely to give an impression of being a static concept with a view of society as a fixed entity. This is not our intention. We shall view social structure essentially as a dynamic concept which is similar in many respects to the concept of social system as defined by Myrdal.[10] Social structure is an evolving, changing entity with interdependence among its component parts. The idea of interdependence implies the chain effect arising out of a change in any one component of the social structure. However, theoretically we do not assume that these chain reactions of change, originating in one component will result in simultaneous synchronic changes in the other components in the same direction. This may be the case generally. But we do not rule out (on the contrary, we even accept) the probability of change in the opposite direction in some of the components of social structure. Theoretically, this is the major difference from the structural-functional view of society, according to which endogenous changes always lead in the same direction which is the equilibrium and order. Our conception is somewhat nearer to the Marxist concept of dialectical tendencies resulting in contradictions and conflicts which frequently lead to significant changes in social structure.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE: ITS COMPONENTS

The components of social structure are the social institutions. Social institutions may be defined as established and organised ways of meeting social needs in a distinct area of social function. As components of social structure, social institutions have both ideology and

elements of structure. The structure of the social institutions may be fairly concrete. Thus the meeting of the social needs in a particular area may be directly carried out by the institution through this concrete structure, as in the case of the family. When the structure is more complex and less concrete, then the social function is likely to be carried out by a set of formal organisations like schools and colleges in the sphere of education, and by church, monastery, temple or math in the religious sphere.

The social institutions include economic, political, religious, educational and legal institutions, and family, kinship and marriage, etc. Social welfare, too, is to be viewed as a social institution which is a component of the social structure.[11] While we have listed some of the well-known component social institutions, it is not implied that these institutions are equal in importance. The Marxist view of social structure emphasises the dominant and the determining role of the economic institution, and in particular the processes of production and the relations of production. All other institutions including the political institution are conceived as superstructures standing on the base which is the economic institution. The historical evidence available to us since Marx put forth his theory, to a great extent lends support to the dominant and determining position of the economic institution in the social structure. However, there is also evidence which calls for a slight modification of the orthodox Marxist view of the primacy of the economic institution.

INTERDEPENDENCE AND AUTONOMY

Among the Marxist scholars there are some who would like to attribute considerable measure of autonomy to the political institution and give it a prominent position, perhaps next only to the economic institution.[12] We are in agreement with this view. In other words, while we do not accept that all social institutions that are components of social structure are equal in their importance, we do

recognise the interdependence, to some extent, of the various social institutions. At the same time, we also recognise the primacy of the economic and political institutions over the other social institutions. There is considerable historical and contemporary empirical evidence to indicate a fairly close relationship between the economic and the political institutions, which does not contradict the essence of the Marxist view of the determining influence of the economic institution. In other words, the two most dominant social institutions, the economic and the political, while being closely linked to each other and retaining a measure of autonomy between themselves, frequently reinforce each other. For these reasons, we may view these two institutions in their interrelated, slightly autonomous and unequal relationships as, borrowing a phrase from MacIver, an institutional-complex.[13] However, the economic institution tends to influence the political institution more than the other way round.

CONCEPT OF STRUCTURAL DIFFERENTIATION

Emergence of new social institutions in human societies is a matter of historical record. This process can be well described through the concept of structural differentiation as formulated by Smelser:

> .... stated in very general terms ... under conditions of social disequilibrium, the social structure will change in such a way that roles previously encompassing many different types of activities became more specialised; the social structure, that is becomes more complex and differentiated.[14]

The intellectual roots of the concept, as pointed out by Smelser, are very diverse. From the main ideas of thinkers like Karl Marx, Adam Smith, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons, Smelser has developed his model of the historical change and evolution of social structure. The general feature of this model rests on the well-known sociological principle that as a society develops, its social structure becomes more complex'.[15] Extending this general principle. Smelser propounded that 'rapid social development

involves the same increasing complexity of structure in other institutions as well-in education, religion, politics, the family and so on'.[16]

Smelser's model has several defects, some of which are due to his structural-functional approach to social change. But, as an explanatory concept which describes the process of structural change on a graded scale from simple to complex social structures which results in the emergence of not only new roles and functions in society but also new social institutions, it is eminently useful. We shall utilise it only thus, as a concept and not as a model.[17] But it leaves the crucial question open: what factor (s) sets in motion this process of structural differentiation? This is a major defect in his model and perhaps, recognising it Smelser states that it is an open-ended model. In our view, it is an advantage because it permits the use of any theory to fill this gap in the model. This, up to a point, is what we will do.

As societies move from simple to complex social structures, new social institutions emerge to take over the functions which are being shed by the previous institutions. Another outcome of this process may be the birth of new occupations (and professions) within the same social institution as a result of the growth of knowledge and technology, and the growing complexity of tasks. An example of this would be the emergence of industrial managers following structural differentiations in industry and industrialising societies. The function of managing a factory which used to be performed by the capitalist-owner is differentiated into two or more separate functions performed by two distinct occupational groups-the industrial enterpreneur and the manager.

CONCEPT OF SOCIETY AND ITS BOUNDARIES

The concept of social structure which has been explicated earlier would require a definition of the term society. Are we concerned with the structure of village communities as society? Are we concerned with a segment of national population such as peasant society?

Finally, are we concerned with the entire population residing in a small, medium or large-sized geographical entity known as a village, a region or a nation? There is no doubt at all that in our conception of society we are concerned with human beings in their social relationships. At the same time our acceptance of the interdependence of the elements of social structure and the cumulative change-producing effects of any change within any one of these elements poses a serious theoretical problem. Ideally speaking, we shall have to consider human beings inhabiting this globe as part of the concept of society. In fact it is not only an ideal conception but also an empirical reality. One has only to recall the momentous developments of the recent past, such as increase in the price of petroleum and the world food shortage and information technology globalisation, to remind ourselves of the interdependence of people as a world society.

While this type of conceptualisation has its merits, it will create a variety of other complex problems, both of a theoretical and practical nature. Theoretically, the tasks include a delineation of systematic linkage between various parts of the world society. This may be possible when we select one or two elements for explicating a relationship between nation-societies in different parts of the world.[18] Empirically, the task is complicated because of the various societal mechanisms which are operating at different levels, geographical and otherwise. So we are compelled to demarcate somewhat arbitrarily the boundaries of human society for the purpose of our theoretical framework. A frequent approach is one of the geographical boundary which sets its limits to a modern nation-state. We shall accept this as a parameter of the society when we speak of a social structure.

How is the nation-society to be viewed for the purposes of analysis? Do we think of it as a homogeneous entity in the sense that all the people accept the same values and norms, and all of them have similar needs? In the structural-functional conception of society such a homogeneous view of the people is frequently assumed. This may

serve the theoretical purpose. But it creates severe complications when we try to apply it to an empirical reality.[19] For this reason, we see society as composed of many segments cross-cutting each other on the basis of a variety of parameters such as religion, occupation, sex, administrative-political boundary, language, kinship, social customs, values, etc. This is not a chaotic picture of innumerable, heterogeneous groups of people of varying sizes scattered geographically in different administrative units. While we see society as not homogeneous but segmented, we also view it united in some ways. Certainly, one of the most dominant factors contributing to this unifying process of a society is the concept of the nation and consciousness of belonging to a nation. Also, some dominant value themes of ideology may contribute towards the unification of the people.

SOCIAL WELFARE- A COMPONENT OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE

It is time that we define our approach to the study of social welfare. Social welfare is a component of social structure. The nature of social welfare at any given historical point of time is influenced, and to a great extent determined, by the nature of social structure which has evolved historically at that point of time, in particular by the economic and. political sub-systems of the social structure. In our opinion, the economic and political components are very crucial for the concept of social structure and the understanding of human society.

Social welfare, as mentioned before, is a component of social structure. The historical evolution of the goal, nature and the functions of social welfare are influenced and determined mostly by the economic and political institutions of the social structure. While this view might seem a Marxist one, it may be pointed out that it has also been the view of the structural-functional sociological analysts. For example, a classic and an original piece of sociological study examining the nature of social welfare in the social context of the U.S.A. is

Industrial Society and Social Welfare by Wilensky and Lebaux.[20] It was a pioneering study. Our own thinking has to some extent been influenced by this analysis of the linkage between the nature of society and the evolution of social welfare in U.S.A. Our main difference with Wilensky and Lebaux is in regard to their conception of the nature of American society as an industrial society. We do not dispute the predominantly industrial character of the society. However, we differ from them in that they exclude the political institution from their conception of the society, and thus fail to analyse its influence on the development and nature of social welfare. But we agree with their basic postulate that the emerging nature of social welfare in the U.S.A. was due to changes in the structure of society.

STRUCTURAL DIFFERENTIATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE

Application of the concept of structural differentiation will explain the appearance of social welfare as a new social institution as society in its historical evolution becomes more complex and specialised. This happens when the simple social structure of a tribe grows into a complex social structure of a feudal-agrarian society and later into a capitalist-industrial or socialist-industrial society, as a consequence of the changes in the institutional complex of economic and political spheres of the social structure. Communal ownership of social resources and the kinship relationship of the early tribal social structure, with its simple fruit-gathering or nomadic pastoral economy has no need for social welfare as an institutionalised, specialised function. But, with the evolution of a complex feudal society based on agrarian economy and private ownership of agricultural land, the stratified, class-based society has a new social function of meeting the needs of the slave labourers or serfs, and of integrating them with the feudal social structure. This integrative, need meeting function leads to the appearance of charity as an ideology and as a social function.[21]

The institutional manifestation of charity as a concrete social function may vary, depending upon the type of feudal-agrarian society and its other component elements. In many ancient feudal societies, charity was a function of the king and his nobles (the feudal lords), and of religious institutions, like churches, temples, mosques, monasteries, and maths, etc. The ideology was mostly linked to, or was part of, religious doctrines. This was due to two reasons. In early feudal societies (and also to some extent in contemporary feudal societies) religion was the source of all ideologies and religious sanction was a powerful instrument for conformity in behaviour. The divine origin of monarchy and the divine right of the king are examples. It is important to note here that whereas a new social function has emerged and it is institutionalised, the function is performed by a number of existing social institutions like monarchy, religion, nobility and also the extended family. In the Indian historical context, we may also add the village community and caste. In this type of social structure, social welfare function is fragmented in a number of social institutions.

With the further growth of complexity in social structure and the consequent structural differentiation found in capitalist- industrial societies, social welfare emerges as a new social institution. It performs the fragmented pieces of social welfare function which are being given up by other social institutions. The nucleating family sheds its social security function which it performed as an extended family before and it is taken over as a state responsibility to be administered under new organisational and occupational arrangements. This, as well as other social welfare functions performed by the social institutions like caste, religion (church/math/mosque/temples) and nobility, apart from the extended family, are now performed by the formal organisations, while retaining their links with the previous institutions. This is manifested in the work of sectarian, religious welfare organisations which continue to be inspired or influenced by

their particular ideology. On the one hand, welfare institutions established and run by Christian missionary orders, mainly with the help of nuns and priests, and on the other hand, the welfare institutions like hostels for poor students, schools and colleges, orphanages, widow homes, etc. organised and administered by caste associations belong to this category. Gradually this process may lead to the birth of a new occupation or profession which will complete the process of institutionalisation.

MODERNISATION, INDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES AND SOCIAL WELFARE

The modernisation theorists have outlined an evolutionary model of societies on the basis of a typology of societies as traditional and modern. Some of them have in fact, identified modern society as an industrial society and the direction of developing societies is seen to be toward this goal of an industrial society. Empirical data from Japan and some European and North American countries are used to formulate a highly generalised typology, which gives the impression of a very objective scientific law applicable to a variety of political systems, and in particular, to both the representative democratic forms based on plurality of political parties and free elections, and the one party socialist (or communist) countries.[22] This is now carried one step further by postulating a post-industrial society whose characteristics have been described, once again at a level which permits inclusion of a variety of political systems.[23]

These theories and models have been criticised, on account of the reductionist approach as well as on other grounds. We are in agreement with these criticisms.[24] It is our view that an economic structure of a society includes many crucial elements and its industrial character is only one of them. As stated earlier, we also believe that the political system is an equally important component which is closely linked to, and to a great extent influenced by, the economic system. It is for this reason that we consider it inadequate to treat modern social

welfare as the product of an industrial society. It is vitally important also to take into account the political systems or the character of the state and its apparatus, the political and social ideology, and the nature of the economic system, whether it is of the capitalist free-enterprise, state capitalist, or socialist variety.

Though the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. are both industrial societies, the manner in which the respective social structures try to discharge the social welfare function displays a very significant difference. While one can identify concrete tasks of a similar nature in social welfare in these countries, the organisational framework, types of personnel, their training, etc. are vastly different. Counselling of the problem child in school and psycho- therapeutic treatment of the mentally ill are found both in the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. But the therapeutic and counselling techniques vary significantly, because of the nature of social structure which in turn gives birth to different sets of therapeutic ideologies and techniques. In accordance with its overall orientation to the social group, and not the individual as in the U.S.A., the aims, ideology and techniques of counselling and psycho- therapy in the Soviet Union reflect group-orientation.[25]

The U.K. and Soviet Union (or Czechoslovakia) as industrial societies have comprehensive social security programmes under state auspices.* But in the latter two industrial societies, which have different political and economic institutions, there is no professional social work of the type found in the U.K.[26] Even between the U.K. and U.S.A. which are similar in many respects, including the industrial, urban character of their societies, social welfare as a social institution has developed differently. This could be explained in terms of their historical development, and in particular, on the basis of the politico-social ideology of these two countries.

*   Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia ceased to exist and new nations have come
     into   existance.

SOCIAL INSTITUTION AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Our next task is to delineate in what manner social welfare as a social institution is linked with other social institutions and to the social structure as a whole. Social institutions are developed in order to serve as mechanisms of social stability and social control. The different social institutions perform this function in their own designated areas with varying degrees of importance and emphasis. Whereas the social control function of the coercive apparatus of the state like the police, the military, the judiciary, etc. is direct, visible and perhaps of a high degree, this very function is performed by other institutions in less visible and more subtle ways.

In the case of education for example, the social control function is not so obvious and is frequently missed by those who criticise the educational system for its failure to bring about social change. This is because, firstly the social control function of education is gradual, and of a long-term nature, and secondly, because of its invisibility. Through the process of ideological inculcation and also by other means such as socialisation, the young population is gradually prepared for accepting the norms and conditions of the social structure. Particularly, the ideological element of education is frequently overlooked by many theorists because of the emphasis on the production and acquisition of knowledge. Much of our knowl- edge is not only theoretical but it is also highly value-oriented. This is true even of those branches of knowledge in social sciences which have come to acquire an aura of neutral scientific laws.

Social welfare as a component institution of the social structure is developed and used for social control. This is done by means of providing certain concrete services to those sections of the popula- tion which are likely to rebel or revolt. Social security is one such example.[27] The other means used include a variety of psychological influence mechanisms on this segment of the society to bring about

conformity with the norms of the society. Frequently, and more popularly, this type of activity is known as counselling. It is claimed as a highly complex scientific activity with the professed intention of helping the people in their problems. A careful analysis of much of this type of work would reveal its non-scientific, ideological character. This is best illustrated in the famous sociological analysis, *Faith of the Counsellors* by Paul Halmos.[28]

It may be conceded that the above statement that social welfare is an instrument of social control is not valid in the case of physically handicapped and mentally retarded persons. This group is in any case a very small proportion of the population which is the target of institutionalised welfare services. The major group who might pose a threat to the *status quo* are the poor and destitute who are without honourable means of livelihood, and the underpaid and exploited members of the working class.

Also, individual actions of charity based on altruism are not ruled out. In an excellent sociological analysis of the basis of altruism, Gouldner has formulated the concept of the norm of beneficence. He says:

> This norm requires men to give others such help as they need. Rather than making help contingent upon past benefits received or future benefits expected, the norm of beneficence calls upon men to aid others without thought of what they have done or can do for them and solely in terms of a need imputed to the potential recipient. As we view it here, the norm of beneficence is a diffuse one encompassing a number of somewhat more concrete normative orientations such as "altruism", "charity", or "hospitality". In short, the norm calls on men to give something for nothing. Such norms are apparently found in the most diverse of primitive or nonliterate societies, no less than in "Christian" cultures where we once heard of the duty of "charity".[29]

SOCIAL WELFARE AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Earlier we had said that social welfare as one of the social institutions is essentially a mechanism of social control. The social control nature of social welfare is an inherent characteristic irrespective of the

nature of the political and economic frame-work of the social structure. In other words, whether in the U.K., U.S.A., Soviet Union or Yugoslavia, social welfare will be utilised as an institution for social control. In an example quoted earlier, we had made reference to the ideology and techniques of counselling in the Soviet Union and in the U.S.A. Whereas the nature of ideology and techniques would reflect the politico-economic content of the respective social structure, in both cases the main aim is to secure conformity of behaviour on the part of those who seem to be deviants in distinct areas of social norms, like the problem child and the mentally ill person.

The above statement regarding the inherent social control nature of social welfare and other institutions does not rule out the possibilities of social change through these social institutions. Again, the historical empirical evidence indicates that almost all social institutions seem to have an in-built potentiality for change, including fundamental change in the social structure. Even such an extremely coercive social institution like the military seems to possess elements of social change. An example which illustrates this point graphically is the role of the military in Portugal. After nearly four decades of absolute dictatorship, it overthrew the dictatorial regime and tried to bring about a socialistic social structure.

Why and how social changes take place within social institutions devised as mechanisms of social control and deliberately used by the ruling groups for that purpose, is not always quite clear. In other words, there is no convincing generalised theoretical explanation to account for the potentialities of change in social institutions, except in the Marxist theory.[30] The Marxist theory explains it on the basis of a dialectical tendency in the society, which leads to conflict, and ultimately towards a higher level of social development. There is another explanation of this process. Social change is the result of unintended and unanticipated consequence of human actions. So,

the social control aim of the social institutions can be undermined.

Leonard has attempted to adapt the Marxist theory for social work practice.[31] The main element of this model is Paulo Friere's concept of *concientisation,* which is an educational process designed to develop among the oppressed people 'critical reflection on reality and subsequent action upon it'. It aims at transforming social reality through concientisation of the beneficiaries of social welfare. There are two major defects in this model. Firstly, most social workers do not have the freedom to engage in such radical practice, because they are employees of the state and are charged with the responsibility of social control. Secondly, even if a few social workers manage to do this, it will not lead to a basic transformation of society, unless it is linked to the political process of radical change.[32]

Earlier reference to typology of societies, such as tribal, feudal, capitalistic and socialistic with reference to the nature of social welfare should not be taken to mean that all human societies can neatly be classified in one of these categories or that there is an inevitable movement from one type of society to the other. As stated before, we do not view social structure only in theoretical terms but also as an empirical reality. At the same time, a theoretical formulation is necessary in order to understand the empirical data pertaining to social structure or any aspect of it. In other words, our approach all along has been that these classifications of society are in the nature of ideal constructs for the purposes of theoretical formulation, in the Weberian sence. While usefulness of an ideal theoretical construct is recognised, it should not be mistaken for empirical reality; nor empirical reality be so interpreted as to suit the theoretical needs. What is required is a reflective analysis wherein we make a theoretical formulation first and then examine it with reference to an empirical reality.[33] Following such an analysis, we turn back to the theoretical formulation and make appropriate modifications. This is a forward-backward kind of intellectual exercise, moving from theory

to empirical data and back to theory. We may even conceive of this as circular analysis which is different from the linear analysis.

So far all the theoretical formulations of human society viewed within evolutionary perspective have proved to be inadequate when examined in the light of empirical data. This is true of the Marxist theory as well as the modernisation theory.[34] What we are likely to find is a continuum from one end of the theoretical construct to the other end, and human societies at present are likely to exhibit all or many features identified with one (or more than one) particular type of social structure at a specific stage of social development. What is important to note is that all these features are not present in an equal degree of dominance or coverage of the population involved. In case of developing societies like India particularly, we may find elements of tribal, feudal-agrarian, capitalist-agrarian, capitalist free-enterprise, and state capitalist elements in varying degrees and with varying dominance. This means that when we view the nature of social welfare holistically, we are likely to see a mixed pattern of the elements of social welfare, discussed with reference to certain major types of social structure. In particular we may find the features of social welfare of an industrial-urban society in regard to the population living in urban areas, and many features of social welfare of a feudal-agrarian type of social structure in most of our rural population. Even within the urban population, we are likely to encounter elements of rural social structure among the recent migrants and most of the slum population.[35]

So we may find elements of social welfare of a modern industrial society in some respects, of the feudal-agrarian society in some other respects, and also elements of other varieties of social structure. But the most prominent pattern when viewed nationally is likely to be a combination of social welfare of a feudal-agrarian and industrial-urban society based on an exploitative, economic and social relationship. On the one hand we may still notice the elements of the feudal

master-client system operating as in the case of agrarian bonded labour (legally in existence until recently) and elements of social welfare as performed pre-dominantly by such social institutions like extended family, caste and village communities; on the other hand, we may see modern capitalist or state capitalist elements of social welfare like social security for organised industrial labour, secular residential institutions for the destitutes, vagrants and the handi-capped, social assistance schemes of a token nature in the case of the neglected and destitute aged population in the urban society, and a mixed variety of sectarian, formal organisations like caste or religion based welfare institutions.

It is for this reason, that we need to view social welfare in develop-ing societies like India as dualistic or pluralistic in nature, combining elements of social welfare from feudal-agricultural and capitalist-industrial system. The need for such a conceptualisation has been recognised some time ago by theorists in allied disciplines like economics and sociology. The concept of a dual society was formu-lated to explain the extremely dualistic nature of the economic system of the developing societies by the well-known Dutch econo-mist Boeke.[36] Another prominent theorist from the discipline of anthropology, Robert Redfield formulated the binary concept of great and little traditions. An attempt has been made to apply this concept to developing societies by some of the anthropologists subscribing to the recent modernisation theory. The modernisation theory itself is based on the binary concept of traditional and modern society.

The application of these to the Indian social structure and also to the social structures of some other developing societies in Asia and Africa has led a few of them to propound the view that developing societies include features of both traditional and modern societies. Rudolph and Rudolph in their study of Indian society in the context of modernisation theory have come to the conclusion that the

traditional elements sometimes tend to operate in the direction of modernisation, and the modernised sector of the society seems to contain some significant traditional elements.[37] For these reasons, we are of the opinion that developing societies are to be viewed essentially as dual societies, or better still as multiple societies. What is important is to see which are the dominant elements and in what segments or sectors of the society these elements are found.

To conclude our discussion, it is our view that the feudal-agrarian nature of social welfare is more likely to be found in the rural population of Indian society and the capitalist-industrial elements of social welfare are likely to be found among the urban population, and that too among the middle and, upper classes of the urban population. The paradox of the simultaneous presence of two or more types of social welfare in developing societies like India is to be noted as an empirical reality. This is in accordance with our theoretical formulation that a national social structure is to be seen essentially as segmental and heterogeneous, and not as a homogeneous society.