

**SEEKING SOCIAL GOOD:
A LIFE
WORTH LIVING**

An Autobiography in 6 Volumes



JOHN LAWRENCE

Volume 3

**WORKING
IN AUSTRALIA**

WORKING IN AUSTRALIA

WORKING IN AUSTRALIA

Volume 3 of an Autobiography

JOHN LAWRENCE

SEEKING SOCIAL GOOD: A LIFE WORTH LIVING

An Autobiography in 6 Volumes

- Vol. 1 Getting Educated
- Vol. 2 A Career Under Way
- Vol. 3 Working in Australia
- Vol. 4 Living and Working Overseas
- Vol. 5 Working with International Organisations
- Vol. 6 Disengaging from Work and Later Life

First published 2017

Copyright © 2017 John Lawrence. All rights reserved

Published by John Lawrence

This ebook is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, or under Copyright Agency Ltd rules of recording, no part may be reproduced by any means without the written consent of the author.

ISBN 978-0-9953948-8-9

Cover photograph: John Lawrence

Cover and text design: Paul Taylder – Xigrafix Media and Design

Index: Caroline Colton – Indexat

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry (ebook):

Creator: Lawrence, R. J. (Robert John), 1931– author.

Title: Seeking Social Good: A Life Worth Living. Volume 3. Working in Australia / John Lawrence.

ISBN: 9780995394889 (ebook: volume 3)

Notes: Includes index.

Subjects: Lawrence, R. J. (Robert John), 1931–
Social workers—Australia—Biography.

Social work education—Australia.

Public welfare—Australia.

Social policy.

Social sciences.

Benevolent Society of New South Wales.

Australian Association of Social Workers.

University of New South Wales. School of Social Work.

Australian Council of Social Service.

Child abuse—New South Wales—Prevention.

Community organization—Australia.

*Dedicated to all who seek and achieve social good,
and to Trish and the many others who
have made my own life worthwhile.*

Comments on the Autobiography

'A monumental achievement! Not only the effort put into pulling it all together now, but the meticulous record keeping throughout the years that it reflects, is just so impressive. This is an extraordinary record of a life, a life certainly worth living, and an invaluable resource for the social work profession and for a morally grounded social policy perspective.'

Bruce Lagay (former Prof. Fellow & former Head, Social Work Dept., Univ. of Melb.; former Assoc. Dean, Rutgers Univ., and Dean, Syracuse Univ., Schools of Social Work, USA)

'This personal and professional record is testament to the necessity of considering the interactions of someone's personal background, formative and institutional influences and exposure to educative and attitude shaping experiences, if a rounded picture is to be gained of what they stand for and why. The author's constant engagement with history and ethics, not as side issues but disciplines that are of great importance to social work, is evident from Seeking Social Good. It is my fervent hope that others will readily gain access to this work and learn from it, as I have.'

Tony Vinson (Em. Prof. of Social Work, former Head of School, UNSW; former Head, NSW Corrective Services; social scientist, prominent public intellectual)

'I thoroughly enjoyed reading this autobiography, which I think is a really significant work. The author had a wonderful opportunity to shape the direction of social work education in Australia, and internationally and seized the opportunity. So many different groups of people will be interested in this work – historians of the twentieth century, people interested in Australian academic life, anyone researching the history of the University of New South Wales, social work historians of course, whether interested in Australia, the USA or Europe, the many people interested in the Whitlam era and social scientists or historians interested in the development of the teaching of social policy.'

Jane Miller (social work historian; former Head, Social Work Dept., Royal Children's Hospital; AASW Life Member; President, Melb. Univ. Social Work Alumni)

Comments to the Author about his history of the SWRC/SPRC

'Your history of the SWRC/SPRC is, it goes without saying, well and thoroughly researched, clearly and expressively written, and passionately argued! I thought you handled one of the trickiest aspects – your own centrality in the story – with excellent taste and balance. There is, overall, a rich appreciation of the leadership and working researchers without losing sight of the larger argument you want to make.'

Sheila Shaver (former Deputy Director, SPRC; later - Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Res.), Univ. of Western Sydney; Conjoint Professor, SPRC)

'You tell the story well, and there is a great deal of scholarship and perception in the way you assemble and analyse the material. It is an excellent and worthwhile read.'

Adam Graycar (1st Director, SWRC; later - Head, Ausn. Institute of Criminology; Head; Cabinet Office, S.A. Govt.; Prof. of Public Policy & Director, Res. School of Social Sciences, ANU)

Contents

Preface	1
Chapter 1 Our New Permanent Home in Sydney	7
Chapter 2 New Responsibilities in Turbulent Times	23
Chapter 3 Changing Fortunes of the Professional Association	47
Chapter 4 Building a University School of Social Work	77
Chapter 5 Colleagues in the School	131
Chapter 6 The Michigan Connection	213
Chapter 7 Community Activities	247
7.1 Retirement as a Social Issue – Symposium on the Aged in Australian Society 1969	251
7.2 Migrant Social Welfare in a General Framework for Social Welfare	258
7.3 Urbanisation Seminars, ANU	265
7.4 The Benevolent Society of New South Wales	278
7.4.1 Its Historical Context	278
7.4.2 The Society, 1968–71 – Welfare Progress Thwarted	280
7.5 Redfern Aboriginal Legal Service	295
7.6 Australian Council of Social Service	303
7.6.1 ACOSS ‘Transformed’	303
7.6.2 Submission for Federal Funding	305
7.6.3 ACOSS Conference 1970, Canberra	317

7.6.4	ACOSS Follow-up on ICSW Pre-conference Working Party	328
7.6.5	Revising the ACOSS Constitution	334
7.6.6	A Proposed National Inquiry into Social Welfare	340
7.6.7	ACOSS Evidence to the Poverty Inquiry	343
7.6.8	ACOSS Board Member 1973–77	346
7.7	First Australian Child Care Conference 1972	365
7.8	Relating to the Medical Profession and Beyond	369
7.8.1	Service to People in the 1970s	369
7.8.2	Medicine and Related Professions	379
7.8.3	Professional Responsibility – 1972 Squibb Academic Lecture to Psychiatrists	384
7.8.4	First Australian Conference on the Family and Health 1977	397
7.9	A Social Planning Consultancy with ACROD 1973–74	413
7.10	The International Year of the Child in Australia 1979	417
7.10.1	IYC National Conference, March 1979	419
7.10.2	IYC National Conference Follow-up Group	428
7.11	AASW National Conference 1979, Canberra	434
7.12	Montcalm Inquiry, 1982	442
7.13	The Benevolent Society 1978–86 – Substantial Welfare Progress	450
7.13.1	Board Seminar 1979	453
7.13.2	The Scarba Review Committee and Report 1979	455
7.13.3	Director of Welfare Services	464
7.13.4	The Objectives Committee 1981	468
7.13.5	Full Implementation of the Planning System	478
7.13.6	Change the Name of the Organisation?	492
Chapter 8	Family Photos	497
	Index	515

Preface

The first two volumes of this autobiography cover my story up to about the end of 1968. The first volume deals with the family background in Victoria; my parents living in Mount Gambier in South Australia where my brother Jim (1930) and I (1931) were born; our transfer to Adelaide in 1934, where my sister was born (1937); my schooling and higher education in Adelaide; and the various influences that shaped me as I grew up in Adelaide. The award of a Rhodes scholarship to the University of Oxford in Britain extended my educational and other experience, before returning to marriage and work in Australia in 1956. Although we were unable to marry because of the rules of the scholarship, my future wife Patricia Berry came to England with me as my fiancée and lived in Oxford teaching maths at a school near Banbury. A 1936 Morris enabled us to do a ‘grand tour’ of continental Europe in the summer of 1954, a shorter tour north to the top of Scotland the following summer, and at other times pay visits to Trish’s relatives in Cornwall and to stay briefly with a number of British families under a scheme for overseas visitors. My very busy life during term-time in Magdalen College is described – my tutors, tutorial essays, university lectures, the curriculum, the college choir, my friends and visitors, my sporting and other recreational activities. Four-weeks of ship-life shared with Trish book-ended this overseas experience.

The second volume commences with our marriage celebrated with families and friends back in Adelaide in August 1956, and covers the period to about the end of 1968. We lived in Blackwood, a hills suburb of Adelaide, until shortly after our first son was born in February 1958. My education at the University of Adelaide had included a social work qualification, and I decided to enter the field of professional social work. Although it was still in its early stages of development in Australia and its status and pay were low, I realised it had great potential for someone with my values and interests, and with my education in the social sciences, history and philosophy. I was employed as a social worker in the Commonwealth Department of Social Services, which had developed a professional social work service in the immediate post-war period. Active involvement with the local branch of the professional association (AASW), included becoming the organising secretary for the 6th conference of the AASW, held in Adelaide in 1957.

The national conference sharpened my awareness that many of the pioneers of professional social work in Australia would not be with us much longer and that no-one had tackled writing a history of the profession in Australia. This was the topic of my PhD undertaken on a research scholarship at the Australian National University in Canberra (ANU), 1958–1960. An account is given of our time in Canberra – our university flats, at Bega and at Forrest, our friendships and social life, and of periods spent in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, while I collected material for my thesis. Our second son was born in February 1960. Canberra was still less than 50,000 inhabitants and the lake had not yet been formed to tie its scattered parts together. Apart from the impressive University House, the ANU was still largely housed in huts.

The ANU was a post Second World War creation concentrating on research, initially with only PhD students and the research staff involved in their supervision. In my case, I did not have the advantage of supervision that was well informed about my topic area. My supervisors were, however, conscientious top-line scholars and they could not have been more supportive. A fairly full account is provided of the evidence I collected from interviewing people involved in the development of the social work profession, and of how I tackled studying it at a doctoral level.

In 1961, we moved to Sydney when I was appointed by the Social Work Department at the University of Sydney to the first academic appointment in social administration in Australia. Our daughter was born in July 1961. An account is given of my development of the subject in the social work curriculum and more broadly through published papers. Involvement in various social welfare community activities, like the Council of Social Service of New South Wales (NCOSS), the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS), and the AASW, became a significant part of my professional life. Until the end of 1968, our home in Sydney was at Balgowlah Heights, a new attractive area within easy reach of the harbour and surfing beaches.

In 1967, we had a truly memorable sabbatical year in the United States living in Ann Arbor, home to the University of Michigan. It was a year of great social and political turmoil – race riots, the Vietnam war, the ‘war on poverty’, student unrest. Our children had a very positive school experience in this university town. In the summer we toured, camped and stayed with friends in the north-eastern region of the United States and visited Expo 67 in Montreal in Canada. At the end of the year, we travelled to the west coast by train, drove down the coast to Los Angeles, stayed with friends at Pasadena, saw the Rose Bowl parade and football final, and travelled back to Sydney across the Pacific by ship. Initially I had hoped to spend the year working on an Australian social welfare encyclopedia/handbook, but family financial needs forced me to undertake a half-time teaching appointment in the U of M School of Social Work. The school was flourishing with very high morale and I was quickly integrated into relevant parts of its teaching program. A major curriculum review was under way and my contribution was welcomed not only in the area of social welfare policy, but I was asked to chair a group on social philosophy and ethics, a neglected part of the curriculum.

This third volume of my autobiography takes up the story from when I was

appointed to the first Australian chair of social work in 1968 at the University of New South Wales.

In 1997, I was made a member of the Order of Australia – *‘for service to the discipline of social work internationally, and as the first Professor of Social Work in Australia, to the development of social policy research and to community agencies’*.

A statement at that time by the AASW provides a brief description of the main features in my professional career as it had evolved over the years:

John was vocationally guided into the social work course at the University of Adelaide almost fifty years ago. He combined it with an honours BA in history and political science. The 1953 Rhodes Scholarship for South Australia enabled him to study another degree – in philosophy, politics and economics – at Oxford University. This further study strengthened his commitment to social work as a career. A period of employment in the Commonwealth Department of Social Security in Adelaide was followed by a doctorate at the Australian National University where he wrote a history of his chosen profession, at a time when the memories of many of the pioneers were still available.

After some years at the University of Sydney in the country’s first lectureship on social administration (or social policy as it came to be called), he was appointed to the Chair of Social Work at the University of New South Wales in 1968. For fourteen years he was head of school, developing a full range of undergraduate and postgraduate educational and research programs. He played a significant role in the University’s faculty of professional studies, a grouping of professional schools mainly in the public sector, and served on the University Council. Of particular satisfaction to him was his major involvement since the later 1970s with the establishment and development at UNSW of the Social Policy Research Centre, a national centre directly funded by the Commonwealth Government. He resigned as chair of its board of management in 1996. He was appointed Emeritus Professor on his retirement from the school of social work in 1991.

In all, John spent almost seven years away from Australia – in England, the USA, Canada, Thailand, and Sweden, and visited other countries when attending IASSW, IFSW, and ICSW conferences. For eight years he was on the Executive Board of the IASSW. In 1984, he delivered the first Dame Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture. He is a firm advocate of international experience.

In the 1970s, he had an active membership of the ACOSS board and served as its Vice-President. Other community involvements have included active membership of the governing bodies of the Benevolent Society of NSW, and ISS Australia, organizations with great social work potential. He was responsible for the first Australian child abuse inquiry, in 1982.

One vivid memory of his AASW Presidency was his two days straight giving evidence in the first work-value case for social workers employed in the Commonwealth public service. Another, was trying to deal constructively with the plans of new social work courses, and holding the line on the need for degree-level professional education.

He has had a long-standing commitment to clarifying the ethics of professional work. His completed manuscript *Argument for Action: Ethics and Professional Conduct* is currently under consideration for publication. He served recently on the National Ethics Committee of the AASW.

John states: 'Worthwhile professional work has its inherent satisfaction, strengthened by a sense of shared enterprise with colleagues past and present, here and in other countries'.

The ethics of general community award systems is a complicated, difficult subject. Professional social work had been little in evidence in the Australian award system, so I decided to accept the award as indicating some recognition of the social work profession, but I was not an enthusiastic recipient. I had been privileged to be able to make a career of searching for social good through social work and social policy, and really did not need or expect to get a general community award for it. Doing what I ought to be doing was enough and it was essentially a shared endeavour with professional colleagues and others, not just a singular enterprise. Anyway, what else would I have preferred to be doing?

It is impossible and inappropriate to give a full account of each of the various activities in which I was engaged in the course of my professorial existence. They were, in fact, wide-ranging – at the local, national, and international levels, both inside the university and in the outside community. Only the more significant of these will be covered in any detail. Life was never dull, or static. There was so much to be done in both my major areas of interest and expertise – social work education, and the study of social policy. I was very much aware of what only one person could achieve, but was also aware that I was engaged in institution-building in both areas. Their unfulfilled potential for the betterment of human society was becoming evident not only to me, but to increasing numbers of colleagues and members of the community, in Australia and elsewhere.

The claims of my work had to be juggled with my family responsibilities. It would be tedious to go into this in any detail. However, an understanding, loving wife who proved to be an exemplary mother of our children was for me a huge, indispensable part of my life. I was delighted when Trish, in her early fifties, discovered she had a real talent for sculpting. We were living in New Brunswick when I was on study leave at Rutgers University in the USA. This became an absorbing, fulfilling part of her life which had been so devoted to her family's well-being. At one stage, she had done further school-teaching, at Abbotsleigh, but this was only for a short period and only part-time.

Before moving on to an account of the rest and major part of my professional life – in Australia, living and working overseas, and working with international organisations – the first chapter in this volume deals with our relocation to a new family home in Turrumurra on the upper north shore of Sydney, and our experience of living there. It is still our home after almost 50 years, and we could not have wished for a more successful home-base.

Chapter 1

Our New Permanent Home in Sydney

Our Relocation in Sydney

Towards the end of 1968, we decided we should shift from where we had been living at Balgowlah Heights to Turramurra, a suburb on the upper north shore of Sydney. I wrote to my parents:

You must be staggered by our decision to move, because you know how much we enjoy living in this area. There are a number of reasons for it. (1) The local primary school has not proved satisfactory, at least partly because of the headmaster who has been there for 19 years and is unlikely to shift. Both Ruth and Peter have some years of primary schooling ahead of them, so a shift to another school seemed advisable. (2) David will go into secondary schooling the year after next. We are still not sure where we want the children to go, but choices from here are very limited. Recently I saw the admissions person for Shore (Jean and Tim [Wall] sent Geoff there) and now David and Peter can definitely go there in 1970 and 1972 respectively. The school is just near North Sydney station. ... (3) I'm a bit tired of wasting so much time each day sitting at the wheel of the car. A train trip to Central Station plus 20 minutes or a quarter of an hour bus trip to the University of NSW would give me reading time I can't get if we continue to live here. Other lesser reasons were that we have quite a few friends over in the area we are going to, and the particular house is better built and has a larger entertaining area than this.¹

6 Lowther Park Avenue, Turramurra

With my new level of salary, we could afford a better home and to think of sending the children to private secondary schools if need be. Our search for another home concentrated on areas reasonably accessible to the north shore train-line. Further up the line, the house prices were more reasonable. We were delighted when we found a very suitable architect-designed house in Turramurra at a purchase price of \$38,000. It had been built for the Whitmore family in 1961, but Mrs Whitmore had to sell the property when her husband died from a sudden heart attack. At the end of December 1968, a real estate

¹ Letter, John Lawrence to his parents, 11/12/68.

agent told us our Dobroyd Road house had been sold at a price of \$27,000 (we had paid £8,650 for it in 1961). This and two other possible sales fell through, and we did not eventually sell it until July 1969 at a price of about \$24,000. The Commonwealth Bank, however, provided us with bridging finance and another mortgage on our new home, which we had paid off by the end of 1977. We moved into 6, Lowther Park Avenue on settlement day, Wednesday 22 January 1969. This has been our home ever since, and we have no intention of shifting unless we are forced to by changed circumstances. We are anchored by my extensive library and archival boxes, and Trish's sculpting studio and her sculptures available for sale.

The Location

Lowther Park Avenue is a short, sloping cul-de-sac of about 10 houses between the Pacific Highway and the railway line. Not being a through-street seems to have deterred burglars and we have never been burgled. The houses were built on land originally part of the large federation-style house on the corner at the top of the street. The Turramurra shopping centre and railway station are within easy walking distance down the Highway towards the city. The north-shore rail to the central station takes 40 minutes. Warrawee Public School is nearby on the Highway going north. Shore School, located just north of the Harbour Bridge, is near North Sydney station. We were confident that we had chosen a suitable location for the next period of our lives. Because of the proximity of the train-line, we managed on just the one car until well into the period when our children were going to university. Turning right into our street from the Pacific Highway was always hazardous being just over the rise up from the Turramurra shopping area, but thankfully some years ago this was blocked by the traffic authorities. You then had to drive up to Fox Valley Road, turn left into Fox Valley Road, turn around at the next road to the right and return to the Highway along Fox Valley Road, turn right into the Highway and the third street on the left was Lowther Park Avenue – a rather tedious procedure. After a few years the suburb of our street was changed from Turramurra to Warrawee, but fortunately the postcode 2074 was unchanged.

The House and Garden

Our house was designed for the Whitmore family by Bowe, Burrows and Turner, architects in Phillip Street, Sydney. Karla Whitmore visited us in 2000 to pay a nostalgic visit. 'It was lovely to see the house again and to know that you have enjoyed owning it and using it to the full.'² She sent us photos of the house in its early stages – when it was under construction in 1960, and when it was listed for sale in 1968. These included a shot of the attractive multi-coloured, irregular-shaped, Sydney stone wall dividing the living room from the dining room.³ The floor-boards of boxwood and tallow-wood were

2 Letter, Karla Whitmore to John and Patricia Lawrence, 4/9/2000.

3 There is a very similar feature in the house that the young Harry Seidler built for his parents in Clissold Road, Wahroonga, 1948–50.

not yet laid in those two rooms, and the wooden wall and opposite wall of glass panels in the living room were still to be installed. A shot of the house we purchased shows in the front, a rockery beside the drive, and a well-kept lawn with a couple of umbrella trees the height of the house, and a couple of smaller trees nearer the footpath. Over time, we replaced the umbrella tree in front of our bedroom with a copper beech tree, which has wonderful Autumn colours; we removed the other umbrella tree; made various garden beds and planted a variety of shrubs; and the two original smaller trees have grown into substantial trees – a cedar *atlantica glauca*, and a fairly slim conifer.

The house was set in a square block of land 100'x100'. Seen from the front, it covered almost the whole width of the block. Pathways on each side led to the back. On the left was a double garage with a double-width cement driveway from the street. This gave us ample room for off-street parking for visitors and later, for parking David's Hobie 18 sailing catamaran. In 1973, we installed a roll-a-door on the left garage and converted it into a studio for Trish's potting and then her sculpting. Dean Berry designed the dividing partition for us and a window was made in the back wall of the garage. The shape of the overall plan of the house and garage was an upside-down T. On the left arm of the tee was the double carport, on the right arm of the T were a bathroom and a toilet opposite, and three bedrooms (11'x9', 11'x10', & 15'x9') with access from a passage from the living room to the third bedroom. The eave shading these rooms was substantial. The passage had a high window and was lined with chest-high cupboards topped by a dark veneered wooden shelf, ideal for storing some of Trish's sculptures. The wall of the passage with stained wooden doors leading to the bedrooms was of stained pine-wood. So too was the wall between the end bedroom and the one next to it, which had huge built-in storage space. Between the two smaller bedrooms was a wooden partition which we removed when we no longer needed all of the bedrooms.

In the central stem of the T, nearest the street was an extension of the carport with direct access to the front door. Inside the front door was a small entrance area with a door on the right to our bedroom (14'x12'), an open access to the living room (27' x 20'), and a door in a wooden panel wall to what in the original plan was designated 'study' (18' x 10'). We, in fact, used it as another bedroom, for Peter, and used the bedroom at the right-hand end of the house as my study. Our bedroom had its own bathroom and toilet. Beyond Peter's room was a laundry with the backdoor to a small sheltered entrance area, and a door into the kitchen. The living room was continuous with the dining room (14'x12') making a very large open area for entertainment purposes. On the right-hand sunny side of most of the living and dining rooms was a glass wall; beyond it a wide cement terrace which ran almost to the back fence before ending in a high brick wall. Beyond the terrace was a rectangular garden area for lawn, shrubs and trees, with access to a storage area under the house created by the slope of the land. We have had a water tank installed there, and on our low-pitched roof we have a large solar heater and seven solar panels. On the other side of the house behind the garage and the kitchen was another area for a small lawn, shrubs, vegetables, and compost heap. Behind the kitchen we had a kiln when Trish was making pots.

There was open access to the kitchen from the dining room. As in the living room, the dining room had a wooden panelled wall. We were told by the real estate agent that some potential buyers had been put off by all of the wooden panelling in the house, but Trish and I found it attractive. It took a while, however, for the gun shapes on the living room wall to disappear; Mr Whitmore had been a keen collector of guns. In recent years I have used the wooden panels in both the living and dining rooms to display my photos of Australian wildflowers and of places we have visited on our travels to Europe.

The house had double-brick walls, painted with Boncote cement paint, which I found easy to apply. Its aluminium window frames are still in reasonable condition. The low-pitched grey tiled roof has required some work but generally it is lasting well. A few years ago we had to replace the original gutters which had rusted badly, but their replacement is rust-free. We have also had to have the floors of the living and dining area resurfaced. Generally, however, the house has proved very easy to maintain, and until fairly recently I have managed to do the necessary painting both inside and outside myself. We have obviously been very fortunate to live in a house so soundly built and well-designed by architects. We could not have wished for a better house in which to live and bring up our children. It worked very well as a family home, and we had ample space for staff functions, and other entertaining including a wedding reception for one of our children.

Our Neighbours

The first of the houses to be built in Lowther Park Avenue was number 4 on the Highway side of us and was occupied by Eric and Rowena Craig, and three of their children Rex, Averil, and Denver. The Craigs attended the Anglican St James Church which was within walking distance down Cherry Street and across the bridge to a footpath which led to the church. Eric Craig was an executive in Woolworths. A camellia expert, he exhibited a variety of beautiful camellias in camellia shows and competitions. He was president of the Australian Camellia Society and attended many international camellia gatherings in Japan and elsewhere. It was not surprising that he suggested sesanqua and other camellias when we sought his advice on what might be suitable to plant in our garden. The Whitmores had planted a row of pencil pines along one of our borders and we managed to sell these to a nursery and purchase sesanqua and other camellias with the proceeds.

In number 8 for many years were Andie and Helen Mackay and their daughter Helen. They converted their garage into a grannie flat and it was occupied by Mrs Graham, who had worked as a seamstress at Shore mending the boys' clothes. They were originally from Scotland. Andy was a Qantas executive who had spent time in south-east Asia. After his retirement, they moved to a place on the central coast, where we once visited them, but they were not very happy about their relocation. Andy died ahead of Helen and we heard she had decided to return to Scotland.

Aubrey (Aub) and Elaine Ogden lived in number 10 for many years. Tony, one of their two children, did architecture at UNSW. Aub had served in the

airforce in the Second World War. He had a country background and did not enjoy his work when his bank asked him to be its branch manager in King's Cross. He and I would sometime chat on our way to or from Turramurra station. He could hardly wait for retirement. Just recently they had pleasure showing us over their unit in The Landings, a large retirement village in North Turramurra, after the funeral of Bill Mayne, one of the other residents whom we had known for a very long time. Our children knew Bill and Joan Mayne's children at St James' Church and their daughter Nicky Mayne was one of our UNSW graduates.

Another long-term resident was John Hill, who died fairly recently well into his 90s. He lived in number 12 next door to the Ogdens just below the railway line. John had been a Lt Colonel in the Australian army, and had a second career in the state public service. He was a quiet courteous man very well liked by his neighbours. Some time after his first wife died of cancer, he had a very happy period doing a lot of travelling with a new, much younger partner. We found out when he died that he had his first taste of travel attending an international meeting of boy scouts and that he became a significant financial donor to the boy scout movement.

Next door to John Hill in number 15⁴ was the Broomfield family. We did not know them very well at first, and unfortunately Heather Broomfield's husband died in middle age. Heather fairly recently finally sold and went to live near family in Queensland. In recent years she had provided board and lodging for various young members of her fairly extensive family. Heather always came to street parties, given by the Craigs, then by the Ogdens, and then by us. When she went, we were left as the sole survivors of the early occupants of Lowther Park Avenue.

At number 11, there were successive older retired couples, whom we did not know very well. Opposite us in number 9 were Pat and Betty Purcell, and their children – Penny, David, Richard, Virginia, and Nicky. The Purcells came from Bermuda. Pat had served in the war in Britain and Betty was British. They were a Catholic family; Betty was a keen churchgoer. Pat had been a journalist in Bermuda. In more recent years, he worked for one of the local papers. He took special pleasure in restoring old furniture. He tended to have a rather short fuse, but in later years mellowed. I had many conversations with him after his eventual retirement when he spent a lot of time maintaining his lawns and garden. He died some years before Betty. She was subsequently greatly helped by Virginia during a long period before she eventually died just recently. Betty asked us to witness her will and we had a good relationship with her.

On the Highway side of the Purcells, in number 7, was a Jewish family, the Rosenblums. Felix had been a prisoner of war and had poor health. After he died, his wife Nina lived on for many years before finally going to a nursing home, where we visited her much to her delight. Their son Graham had a mental condition which meant he could not be in the regular work-force and was a constant worry for them. Their daughter was a psychologist, who married and lived elsewhere. We and other neighbours tried to be as supportive as we

4 There was no number 13!

could with Graham, but eventually when he stopped taking his medication, Nina could not cope with him any longer and he had to be admitted into special accommodation for people with mental disabilities. Betty Purcell and Nina were good friends. Nina remained positive and cheerful, despite her very difficult life circumstances. We did not know the Rosenblums' history, but I think Nina had lived in Israel.

At the top of the street in number 5, next door to the original mansion, were Ron and Mim Fenig. They were about same age as our parents, and were for a period like grandparents to our children whom they clearly enjoyed. Ron loved telling them about his Sydney Harbour tugboat business, which his family had owned for almost 100 years. When he could no longer use the tools in his workshop, he very generously gave them to David our eldest child. Mim Fenig enjoyed painting. In the hall-way of our beach-house is one of her paintings which she gave to us. It is a painting of our house in Lowther Park Avenue as seen from their house. Not long before they died, they invited us to a memorable lunch at Brooklyn on the Hawkesbury in a restaurant adjacent to their son's boat hiring business.

A Changing Neighbourhood

After a long period of relative stability in the social and physical composition of our neighbourhood, in the last few years, substantial changes have been occurring. As indicated, for a period we enjoyed living in a street with a number of other families with children. The children all left including our own, and some of the neighbours moved into accommodation for older people or died. Along the Pacific Highway many properties were no longer occupied and were in a derelict state; the area became quite shoddy. A chronic period of 'planning blight' had set in. Clearly something was going to happen to these properties, many of which were much older than the houses in our street.

Until about 9 years ago remarkably there was a vacant block at the top of our street opposite the big house. It was owned by a woman who finally sold it to a developer who had also managed to purchase and demolish a number of the derelict houses along the Pacific Highway between Lowther Park Avenue and Winton Street. Two five-story developments, of 27 and 32 units, were built in just a few months. One had a car entrance from Lowther Park Avenue, the other from Winton Street. Not long after, on the town side of the original Spooner mansion, a larger development was finally built by Ralan in Cherry Street. All of the residents of our street were united in not wanting to sell to developers; our blocks were not deep enough anyway for much denser housing. The Kur-ing-gai Council failed miserably to cope with conflicting pressures from developers, residents who fell into different categories, and the state government. Eventually the Council had its planning powers withdrawn by the government and direct approval was given to many high-rise developments especially along the Highway. This changed the character of many of the suburbs involved. In Warrawee, the proportion of apartments grew from only 1%

in 2001 to 27.4% in 2011.⁵

We accepted that each area of Sydney should take its share of expected population growth; more medium density housing properly planned could be suitable for our area, but what actually has eventuated seemed the antithesis of good planning. The Ralan development just one house away from our home did not provide adequate outside facilities for the residents of the units, and visitor and resident parking seemed minimal. The surface of our street was badly damaged during the building of the units; it was repaired by council in 2015. The residents of our small street were apprehensive about the traffic and parking impact of the development, but these have proved to be manageable, partly because of parking restrictions recently placed by the council. Our home is not overlooked by the units, they do not block our sun, and they cut down traffic noise from the Highway. There is little external evidence of whether or not the units are occupied. Ralan had them for sale when they were being constructed. Many units are now being rented, often it seems by people from the Asian and Pacific region.

The Recent and Current Social and Ethnic Mix of Our Street

On Saturday, 6 October, 2012, we invited our neighbours in Lowther Park Avenue to a very successful street get-together. They came from the one-storied houses of the original development, still basically physically intact since they were built around 1960. The social and ethnic composition of the street is a tiny reflection of Australia's changing population. The Bulls bought the Fenigs' house in number 5. Graeme is retired from working with IBM and occasionally has generously helped me when I have had computer problems. He has lost his wife to early alzheimer's disease. Originally from Victoria, he has an anglo-saxon background. His father worked for the post-office but Graeme is not a strong supporter of government-run services. A keen amateur pianist, he has played with a jazz group until quite recently. Nina Rosenblum's house, number 7, was bought by a Chinese family. Pauline and her daughter Leonie from this family came to our get-together. Another Chinese family purchased number 9 after Betty Purcell's death. Olson and Anna Yu, with their son David, came from north-east China. Unusually, they are Chinese Christians. David puts out our rubbish bins each week. The family in number 11 have been there a number of years and produced a couple of children. We donated a child's pusher to them at one stage. They come from India. Shankar works for Westpac bank and Priya works from home. I very willingly wrote a reference to Knox Grammar School in support of their son's admission. Two young professionals, Peter a lawyer, and Andrew an IT specialist, bought number 15 from Heather Broomfield. Peter (Maddigan) has been particularly helpful to us when we have had television and computer difficulties.

Now in number 12 are Alex Raffles and Hanna Pelham, with three young children. Alex is a medical GP working in North Turrumurra. Hanna comes from Adelaide. The Ogdens' house in number 10 was bought a few years ago

⁵ McConnell Bourne (estate agents), *Upper North Shore Property Review 2011/12*.

by a couple from Hong Kong, Davy and Kit, with teenage children Victor and Christine. Davy is a lecturer in statistics at the University of Technology, Sydney. We have developed a strong relationship with them, strengthened by Trish providing help and encouragement to Kit to improve her English and undertake training in ceramics and sculpting instead of languishing at home. Victor and Christine, their children, are now at university.

The Mackays' house in number 8 was purchased by Frank Halim, in anticipation that he and his family would be moving from Melbourne, but this did not occur.⁶ The house has been occupied by a variety of tenants over recent years, but they have kept to themselves and have not interacted much with the rest of the street. This has also been the story with a succession of both owners and tenants for number 4, the Craigs' house. Currently, this has a young Chinese owner, Eric, and provides accommodation for about seven tenants. Four tenants came to our street get-together on 6 October, 2013 – Soyoung, a newly qualified Korean nurse working at the Sydney Adventist Hospital in Wahroonga (the 'San'); Aaron a recently arrived IT specialist from Ireland; Gill, originally from South Florida, who had spent ten years in Panama, and hoped to get permanent work in the building industry in Australia; Trevor, who worked on the garden of the Pymble golf club; and Bill. Everyone at our get-together clearly enjoyed the occasion and thought it was a good idea for me to make a list of their phone numbers for sharing with each other.

6 I had some contact with Frank when I took responsibility for organising a street letter to Council about our planning concerns. Although he lived elsewhere, he supported our concerns and added his signature. Frank headed a very successful computer company but it was taken over by a Chinese firm who did not want his staff, and his own position was very uncertain when I last spoke with him.

OUR SYDNEY HOME – SINCE 1969



Under construction 1960



The house listed for sale 1968



Our new home – Ruth, Peter, David, Trish



Excavations, top of our street, 2008



Cement trucks – PDL talking to driver, 2009



The apartments nearing completion – from our street outside our next-door neighbours' house



Entrance hall to our home: PDL sculpture 'Young Torso'. Brass rubbing by all the family of medieval couple (Sir John Routh of Routh, Yorkshire, and his wife Agnes). Rug designed and hooked by RJL, wool spun by PDL



Blue-tongued and Golden lizards - left side garden, from the front



King parrot on the terrace, right side garden



Golden-crested white cockatoos - frequent and sometimes destructive visitors

Front Garden



Japanese wind flowers



Autumn crocus



May bush



Vireya rhododendron



Vireya rhododendron



Arctotis (African daisy)



Grevillia - Honey Gem



Planting a Wollemi pine, ancient tree discovered 1994. (Our specimen did not survive!)



Japonica in blossom



Crassula multicaeva – a succulent



Hibiscus

Right Side Garden



Flowering shrub



Native hibiscus



Hydrangeas



Hydrangeas from 'Wingfield' (Berry family home)



Hydrangeas (from Doug Hirst's garden) - Susie Hirst and PDL



Camellias



Lime fruit



Yellow and purple Iris





Magnolia



Judas Tree - Spring



Judas tree - Summer, Autumn

Left Side Garden



Clematis



Azalias



Zineas



Tree dahlia



Yellow roses

Chapter 2

New Responsibilities in Turbulent Times

The period from the late 1960s until about the mid-1970s was a time of a considerable social change and turbulence in Australian society. For someone in a new professorial appointment, who professed social work, with a special interest in social policy, it was a time with considerable potential. So much was happening. The period ended, however, in disappointment and frustration on the social policy front, and much of the promise of a new deal for social workers and their concerns remained unfulfilled – at least partly because of the relative weakness of their professional association.

Social Reform in a Hurry Under The Whitlam Government

Towards the end of this period of social unrest, the Whitlam government operated for three hectic years of attempted social reform after 23 years of conservative rule. Its initial electioneering slogan 'It's time' captured the mood, but effective social change takes time, patience and knowledge. The government was in a hurry and was inexperienced. It had to cope with a civil service resistant to change, the oil crisis in the middle-east in 1973–4, an emerging recession, and rapid inflation. It was not surprising that after Whitlam was very controversially 'dismissed' by John Kerr the governor-general, in November 1975, the long-term tendency of most of the Australian electorate to conservatism reasserted itself with the election in December 1975 of a Fraser government. The extravagances of the Whitlam period and the down-turn in the economy halted any sustained movement towards a social democracy, not just immediately but in the longer term. 'The welfare state' began to be undermined by the emergence of 'economic rationalism', instead of being seen as a bipartisan permanent post-war achievement. The Australian post-war liberals had always included people who insisted on government providing an adequate safety-net for all citizens, but now they were losing ground within their party.

The period had exposed the general ignorance which still persisted about Australian social conditions, despite some improvement in social data. Gough Whitlam and his colleagues needed reliable data on which to base their social policies and had to set up a plethora of commissions and other inquiries to

try to quickly rectify the problem. As I have indicated in the second volume of this autobiography, my pioneering teaching responsibilities in Australian social policy had made me acutely aware of the deficit. No amount of political ideology and rhetoric could substitute for knowing what they were talking about. I believed universities had a central role in developing, teaching and disseminating the relevant knowledge, but had come to realise that this would be a slow, long-term process in the Australian context.

New Opportunities for a Social Work Profession Not Ready for Them

Gough Whitlam had some awareness of professional social workers, partly because his wife Margaret was a University of Sydney social work diplomate. She died in 2012, a highly respected and admired Australian. In recent years she had attended our retired social workers group in Sydney, and I enjoyed talking with her about our mutual interests. She was sad Gough had to live in a nursing home; they had enjoyed a wonderful partnership. I can recall her excitement and enthusiasm when the Rudd Labor government was elected in 2007.

Under the Whitlam government 1972–75, social workers might have been expected to play a significant part as planners and operatives in many of the social initiatives of the new government, but realistically their numbers were still very limited, and only a few amongst them had the necessary expertise in administration, policy development and research that was needed. It was a particularly challenging time for all professionals and their professional organisations. Political radicals and radical sociologists accused them of being essentially self-serving and elitist. While I agreed with some of the criticism especially when it was grounded in evidence and addressed to powerful vested interests in long-established professions, I saw a lot of it as ill-informed political polemic. It distracted attention away from reforms that needed the knowledge and know-how of occupational groups organised on professional lines, and were more likely to be achieved through a less confrontational developmental approach.

The Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW), organised nationally in 1946, was growing in membership numbers,¹ but compared with other large, well-established professional bodies, it was small, its fees were low, and it was still at a relatively early stage of development. None of its members in social work employment received very high financial return for what was often high-pressured, stressful work, and many received no remuneration for the considerable amount of unpaid work in which they were engaged in relevant community organisations and in their own professional association. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, the AASW had reached a transitional unsettling stage, when its increasing numbers and responsibilities – in professional education, social action, and industrial matters – were requiring a national restructure.

At the outset of the period, I was centrally involved in the AASW as its

1 They tripled from 1955 to 1968 (383 to 1158). AASW Newsletter, No 11, April 1969, p. 13.

federal president for two years when educational standards for the profession were seen to be threatened by new courses in the colleges of advanced education. Also in 1969 I played a significant part when social workers in the Commonwealth public service received a very favourable award which fully recognised their professional standing and set a general national standard for social work employment. Yet it was dispute over how to handle industrial issues which seriously divided and weakened the profession in the later part of the period. Some account of these various events will be given in the subsequent chapter on the professional association which concentrates mainly on this early period. I did not continue with an active direct role in the professional association, except to function as a member of its panels which assessed whether Australian social work courses met minimal requirements for association membership. This was not through any lack of interest or concern, but I gave other professional commitments priority and thought anyway it was time for our graduates and many others to be accepting their responsibilities in the AASW.

My professional commitments and activities were, in fact extensive – as will become apparent in what follows and is indicated by the table of contents of each of the volumes. This volume concentrates on my work in Australia. Subsequent volumes cover living and working in other countries, and working with international organisations. Although the story is told in separate volumes, with each of the chapters within the volumes concentrating on a significant activity in my professional life, much of it was interwoven and not sharply separated. That is the nature of the complicated, inter-related subjects that I was tackling.

The present chapter opens with an account of my appointment at The University of New South Wales. It gives a brief account of that university and my involvement in it for the rest of my working life. Only 37 years of age when I was appointed, I chose to join a small professorial superannuation scheme instead of staying with the state scheme which was not portable. I mistakenly anticipated that I might want to move interstate or perhaps overseas at some stage. As my career evolved at UNSW, I decided to stay despite being approached about a couple of attractive professional possibilities in Canada.² As will become apparent, my life continued to be reasonably varied and interesting with UNSW as my base, and although my wife and I thoroughly enjoyed time spent in other countries, we were culturally Australians and Sydney was home.

The University of New South Wales

At the invitation of Norma Parker, then head of the Department of Social Work at the University of New South Wales, Trish and I went to the opening of the Morven Brown building on 25 June 1966. I was not impressed by the state premier Askin receiving an honorary degree before he performed the opening – ‘a case of straight political bribery’, I described it to my parents.

2 One at Carleton University in the Canadian capital of Ottawa was particularly attractive.

'Canned organ music poorly handled did not help things.'³ I did, however, see Norma and other social work colleagues in her small department, and met for the first time Betty Davis, her secretary (shorthandwriter/typist), who was later to play a significant role in my working life. Betty, a widow with teenage children, was an excellent experienced secretary originally from England.

On my return from the USA to teaching in the University of Sydney in late January 1968, I was told about the advertisement for the first chair of social work in Australia – at the University of NSW, and that I was expected to apply. (The closing date for applications was 30 March.) For me, it offered a very rare professional opportunity to continue working in Sydney in a new senior position where I might directly influence the development of one of my two major interests – social work, and indirectly the development of the other – social policy.

The university described itself to applicants in these terms:

The University of New South Wales was founded in 1949 to help meet the need for graduates in the scientific and engineering disciplines and to develop studies in new technological fields. Early in its history the university decided to include in its scientific and technological courses a group of compulsory subjects in the fields of liberal arts and social sciences. In 1958 the university extended its activities to arts, commerce and medicine.

Courses for the training of social workers were inaugurated by the late Professor Morven S. Brown ... In 1965 the Board of Vocational Studies, in association with the School of Sociology, offered a course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Social Work. ... The academic course involves a minimum of four years' study and students obtain a total of six months' field work training during the second, third and fourth years of the course. ...

I was under no illusions of the difficulties I might face at UNSW. When Norma Parker had been invited by Professor Morven Brown and the vice-chancellor Professor Sir Philip Baxter to head the Social Work Department in the School of Sociology as an associate professor for three years prior to her retirement in February 1969, she was helping UNSW and Morven to retrieve a very shaky start for social work education in the university. Norma was, in fact, the only person with sufficient professional credibility to achieve this, but was quite devastated when Morven died in October 1965 before she had even taken up her appointment.⁴ The 4-year bachelor of social work degree had had to be largely designed by Tony Vinson, then a very junior lecturer, with Brown 'under the duress of having publicly promised such a course, and with a parent threatening legal action unless the university provided it.'⁵ Before Norma's appointment, many social workers and social agencies were uncertain whether to provide field work for UNSW students. Norma Parker was trusted to resolve these problems.

3 Letter, John Lawrence to his parents, 3/7/66.

4 See Vol. 2, p. 235.

5 Patrick O'Farrell, *UNSW A Portrait: The University of New South Wales 1949–1999*, UNSW Press, 1999, Sydney, p. 74.

Norma Parker had considerable difficulties, however, with Morven Brown's successor in the chair of sociology, Sol Encel. She told me it was ironic that she had found it impossible to work with two people – one near the beginning of her professional life, Aileen Fitzpatrick, and the other at the end of her professional life, Sol Encel. A fortuitous outcome for social work was that social work was disengaged organisationally from sociology. In the information provided to applicants for the chair, it was stated that the council of the university had decided to separate the Department of Social Work from the School of Sociology and to make its head administratively responsible to the chairman of the Board of Vocational Studies, Professor A. H. Willis, pro-vice-chancellor. The department would become a separate school and the successful applicant would be the first head of the School of Social Work.

Referees

In my application for the chair of social work, I nominated three referees: Tom Brennan, the head of my department; Len Tierney, the director of the Department of Social Studies at the University of Melbourne; and Bob Vinter, the associate dean of the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan.

In writing to Tom, who was on study leave in Hull in Yorkshire, I told him I had spent the previous evening with Norma Parker discussing the situation at UNSW.

It is obvious that running 'the other place' would be no bed of roses, but I have decided to apply. ... My application is in no sense a vote of no confidence in my present circumstances. I won't feel keenly disappointed if I am unsuccessful, because I am happy where I am, thanks largely to your developmental efforts. However, since we want to stay in Sydney, opportunities like the N.S.W one are likely to be extremely rare and I would like to tackle the challenge it offers. I wish it had not come quite so soon. ...

I added,

I have been impressed by our new quarters.⁶ The layout seems to work well and certainly the air-conditioning has been a boon in the hot weather of the past week or so. I have particularly enjoyed being able to use my bookshelves for my books, many of which I bought in the USA. The thought of the other place (the Mackie building) now seems intolerable!

... it is good to be back and I am looking forward to trying to plough into the local system some of the benefits gained from last year.

We found the house in no worse condition than when we left but some of the garden didn't survive.⁷ I hope you enjoy your trip and have as interesting and enjoyable time in England as we had last year in the US. ...⁸

Tom agreed that it would be foolish not to put in an application, though

6 While I was away, the Department moved from the Mackie Building to the stacks building of the Fisher Library.

7 We had had good tenants, well liked by their neighbours the Sonleys.

8 Letter, John Lawrence to Professor T. Brennan, 14/2/68.

he did not have any idea what the field was likely to produce as competition; and 'of course' he had mixed feelings about the situation. 'By all means' give him as referee, however.⁹

In writing to Len, I sent our best wishes to Joan and the children. 'We did enjoy the day in New York'. I had not seen him since then and we had a lot to talk about. He had had a profitable time in New York since then, as we had had in Ann Arbor. I gave him some news of Spencer Colliver. 'I think you would be pleased with Spencer's programme. He was working extremely hard and doing very well while he was staying with us throughout the Fall term – he should have a lot to offer by the time he returns'.¹⁰ Len obviously would not have wanted to provide a reference if he were applying for the position, but I knew he was hoping his university in Melbourne would establish a social work chair, for which he would be a very strong contender.

In my final meeting with Bob Vinter at Michigan, he told me that their school had not previously considered employing a foreign visitor, but that I had demonstrated how worthwhile it could be for them. As I have indicated, he played a key leadership role in the school's major curriculum revision and it was he who invited me to become directly involved in some of this. In a letter to Bob, I briefly described the position for which I was applying. 'If you feel unable or unwilling to provide a reference please do not hesitate to say so. Consultation with various colleagues with whom I worked (Sid, Roger, Phil, Henry, Clarice etc.) may prove helpful to you.'

I added,

Our trip home was smooth and pleasantly eventful, and allowed us gradually to reorientate ourselves to our home environment. We have very fond memories of Ann Arbor. As was obvious, we felt very much at home amongst you all, and we are grateful that you people made us feel that way.

I am anxious to hear about your experience with the new curriculum, particularly what is happening in the social philosophy and professional ethics area. I hope our recommendations do not languish for want of continuous advocacy!¹¹

After some delay, Bob Vinter responded with a cable – 'Would be pleased to recommend you for head of school of social work based on you exemplary achievements here and high regard of our faculty.' I could use this statement or he could write another for the university.

The Selection Committee

I was invited to meet with the selection committee at UNSW at 2.30pm on Thursday, 30 May, in committee room 1, on the ground floor of the chancellery, High Street, Kensington. The committee was chaired by the vice-chancellor, Sir Philip Baxter, but I do not recall its other members, apart from Professor Gordon Hammer from the University of Sydney. Gordon had been a psychology colleague whom I liked and respected in the Mackie building at the

9 Letter, Tom Brennan to John Lawrence, 1/3/68.

10 Letter, John Lawrence to Len Tierney, 2/2/68.

11 Letter, John Lawrence to Robert Vinter, 14/2/68.

University of Sydney. Professor Al Willis would certainly have been on the committee and possibly professor Rupert Myers. For this level of appointment, it was customary to invite someone at a professorial level in the same field to serve on the selection committee, but this was impossible as yet for social work in Australia.

I went into the interview feeling reasonably confident I could handle any questions that might come my way about social work and social work education. I was only 37 years of age, young for a professorial appointment, and I did not have extensive social work practice experience narrowly defined. I did, however, have developing and as yet rare Australian expertise in teaching social policy which was an essential component for a social work curriculum, and was very alive to practice issues both historical and contemporary. As I have indicated I saw the practice of the profession entailed in any activity undertaken to further the values and objectives of the occupation. My work for the professional association and with community bodies was in my view professional practice. Providing relevant education in a professional school was a particular kind of professional practice.

Usually, of course, professional practice was more narrowly defined and was confined to working directly with specific clients. Applicants for the chair had to have high academic qualifications and 'should have had appropriate professional experience'. I certainly considered I had had appropriate professional experience for leading a school of social work, but I would not have applied if the advertisement required that I should be an experienced practitioner conventionally defined. I could well have become one if I had stayed working in a social agency and I am sure I would have found this very satisfying personally, but for the reasons explained, my career had taken a different route. What all this meant was that if I were successful in my application, I would make sure the school employed well qualified and experienced practitioners to teach the practice subjects, and that when the school could appoint a second professor, this should be someone specialised in the teaching of social work practice conventionally defined.

I was not aware of any other candidates, either local or overseas, for the position I was applying for. I can remember being asked at the selection interview what I thought was the most important social problem in Australia. I suggested the poverty not adequately covered by Australia's income security system and gave my reasons for why it was so important to address it. Ronald Henderson's research at the University of Melbourne from 1966, was beginning to make people aware of the extent of a problem which should not exist in an affluent society.

Success

On 24 June, I wrote to Tom Brennan that I had just heard from Professor Willis that I was to be appointed to the position at UNSW. It would not be official until the matter had come before the university council, but I decided to tell Mary McLelland and Tom immediately so they could give some thought to my replacement at the University of Sydney. I had not yet discussed when I

would be expected to take up the position, but had indicated in my application that I did not wish to leave before the end of the year.

Many thanks for providing a reference for me, and, far more importantly, for being so helpful, both intellectually and personally, over the past years. I could not have wished for a more fruitful association. Although our circumstances will be somewhat changed, I certainly will value our maintaining strong ties in the future.

Trish joins with me in warmest best wishes to you both; your friendship has been one of the reasons for our fondness for Sydney!¹²

Tom congratulated me and wished me well in my new job. About replacing me, he had circulated all social work and social administration departments in the country with a 'preliminary notice', and was just about to go to a conference in Nottingham of teachers of social administration. He hoped to have some luck there and was sure that at least he could avoid missing 'the season'. If it came to the worst Drinkwater,¹³ who was engaged on a textbook in social administration for Constable, should not find it too difficult. Under threat that he might have to do the job, he was canvassing enthusiastically.¹⁴

At the university council meeting on 8 July, the vice-chancellor was authorised to offer me the appointment, subject to a medical examination. The salary would be \$12,000 per annum. Finally, after completion of an X-ray and medical examination, on 8 August I resigned from my position at the University of Sydney – with my final day 27 November, which would enable me to fulfil my various commitments in the Department of Social Work, and was acceptable to the Department.

I am genuinely sorry to be leaving, and wish to record my appreciation of my academic colleagues, especially in the Department of Social Work, and also of the administration whom I have found unfailingly helpful.¹⁵

When I wrote to my parents on 27 July, I reported we had had Norma Parker to dinner and we had spent the evening discussing the situation at UNSW. I would need to begin getting involved almost immediately because decisions about next year needed to be taken. I had already been to a couple of meetings of a UNSW committee planning a seminar on community health next year and had been quite active in discussions in the committee with other professorial staff. The experience had in no way been frightening, which gave me some heart. After the last meeting, Professor John Griffith showed me over his School of Hospital Administration and I met his staff members.¹⁶

Accommodation at UNSW

In the information supplied to applicants for the chair, it was stated that the

12 Letter, John Lawrence to Tom Brennan, 24/6/68.

13 Ronald Drinkwater was the head of the Department of Social Administration at the University of Hull, and would be in Tom's department at the University of Sydney in 1969.

14 Letter, Tom Brennan to John Lawrence, 8/7/68.

15 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to H. G. McCredie, the registrar, University of Sydney, 8/8/68.

16 Letter, John Lawrence to his parents, 27/7/68.

University was located on a 100-acre site at Kensington, an inner suburb of Sydney. The staff of the Department of Social Work were at present accommodated in the Faculty of Arts building. The long-term accommodation plan was for the Department to be moved into its own accommodation in another part of the University.

I quickly discovered, however, that we would be located on the western or lower campus in hut accommodation, expanded by a new one-story 'hut' which would house the professor, some staff and teaching space. These original historic army/migrant (or were they Department of Transport?, asks Pat O'Farrell) huts had provided Arts/Humanities with initial accommodation before they occupied Science hand-me-downs in the Main Building, as Science moved to new quarters.¹⁷ As already mentioned, the Arts faculty moved into its own building in 1966. The School of Social Work could reasonably expect to move into new quarters as the building program of the University progressed and the huts were removed – or so I was led to believe. Other schools had had to 'serve their time' in the huts, and I was told that it was thought that such an environment might be suitable anyway for our clients! Apart from the obvious inadequacies of the huts, they were on a fringe location at a considerable distance from the university library, other schools and the chancellery on the upper campus. When I had my car, I could drive and park on the upper campus, but not so the students. On the plus side, these huts abutted Anzac Parade which had a regular bus service to Central Station,¹⁸ and the Round House on the other side of the road was the hub of student life. The 'hut location' of the school was to become a regular target in the student reviews. I was to have excellent relationships with the university administration, except for one department – the Building Department under Bob Fletcher. This was despite the fact that his daughter was a social work student!

Our hut accommodation on the western campus was to feature regularly in the University's submissions to the Universities Commission. I can recall having an extended conversation with the chairman of the Commission, Professor Peter Karmel, on one of their visits to view our huts. It was not, however, primarily about the huts (their inadequacies for a university school were obvious), it was about my sister Margaret whom he held in very high regard.

Responses to My Appointment – from Melbourne

On 12 July, 1968, I received a rather sad, wistful letter, from Len Tierney. He had just heard from the university that they were offering me the position. Len wrote:

I will not call you Professor at this stage as there is no indication of your acceptance. However, as one of my clients said when offered accommodation at Camp Pell "it is really quite an honour to be offered something' and, as another one of my clients said "a funny thing about Doctors is that Mister is higher than Doctor". The way things are going what with all these Doctors, Associate Professors and

17 Patrick O'Farrell, *UNSW a Portrait*, p. 94.

18 Incredibly it took years before buses went up High Street and served the upper part of the campus.

Professors, I will soon enjoy the unique distinction of being the only “Mr.” as Head of a Department!

Anyway, congratulations John. I am pleased for the profession's sake that you have been appointed Professor at the University of New South Wales. With very best wishes.¹⁹

In reply, I told Len I had accepted the position and thanked him for his reference and support in a variety of ways over the past years. Having people like him who were willing to share their experience would be a great asset in tackling the difficulties I would face in my new job.

When are Melbourne University going very belatedly to recognise your real merit? I hope I can write a similar congratulatory letter in the near future.

I added the PS, ‘If you can come to the Workshop of the Teachers’ Association, 19–20 August, we would of course be delighted to have you to stay.’

(Unfortunately when the University of Melbourne did eventually establish a chair of social work, an American Verl Lewis was appointed, not Len. I certainly believed that Len had the academic capacity for such an appointment, but discovered that he was not respected as an administrator by senior people in the university, and by one in particular, Professor Ronald Henderson. As the chairman of the university body responsible for the social work course, Henderson’s attitude was highly influential.)

On 18 July, 1968, another congratulatory letter came from Melbourne – from Ruth Hoban in the ‘Department of Research Social Studies’ at the University of Melbourne:

Max (Crawford) and I are delighted to hear of your appointment to the first Australian University Chair of Social Work, and we want to send you our warmest congratulations. We feel the University of Sydney, also, is to be congratulated for you will bring scholarly distinction to this Chair.

For many years now, we have waited for the establishment of Chairs of Social Work in Australian Universities, and it is most gratifying to see Sydney leading the way. I do hope that this will spur Melbourne on to take a similar step.

And to you, personally, we are sure that the appointment will bring great satisfaction and happiness. – All good wishes from us both to you both.²⁰

Responses from Adelaide

Professor Ray Brown and Brian Dickey²¹ from the School of Social Sciences at the Flinders University of South Australia both sent congratulations and best wishes. Ray described my appointment at UNSW as ‘an exciting and interesting prospect, and one I know you will enjoy.’²² In October 1968 when I wrote

19 Letter, Mr L. J. Tierney to Dr John Lawrence, 12/7/68.

20 Letter, Ruth Hoban to John Lawrence, 18/7/68.

21 Brian Dickey’s PhD history thesis at the ANU was on charity in New South Wales 1850–1914. He wrote to me at Michigan in April 1967 after a fairly torrid viva asking me for suggestions on how he might eventually convert it into a book.

22 Letter, Ray Brown to John Lawrence, 12/8/68.

to Marjorie Kennedy on her retirement, she sent her congratulations and asked me to send her greetings to Professor John Wood in General Studies at UNSW. She also mentioned that the South Australian Branch of the AASW was currently 'more pro than con' accreditation of the S.A. Institute of Technology course. She remembered me predicting which way tertiary education was likely to go.²³

Responses from Brisbane

Alma Hartshorn and Harold Throssell both wrote from the University of Queensland Department of Social Studies. Daphne Carpenter said she and the social workers in the Brisbane office of the Department of Social Services were delighted. She felt sure I would be next in line when she heard Norma Parker was retiring.²⁴

Some Responses from People at UNSW

Julia Moore from the UNSW Department of Social Work on 5 July sent me a completed application form for membership of the ATSSW,²⁵ requested a copy of the paper I had recently given to the new graduates and members of the AASW, and told me she had just visited 'our new Hut on the lower campus and it was beginning to look quite exciting. Life will be much easier when we are able to be more organized, in more ways than one.' The new professor would have a cocktail cabinet as one of the symbols of office, in what appeared to be a very pleasant room.²⁶

Claire Bunday sent me note of secret congratulations. 'How soon can you start?!'

I received a van Gogh card of the Postman Roulin from Audrey Rennison:

It seems that your appointment is now public so herewith my congratulations and I am humming the Te Deum on my behalf - Not that the welcome won't be pretty general - but mine is rather more specific. See you at Kenso.

Dr Joe Steigrad of the postgraduate committee in medical education at UNSW congratulated me by letter on behalf of the committee and personally.

Dr Sidney Sax wrote from the head office of the NSW Department of Public Health, 'Gwen and I wish you and Patricia lots of fun and happiness in your new appointment'.

Kath Colby gave me a warm welcome by phone. A graduate from the University of Melbourne, she had a master's degree in social work from Columbia University and was experienced in medical social work. She was a temporary lecturer in the Department at UNSW.

I received an unexpected visit at the University of Sydney from Professor Sol Encel shortly after the announcement of my appointment. Given what

23 Letter, Marjorie Kennedy to John Lawrence, 6/10/68. Marj was a much-loved social work colleague in the Department of Social Services in Adelaide when I worked there.

24 Letter, Daphne Carpenter, senior social worker, to Professor John Lawrence, 28/8/68.

25 I was the secretary/treasurer of this organisation.

26 Letter, Julia Moore to John Lawrence, 5/7/68.

Norma Parker had told me about her difficulties with him at UNSW, I was on my guard wondering why he had come to see me. He was keen to find out what plans I had for the social work course at UNSW. When I told him that I wanted to introduce an integrated 4-year degree, which would mean that social work students would no longer be swamping his classes in sociology 11 and 111, he was greatly relieved. He wanted the later year sociology subjects to be taken mainly by serious sociology students, not social work students. My first encounter with Sol was, then, positive. Later there was to develop sometimes an issue between us on whether sociology 1 should it be a general introduction to the subject, or be designed to be the first in a sociology sequence covering three years. When Sol moved more in the latter direction, some of my staff thought we should teach our own first-year sociology course, particularly when some of the sociology staff had negative stereotypes about social work. I thought, however, that on balance it was better for social work students to be introduced to the discipline of sociology by the Sociology School, and took the same position with regard to psychology I.

Other Responses from Social Work Colleagues

Beth Ward, senior social worker at the Royal North Shore Hospital, a good friend and former president of the AASW, wrote:

I have said to you how thrilled and delighted I am, and I know others feel the same way. But I just did want to write on this important occasion to send you my warmest congratulations and to say that I know that social work is fortunate because of your appointment. No doubt it will be hard work especially at first, but I do hope and expect that you will find your new post with its increased opportunities thoroughly rewarding, and it's exciting to think of expanding horizons for the profession at the same time.²⁷

A number of other hospital senior social workers also wrote their congratulations – Dorothy Fraser (St Vincent's), Pam Roberts (The Women's, Crown Street), Helen Ryan (Concord) and Leslie Campbell Brown (Rachel Forster). Leslie hoped I would enjoy 'putting content into all the theories'.²⁸ Dorothy was 'absolutely delighted' at the news and while congratulating me she felt such congratulations would be more appropriate if addressed to all the other members of the profession 'because we are the ones who will benefit'.²⁹ Pam declared:

What an exciting and challenging position and well deserved! I hope you thoroughly enjoy your new position, and although at present we seem rather a 'Sydney' oriented hospital, that in the future we shall be able to collaborate.³⁰

Helen also indicated future collaboration:

27 Letter, Beth Ward to John Lawrence, 19/7/68.

28 Letter, Leslie Campbell Brown to John Lawrence, 2/10/68.

29 Letter, Dorothy Fraser to John Lawrence, 6/8/68.

30 Letter, Pam Roberts to John Lawrence, 6/8/68.

So far as the Repatriation Department is concerned you may feel assured we will be glad to be of service at any time. We look forward to receiving social work staff in due course from the U. of N.S.W..³¹

Another response to my appointment came from a non-medical social work source. Estelle Cooper, social worker with the Ku-ring-gai council, wrote:

The announcement of your elevation and exciting appointment was one very bright spot in what turned out to be a very busy day yesterday, as I became further and further reduced to frustration and despair in my running battle against petty bureaucracy. ... I feel sure that the "community" will benefit from the greater authority and status, and the contribution you make to its welfare will now be of even greater value.³²

I was particularly pleased to hear from Jenny Caldwell with news of how she and Diane Wright were faring in their master's course at Smith College in the USA. Much as she thought it was wonderful for social work in general for me to have my new appointment, she 'did feel a few qualms for the old alma mater' (Sydney University). The Smith School of Social Work had just celebrated its 50th anniversary. At a grand reunion, the faculty and 'alums' were quite distressed when the students produced a skit with the theme 'Fifty years – the world has changed but Smith has not.' Jenny had just been granted her request to diverge from a purely casework approach to work in a field work placement in 'administration (observation thereof) and community psychiatry' at the Bronx State Hospital, part of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. This was part of the bribe to entice her to stay in the program at Smith. She had feared she would be in a family service placement, 'firmly wedged in the long term, dynamic psychotherapy model.' Jenny had just been reading some of Edwin Thomas's work on sociobehavioral aspects of social work and would be interested to see how that trend developed. In spite of the indoctrination at Smith, she was trying to keep an open mind.

Lydia Rapaport really took issue with Thomas's approach in a seminar during the 50th Anniversary. She gave a very emotional reaffirmation of faith in the psychodynamic approach and was given a standing ovation by 500 Alums. We students sat stoically in our seats – personally, I thought her account lacked integrity and was given with disappointing prejudice for a person of her professional stature.

Jenny had a letter from Antoinette Coyle (another University of Sydney social work graduate) who was going to Smith to do her MSW, and commented:

It's really great that a few more people are going onward and upward. If only we could establish a decent master's program in Australia. In retrospect, I can't say I'm too impressed by current standards of social work education and practice in Australia. After the work of the pioneers we seem to have reached a plateau and now it's time for another spurt ahead. There seem to be murmurings of discontent among the younger generation – I hope they can be channelled constructively.

31 Letter, Helen Ryan to John Lawrence, 8/8/67.

32 Letter, Estelle Cooper to John Lawrence, 7/8/68.

The letter from Jenny Caldwell concluded with:

... We look forward with interest to hearing about your impact on the Sydney social work world from your new position in the power structure.³³

My Parents

I, of course, immediately phoned my family in Adelaide, when I heard the appointment was coming my way. My mother subsequently wrote:

Dad and I are very proud and thankful that you have achieved so much and feel more than repaid for anything we did for you. Your own hard work, devotion to your profession, and enthusiasm together with Trish's encouragement and understanding have been rewarded.

My father even put pen to paper:

There is no need to tell you how delighted we all were to hear the good news of your appointment. Thank you for having worked so hard for so long, but do not overdo it – your health comes first. You have been very fortunate to have such a helpful and understanding wife as Trish has been. Good luck for the future. I looked for something with an appropriate name to back yesterday but could not see any. However I had some luck and won \$6. ...³⁴

Trish's Family

Warm and enthusiastic letters came from Dean, Margaret, and Grannie Berry. They were excited not only by my news, but also by news that Trish's sister Mary was to be married to a friend in the USA.³⁵ Mary Barker wrote to Trish, 'It is absolutely lovely and we are very proud of him – and encouraged too – because if people like John are in the right places surely thing won't go too far wrong.'³⁶

LEAVING THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

On the last day of lectures in October 1968, Mary McLelland and the rest of the staff of the Department of Social Work gave Trish and me a memorable 'send-off' with a dinner in the staff club. We felt very much amongst friends, and as I said at the time, I hoped our future changed circumstances would in no way alter this. I was given two gifts – a high-quality book, just published, of pen sketches of the University of Sydney by Allan Gamble to remind me of what had been my work 'home' for the past eight years, and another gift which oriented me to the broader concerns which my new job would demand.³⁷ They were accompanied by a card with a Gamble sketch of choir rehearsal

33 Letter, Jenny Caldwell to John Lawrence, 2/8/68.

34 Letter, Lawrence parents to John Lawrence, 23/6/68.

35 Letters to John Lawrence, from Dean Berry (26/6/68), Margaret Berry (12/7/68), and Grannie Berry (22/6/68).

36 Letter, Mary Barker to Trish Lawrence, 12/7/68.

37 Letter, John Lawrence to Mary McLelland, October 1968.

in the Great Hall, signed by all of my colleagues and sent with best wishes for Christmas and the new year at New South Wales, 'To RJL in affection'. I thanked my colleagues for a memorable occasion and for many other occasions over the past years.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

The second gift was a book on Australia's 14 universities just published by the Sydney University Press. It was written by David Macmillan, the archivist of the University of Sydney, primarily for academic visitors to the 10th congress of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, but was seen as useful for all who were interested in the universities and their future. I was, of course, especially interested in what it had to say about the University of New South Wales.

By March 1967, the university had 825 staff and its student numbers had grown to 6,749 full-time, 5,335 part-time and 243 external, with the numbers of postgraduate students increasing rapidly. An 'ultimate number' of 25,000 students was expected. UNSW had two colleges, one at Broken Hill, the other at Wollongong, and several field stations.

The university had been particularly concerned with the problem of the proper organisation and development of inter-disciplinary studies, especially in the fields of applied science and technology, and a system of institutes had been established. (I was particularly interested in one of these, the Institute of Administration, established in 1960 to coordinate the varied interests of different schools in the broad field of administration, and to provide various residential courses for senior executives 'from industry, commerce and government'.) The university had established an educational research department for studying the educational processes of the university, which included the use of closed-circuit television. The division of postgraduate and extension studies ran an educational broadcasting radio station, with its courses backed by substantial written material. UNSW had established Unisearch Ltd, a non-profit company without shareholders. It undertook research contracts for industry or government departments, on a normal commercial basis, using the university's facilities and members of its staff. It had proved to be extremely successful. A board of studies in general education was set up in 1963 to assume responsibility for the teaching of humanities and social sciences in faculties other than arts.

Macmillan concluded his section on UNSW with this:

The aim of the governing Council for this, the first of the 'new' or post-war universities in the states, has been described as the building of its faculties of applied science and engineering to be among the best of their kind in the Commonwealth of Australia. The professional faculties – engineering, medicine, commerce, architecture, law and those branches of applied science which are professional – will be its main fields endeavour, strongly supported by the pure sciences, which will have their own goals. The role of the Faculty of Arts is clear and important. Relatively numerically smaller than in most other universities, though numbering finally some thousands of students, its main characteristic will have to be quality, for in addition to its own particular studies and disciplines, it has to be a mirror for

the professional faculties, reflecting the continuing importance of the humanities in a world largely dominated by science and technology.³⁸

In his foreword to Patrick O'Farrell's history of UNSW, Gordon Samuels, its long-serving chancellor, wrote:

Professor O'Farrell describes UNSW as unusual, unorthodox, lively and informal. It certainly has been, and still is, all of these. But above all, it was hungry; it was the epitome of the hungry fighter seeking success and recognition.³⁹

This was the institution I was about to join. I realised and welcomed that I was expected to become part of its aspiration for achievement in all it took on. Professor Willis made it very clear that it was hoped that I would place the new School of Social Work on a sound long-term basis for the university, now the university had made a commitment to develop this professional area after its rocky start.

I saw the strong emphasis of the university on its professional faculties as a great advantage in the development of a relatively new and underdeveloped field like social work. I did not fear the science and technology emphasis of the university but argued that notions of science and technology needed to be expanded to the social sciences and relevant technologies in dealing with social phenomena, and extended to dealing with questions of value and purpose. UNSW had pioneered courses in the history and philosophy of science, led by Professor John Thornton, and I anticipated increasing academic interest in the value assumptions of the social sciences as well as in ethics as a serious academic subject. For me, professional education had to address the trilogy of values, knowledge and skills. Professional education which failed to do so, in any field, was theoretically and practically inadequate.

The student unrest and strident student politics were a significant feature of the social turmoil of the period. In student politics as portrayed in *Tharunka* and other student papers, nothing seemed sacred. All social institutions came under fire. People in positions of any authority were under challenge. Notions of authority and any sort of hierarchy were rubbished. Some radicals wanted anarchy; others wanted a socialist revolution; some wanted just the time and space to enjoy themselves. Student advocates of social democracy or liberal democracy as espoused by the main political parties in Australia were not in evidence. This was not a comfortable period generally for many Australian citizens, but it was particularly uncomfortable if you worked in a university setting, whatever your academic rank, and especially so if you headed a university school or department which focused on social concerns.

38 David S. Macmillan, *Australian Universities: a Descriptive Sketch*, Sydney University Press, Sydney, 1968, pp. 55–9.

39 Patrick O'Farrell, *UNSW A Portrait: The University of New South Wales 1949–1999*, UNSW Press, Sydney, p. 1.

Academic Structure, Key University People and Student Unrest

Becoming a Faculty

Being located as a school in the Board of Vocational Studies at UNSW gave due recognition to the need for considerable autonomy for a professional school. The board had been established 'for the purpose of supervising the teaching and examination of subjects which are primarily concerned with vocational training and which do not lend themselves to incorporation in the existing Faculty structure.'⁴⁰ The Board had similar functions to a faculty, and reported to the professorial board which made recommendations to the university council for consideration and adoption.

The original Board of Vocational Studies, set up in 1960, was restricted in its membership, with only the heads of schools being members from each of its academic units. It was a highly centralised arrangement; non-professorial academic staff were not involved, and certainly not students. In 1971, the Board was reconstituted on lines similar to those of a normal university faculty, with student representation. Pro-vice-chancellor Professor Willis served as our dean, a sensible initial arrangement, not least because of his very senior position in the academic hierarchy, and the need for the university to monitor this new academic structure. When it was reconstituted, the Board of Vocational Studies was responsible for all courses in the schools of education, health administration, librarianship, social work and the Department of Industrial Arts. As its first chairman 1971–3, I steered through the professorial board in 1973 its change of name to 'Faculty of Professional Studies'. None of the schools was large enough to warrant a separate faculty, but each was self-consciously a professional school, not appropriately located in a non-professional faculty. Starting out as a rather rag-bag collection, we found we had a lot in common being professional disciplines preparing people for professional roles mainly, but not exclusively, in the public sector. We could respect each other's need for autonomy, but still provide constructive criticism in faculty discussions. Other disciplines were primarily engaged in developing knowledge in its own right.

Professional and Non-Professional Disciplines

Both types of discipline could claim to be rightfully located in a university, an institution based on the development and transmission of knowledge. In the general history of universities, professional education (the church, law, medicine) was, in fact, a much longer tradition than the scientific and other subject disciplines emerging especially from the 19th century onwards. From my own educational experience and research, I was keenly aware of the importance of understanding the distinction between the two. My own bifurcated interests in social work practice and in the development of social policy as a social science discipline placed me in both traditions. Each could of course contribute to the other, but the focus and purpose of each was distinctive. Professional schools were necessarily focused on the values, knowledge and skills, which

40 A. H. Willis, 'Introduction', *Board of Vocational Studies 1969 Handbook*, UNSW.

characterised the members of their profession. Scientific and other subject disciplines focused primarily on the knowledge and knowledge-acquisition skills of the discipline, not on its application by students in particular work roles. There were, of course, instances of subject and social science schools trying to recruit students by making their subjects relevant for students seeking employment on graduation, but they were not engaged in professional education worthy of the name. Morven Brown had run into trouble when he tried to add on some practical work to his diploma of sociology.

Al Willis

I developed an excellent relationship with Al Willis, appreciating his manifest honesty, and consistent support for our school. I always felt the school had a fair hearing from him. Sometimes he would tell me not to ‘overstrategise’ when I tried to anticipate various staffing eventualities; he would assure me he would be of some help whatever our changing circumstances. On my part, I always played it straight, stating our needs but not exaggerating them, and I think he (and other senior colleagues) realised this. A couple of times when a staff member had repeatedly failed to meet reasonable academic publishing or higher degree expectations, he was firm that their contract should not be renewed and though I had argued their case yet again for I still valued their teaching, reluctantly I had to finally agree with him.

Al seemed genuinely interested in social questions and told me at one stage that he himself had come ‘from the wrong side of the tracks’ in England. He appreciated Australia’s egalitarian tradition. Only two years of age when his father died from Spanish flu in 1920, he was forced to leave school early and work as an apprentice engine fitter. A prestigious Whitworth scholarship in 1937 enabled him to study mechanical and civil engineering at King’s College, University of London. Just when he was about to start his master’s degree at King’s, England went to war with Germany. During the war he was engaged in making weapons to kill people. Following the war, he wanted to leave all of that behind and start afresh away from Britain. In 1950, he migrated with his family to Australia to take up his appointment as senior lecturer in the newly-established NSW University of Technology. In March 1952, he was appointed Nuffield Research foundation professor of mechanical engineering and was later dean of the Faculty of Engineering and then a pro-vice-chancellor 1967–78. In 1968, he was the first warden of the university’s International House. On his retirement from the university, he wrote a straightforward, structured account of the early years of the university with Baxter as vice-chancellor.⁴¹

Pat O’Farrell in his official history of the university described him in these terms:

Bluff, honest, solid, long-serving (twenty-eight years) Al Willis was an admirable carry-over from Baxter’s founding fathers ...⁴²

41 A. H. Willis, *The University of New South Wales: The Baxter Years*, UNSW Press, Kensington 1983.

42 O’Farrell, op. cit., p. 178. I would never have described him as ‘bluff’.

Al was an excellent pianist and apparently for years played background music at the Royal Sydney Yacht Squadron. John Kennedy recalled to Pat O'Farrell, a get – together in about 1956 of the students' union and the professorial board when Al played for a sing-song of Noel Coward songs.⁴³ At the age of 94 years, Al continued to take an active interest in the university and had recently endowed two four-year scholarships for impecunious students of high academic ability in the School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering.⁴⁴

Vice-Chancellors

Each dean was a professorial executive head of a faculty. The university's chief executive officer was the vice-chancellor Professor Rupert Myers, who had taken over from Professor Sir Philip Baxter in July 1969. He was assisted by three pro-vice-chancellors, the deans, and the heads of the three administrative divisions (registrar, bursar, and property). The vice-chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) first met in 1960. It was chaired by the vice-chancellor and consisted of the deans of faculties, the bursar, and the registrar; it played a central role in the governance of the university.

Sir Philip Baxter

On my first day at the university in November 1968, I was welcomed by Professor Baxter in his office. In our conversation I can recall him saying that with all the female students in social work we would at least be preparing them to make voluntary contributions to their communities after they married! I responded by saying that the school would be preparing its students for professional practice, that more married women would be working in future, and that hopefully the gender imbalance of the profession would change. (It was inappropriate to have an extended discussion, but I hoped we would be seen as much more than a finishing school for good citizenship. To spend a lot of time and effort in preparation for a professional role that did not eventuate in many individual cases was a waste to the community and dispiriting for those concerned, including the teaching staff.)

I went to a lunch-time meeting called by the staff association and addressed by Professor Baxter shortly before he retired. It was a tense and hostile occasion ending when the vice-chancellor walked out. For twenty years Baxter's prime commitment had been the university and his achievement was 'prodigious', but it was time for new leadership. O'Farrell saw Baxter in these terms:

A superficial reputation for arrogance, for off-putting reserve were as nothing measured against the dimensions of the man, against the excitement of his *bravura* performance, against the achieved greatness of his vision. So what if it is an

43 O'Farrell, *op. cit.*, p.107.

44 See Anabel Dean, 'Al Willis remembers the past and invests in the future', *IMPACT* Newsletter, UNSW website, 29/11/12. In more recent years, I gave Al a lift to the UNSW lunches for emeritus professors. I attended his funeral in 2015. With his interest in the history of UNSW, he was very pleased I was writing my autobiography.

unattractive campus, so what if it was ruled hierarchically.⁴⁵

The changing university environment was becoming less congenial to his manner and taste and direction of his real interests: retirement from the university allowed him to become full-time chairman of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission.⁴⁶

Rupert Myers

Originally from Melbourne, Rupert Myers was one of Baxter's 'founding fathers'. He was appointed foundation professor of metallurgy from the Atomic Research Centre at Harwell in England in 1951. As vice-chancellor, Myers continued Baxter's authoritarian style, but in a very different fashion. In Pat O'Farrell's words,

He made the big decisions. But in a different way: open, warm if with an edge, friendly but distant, the complete family man with clear integrity – one conscious of a changing world, within and without, to which he must relate. A hazardous trick of giving Baxter's values and vision of a nation a new face and a different life, something he did with great success, superb skill and – what Baxter lacked – smooth style: the vice-chancellor as professional art form.⁴⁷

Under the Myers regime the least-favoured faculty was Arts, with Commerce running a close second.

It was not so much that he opposed or distrusted humanities and creative arts as such ... as that he saw the Arts faculty as harbouring some of the less-desirable aspects of the academic environment – pretence, licence, silly and fashionable radicalism, softness, marital infidelity and promiscuity, lack of personal discipline ...⁴⁸

I can recall a graduation address which he gave for graduates from the Faculty of Professional Studies and their families in which he extolled the virtues of the intact nuclear family. Our social work graduates became increasingly restive, and I was relieved when it was over without incident.

Student Unrest

Student unrest was a general feature in the late 1960s and early 1970s, concerned particularly with the Vietnam War and conscription, but also with greater student representation in university governance. UNSW students took part in public protest marches, but their agitation about university matters 'lacked real steam', compared with the University of Sydney. In response to the agitation for greater student representation, Myers acted immediately, in 1969.

His initiatives were not stingy, and were at all levels but, most promptly, involved the setting up of staff-student committees in all schools. This had the effect of localising and dispersing student agitation and focussing its diverse concerns on specific issues particular to the school experience. It placed responsible individual

45 O'Farrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 134–5.

46 O'Farrell, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

47 O'Farrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 133–4.

48 O'Farrell, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

staff practices in the firing line of student criticism and complaint. ... (This) enfeebled and enraged student radicals, who much preferred a centralised authority they could denounce, confront and overthrow.⁴⁹

O'Farrell described the tactic as effective and successful. There was little basis for student frustration and unhappiness in the university. By 1969, the professorial board moved to increase student representation on faculties, and in 1971 after approval by council and amendment of the relevant parliamentary act, student membership was increased from one to three in each faculty. When faculty elections were held, in 1973, students showed little interest, and in two faculties (Professional Studies was one) there were not even student nominations.

Baxter, and particularly Myers, had substantially forestalled the grievance base of student power by moving quickly to accommodate it; plus the magic of the Wizard.⁵⁰

According to O'Farrell, 'the concept and person of the Wizard was crucial to the 'fun revolution' atmosphere which was to prevail in the student unrest of the 1970s, when other universities were experiencing violence and major disruption. ... The Wizard saw himself, not as mad or silly, but playful, driving the left to fury, coaxing the administration into reform, avoiding conflict, generating fun'.⁵¹ Myers realised that in the climate of the late 1960s and early 1970s, he and his academic colleagues had to adapt to avoid major disruption to the work of the university. As 'Prince Rupert' he actively participated in all the fun and nonsense, 'his participation not demeaning him, but widening respect. The alternative of standing one's ground, and on dignity, was proved, in other universities, significantly unsuccessful: running scared did nobody any good. Neither did stand-up battles on principle'.⁵²

A chapter called 'Challenges 1969–75', in Pat O'Farrell's history of the university, provides a lively and insightful account of this period. My first years in a senior academic role could have proved a nightmare, if I had been other than at UNSW. I had more than enough to contend with in the academic and community challenges I was facing in trying to develop social work and social policy. As readers of the student newspaper *Tharunka*, our students were very much aware of the student politics of the time, and some played an active part in the Student Union. I and other school staff supported the school's student association and its various activities, and we encouraged serious debate about our respective concerns and perspectives, trying to relate these to what a school of social work should be about. Of course there were disagreements, both amongst staff and amongst students and between staff and students, but where these were important to the functioning of the school these had to be dealt with, if possible, by relevant argument, not by force. We were operating in a

49 O'Farrell, op. cit., p. 158.

50 O'Farrell, op. cit., p. 158.

51 O'Farrell, op. cit., pp. 152, 154. The Wizard was Ian Channell, originally a sociology tutor. He was appointed 'Gandalf the Wizard of Oz' in April 1969. His accommodation and half his salary were provided by the university. An ambivalent Student Union paid the rest of his salary.

52 O'Farrell, op. cit., pp. 145–6.

university where intellectual freedom should be a paramount value both for staff and students. The development of critical intelligence under-pinned our existence in any university worthy of the name, and also in our commitment to professional social work practice worthy of the name.

When Rupert Myers became vice-chancellor in 1969, the university was the fourth largest in Australia with 15,988 enrolments. In 1976, with 18,378 enrolments, it had grown to the largest in the country. Myers was elected chairman of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee in 1977. He retired as vice-chancellor in 1981. One of our fondest memories was attending 'elevenses' on a Sunday morning at the home of Io and Rupert Myers. We would drive there from Turramurra with our mathematician friends George and Esther Szekeres. These were thoroughly enjoyable occasions where university staff from all disciplines and their spouses interacted in a happy family environment. The Myers children acted as waiters. Rupert himself said of these occasions, 'it created that sense of family. It sounds terribly corny – but it's a benign feeling that either permeates an institution or it doesn't.' Myers extended his hospitality also to students, at home and at informal lunches in his rooms at the university.⁵³

O'Farrell captures something of the changing attitudes to UNSW, from the late 1960s.

There was still the feeling of misunderstood, impoverished outsider – which to some extent it was. But where before there was dismissive contempt – Kenso Tech – such appellations were ringing increasingly hollow and reflecting more on the snobbery and stupidity of those guilty of making them: there was creeping in a tinge of grudging envy and even threatened fear. Here was a force to be reckoned with. Which is not to say they rejected all of the notions of inferiority thrust upon them: there remained a residue of insecurity and apology which lasted, perhaps, to the late 1980s when national performance indicators – and student choice – gave deficiency to the lie.⁵⁴

UNSW became my academic home, not just for the tumultuous first seven years, but for the rest of my working life, and beyond when I became an emeritus professor. It was a privilege to be playing a part in its remarkable growth and development into a university of national and international standing.

53 O'Farrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 144–5

54 O'Farrell, *op. cit.* p. 141.

Chapter 3

Changing Fortunes of the Professional Association

The Organisation of the AASW

From 1947 until the late 1960s, the structure and machinery of the AASW remained largely unaltered. The governing body was a federal council, consisting of seven office-bearers and two delegates from each branch irrespective of size. The federal council met only at half-yearly intervals; it became customary for the federal executive officers to refer most matters by correspondence to state branches; further, when council did meet, it frequently wished to have its decisions confirmed by state branches. This meant federal action was usually slow and much of each branch's time was absorbed by federal business. A federal newsletter, begun in August 1965, and appearing as a regular quarterly from January 1967, helped to inform members of federal council concerns, but there was obvious mounting discontent with the organisation of the association, both at office-bearer and rank-and-file levels. The general meeting at the AASW conference in 1969, which I chaired, expressed concern at 'the apparent growing separation between the general membership and the government of the association', and called for an overall organisational review. At a federal level, such a review was in fact already under way. In the later 1960s and early 1970s, the three main functions of the professional association – industrial, social action, and education – were assigned to federal standing committees with central responsibility for the development and maintenance of each function.

As already mentioned, the association's federal council was located in Sydney during the years 1946–53 and 1959–63; in Melbourne, from 1954 to 1958, and from 1964 onwards. In the face of swelling membership numbers and greatly expanded tasks, the council finally decided in 1967 to establish a permanent central office in Melbourne and an administrative secretary was appointed. The revised constitution, finally confirmed in 1970, released council from the necessity of changing its location at least every six years. Now the president and the two vice-presidents could be elected from elsewhere, but the other officers (the secretary, treasurer, chairman and vice-chairman of the executive committee) had to reside where the federal council office was situated. In addition, there were four other locally-based members of the executive committee elected by,

but not members of, federal council. Each branch still had two delegates on federal council, and it was they who continued to elect the office-bearers, not the general membership, as some had mooted.

Despite the various organisational changes, the AASW still depended overwhelmingly on honorary, spare-time work. In July 1970, I wrote as federal president:

One of the ironies of our present collective existence is the extent to which we undervalue professional modes of operation within our own Association. We rely excessively upon the spare-time, volunteer labour of our members, and the traditional weaknesses of volunteerism are evident – uneven volunteer performances because of other commitments, an unwillingness to hold people closely accountable for their Association work, availability rather than suitability determining functions performed. ... We must have a nucleus of well-qualified professional staff, at federal and branch levels, and stenographically supported, whose central full-time task is to enable the Association to fulfil more effectively its objectives. Such staff is likely to encourage far more widespread and effective member participation than we have at present. ... Only a considerably increased financial commitment ... will hasten the speed of this essential development.¹

The 1971 capitation fee for the federal council was set at \$21, a considerable rise, which enabled the association to improve its services and find more suitable office accommodation.² A half-time professionally qualified federal secretary was elected at the end of 1970. In October 1972, a full-time professionally qualified federal secretary was finally elected, and was re-elected two years later.

Increased Pressures on the AASW

The AASW was struggling to meet the increased challenges presented by this turbulent social period. It needed quickly to get itself better organised and better resourced. If all the qualified social workers had been active members in strong support of the professional body, the task would have been difficult enough, but even though its membership numbers were growing with the increase of social work graduates, many social workers were not joining and some were discontinuing their membership. Those who were in membership were often passive, leaving an excessive burden on the relatively small number active in the affairs of the association. In the eyes of the active ones, the inactive many might well have been seen as ‘free loaders’, willing to receive the benefits that came from professional organisation but unwilling to share the responsibilities. But many social workers had great pressures at work and tended to be focused only on their own work agency; others gave priority to their involvement in social welfare bodies linked with their field of work; some had heavy family commitments, either children or aged parents; and a few were active members of other industrial bodies associated with their work. Hardly

1 AASW Federal Newsletter, No 16, July 1970, pp. 3–4.

2 New South Wales branch members now paid a total fee of \$34; the Victorian branch had a fee scale of \$23–\$35, based on salary earned.

any appeared to have been active members of a political party.

Many social workers in all of the states particularly outside of Victoria concentrated mainly on the local branch affairs and did not respond to federal requests to be involved in national initiatives. The Victorian-based federal officers became increasingly frustrated by the lack of response to their national initiatives. The federal office, located in Melbourne, was often seen as too much Victorian-influenced although federal officers sought for it not to be. A relocation to Canberra would eventually help to resolve this, but this was not a practical, speedy alternative.

The committee for social planning and action (SPAC), established by federal council in April 1971, soon found how difficult it was to take well-informed social action, both because basic social welfare data were not available and because of the difficulty of assembling data on a spare-time basis. Its chairman Edna Chamberlain, who had succeeded me as the federal president, found the AASW's federal structure cumbersome and a drain on scarce resources. 'Issues on which our leadership might be expected, pass with little comment as we struggle to assemble the data.'³ In March 1972, a meeting of the federal executive committee with the convenors of its standing committees (SPAC, FIC, and PEAC) reviewed the association's priorities. The commitment to activities which aimed at social policy change and development was seen as paramount, with professional education and industrial activities 'justifiable only in so far as they contributed to that central commitment'.⁴

Subsequently, in April 1972, federal council set up a working party of two of the most able younger members of the profession, Max Cornwell and Lyn Reilly, to report on the aims, priorities, structure and membership of the association, after extensive discussion with interested parties both inside and outside the existing association. Their report in February 1973 stated:

There was overwhelming agreement among members and non-members that the AASW should maintain its present criteria for membership ... it is quite clear that nearly all parties within and outside the Association do not seek the fusion of their identities into one organisation representing the welfare industry. Nor do they wish tiers of membership, or chapter membership within the one body.⁵

Federal council consequently resolved that the AASW should continue as a distinct body of professional social workers only, but that it should confer with other social welfare manpower organisations, to discuss further relationships and matters of mutual interest. Endorsement was also given to the report's view that the association should become a national rather than remain a federal body, giving attention to social action, professional development and industrial activity. A new national structure with extensive regional activities was envisaged. A New South Wales-based group was asked to study how this could be effected, but before this could report, another federal council decision in September

3 AASW *Federal Newsletter*, no. 23, January 1972, p. 3.

4 AASW *Federal Newsletter*, no. 24, April 1972, p. 3.

5 *Australian Association of Social Workers: Aims, Priorities, Structure, Membership*, Report of the Working Party, Melbourne, February 1973, pp. 33-4.

1974 virtually negated these decisions, taken in the previous year. Arising from Victorian branch recommendations decided upon in July 1974, at a meeting attended by only about one-tenth of its membership, the federal council passed a resolution that indicated a desire to open the membership of the AASW to other groups who did not possess a professional social work qualification. Consideration was to be given to establishing a separate Australian Academy of Social Workers. This turn of events prompted two of the states, New South Wales and Western Australia, to request that the various complicated issues involved be put to a plebiscite of the general membership for their views. The plebiscite was held towards the end of 1975.

Meanwhile, in response to the working party report, a new national publication, *AASW News*, began monthly issues from January 1975. For the first time, AASW members could be informed directly about the activities of their colleagues throughout the nation, but it depended on regular contributions from all of the states and these were not forthcoming. A new centralised social planning and action network (SPAN) centred on the federal office replaced SPAC in April 1973. However, the new system again foundered in the face of the multitude of opportunities to make submissions to the many national commissions and committees of inquiry set up by the Whitlam government.

The result of the AASW plebiscite was that the AASW discontinued its registration with the Commonwealth arbitration court, losing its industrial cover for people working in 'the social work industry'. A new organisation, the Australian Social Welfare Union (ASWU) promised to take over this industrial function, not only for what were described rather scathingly as 'academically qualified' social workers, but also for others working in 'the social welfare industry'. In addition it was argued that this larger and more diverse union would be able to undertake effective social action.

The ASWU seemed to be mainly the brain-child of a small group of Victorian social workers under the leadership of Colin Benjamin. He served the AASW successively as an active chairman of its national industrial committee and briefly as federal secretary when a very frustrated and confused Bruce Belcher discontinued in that position. Benjamin moved on to become the AASW federal president and founding president of the ASWU. A chairman of a wages board in Victoria, he was active in the union movement generally. Initially a considerable number of social workers in the various states joined the ASWU, apparently attracted by the claims that it would have greater industrial muscle and greater social action capacity than their professional association. In the very slender annual report of the NSW branch of the AASW in 1976, membership numbers of the branch had dropped to 395, with only 27 new members, compared with a total of 508 in the previous year.⁶

In 1975, Beth Ward, Mary McLelland and I were made honorary life members of the AASW – and also of the ASWU! It was speciously argued that the ASWU was a reincarnation of the body which registered with the Commonwealth industrial court in 1955 to cover 'the industry of social work'! This was of course nonsense. I, and many others, saw this as a dishonest attempt

6 Australian Association of Social Workers NSW, 'Annual Report 1976', p. 3.

to give the new organisation some legitimacy in the eyes of qualified social workers, as was our appointment as honorary life members of it. Rightly or wrongly, I saw it as Colin Benjamin playing his political games. We had not been asked in advance if we would accept being life members of the ASWU. If we had, I would have declined, but I did nothing, anticipating that the new organisation was likely to founder, because I saw it as ill-conceived.⁷ Over subsequent years, I was sent 'Interface', published by the ASWU. Its contents indicated the new organisation was weak and continued to be over-dependent on its social work members. Kim Wyman, one of the Victorian social workers associated with the ASWU and editor of this publication admitted to me at an AASW conference that its creation had been a mistake from a social work point of view.⁸

It was as well for the future of a genuine social work profession in Australia that the AASW survived this period of its history. It emerged from this turbulent period, however, significantly weakened and stayed that way for some time – an ironic outcome for a profession which claimed to be able to help others achieve constructive social change. Morale was low, proportionately less qualified social workers were in membership, and it no longer had a national industrial responsibility which had wisely been included when Norma Parker was the first federal president. Yet during the turbulent period the AASW did have significant achievements in the area of professional education. Even in the industrial area, it contributed significantly to achieving an industrial milestone for professional social workers throughout the country. The rest of this chapter gives some account of these particular activities.

AASW's Responsibilities in Professional Education

The Tertiary Education Scene

The Australian tertiary educational sector was developing in a confused, incoherent fashion. The emerging colleges of advanced education ran new seemingly professional courses as well as technical courses. In the social welfare area, professionally qualified social workers were very often involved in these courses, and also in 'welfare' courses in departments of technical education. The basic educational underpinning of the social work profession, and therefore the very existence of the profession, was seen to be under threat, unless the distinction between professional and technical education was understood and respected, not only by employers but by social workers engaged in educational

7 I can recall at one stage being invited to a public debate in Sydney by Colin Benjamin who seemed to me, either wittingly or otherwise, to be threatening the very existence of the profession. The next day, my colleague Max Cornwell said I had done well, but could have lightened it up a bit with a few jokes. Perhaps he was right, but I certainly was in no mood for much levity, given what was happening.

8 A trade union entry on the internet indicates that in 1992, the 6,500 members of the ASWU amalgamated into the Australian Services Union (ASU), and now formed the Social and Community Services Sector Industry division at a branch and national level. The entry states that the ASWU was 'formed from the Australian Association of Social Workers, which had been in existence since 1955'. (The AASW had, in fact, existed long before it registered with the Commonwealth arbitration court in 1955.)

enterprises at all levels. A brief account will be given of the abortive attempts in this period to create a national social welfare educational body, which would ensure that in future educational planning would be more coherent.

The AASW, with considerable drain on its very scarce resources, did manage to continue to provide the one national standard for what constituted a qualified social worker – eligibility for its membership. It had hoped this responsibility could be handed over to a well-resourced, adequate national council of social welfare and/or social work. To be eligible for membership of the AASW, a person had to have completed a course which met at least the minimum educational standards determined by the AASW. After considerable struggle and negotiation, both new and old social work courses in Australia agreed to meet this standard.

As already indicated, I had been active in AASW affairs before I went to UNSW. I became centrally involved when I was elected federal president for 1968–70 – under a new constitution that opened up the presidency to members in states other than where the federal office was located (than Victoria) but with a limited term of only two years. Dorothy Pearce, a long-standing respected member of federal council, asked me to stand particularly because the AASW was involved in making difficult decisions on educational issues as new social work courses were emerging, some of them outside universities, and existing courses were being revised. As head of a social work school, I was now centrally immersed in these issues anyway.

General Developments in Australian Tertiary Education⁹

Developments in social work education inevitably reflect general trends in Australian tertiary education. The Murray report (1957) led to Commonwealth government financing of universities, through matching state grants, and to the Australian Universities Commission. The Martin report (1964–65) examined tertiary education generally. One of its chapters dealt with training for social work, which was referred to as ‘a discipline with a developing body of theory sufficient to justify provision for initial professional training’. The report referred to the development of advanced studies and the need for research, and stated ‘preparation for social work demands interdisciplinary studies of a kind and standard which a university can best provide’. The suggestion that universities should discard sub-graduate courses was influential in shifting the university social work courses to 4-year degrees or to postgraduate courses.

The Martin report also, however, stressed the need to finance and develop institutes of technology. The Commonwealth Advisory Commission on Advanced Education was established in 1965, to parallel the Universities Commission and it popularised the idea of a ‘college of advanced education’

9 Much of what follows is taken directly from R. John Lawrence, ‘Australian Social Work: In Historical, International and Social Welfare Context’, in Phillip Boas and Jim Crawley (eds), *Social Work in Australia: Responses to a Changing Context*, Australian International Press and Publications Pty Ltd, 1976. pp. 1–37. (The original is fully referenced.) I was invited by the editors to prepare this as an introduction to this volume of invited papers given at the 14th national conference of the AASW at Monash University in May 1975.

(CAE), a multi-purpose technological institution. A binary system was in fact established, with a great deal of ambiguity existing between the functions of the two parts. The Wiltshire and Sweeney reports in 1969, and the injections of Commonwealth finance, shifted the CAE system towards parity with universities in many respects. The swelling numbers of matriculated students unable to be accommodated by the universities brought to bear inevitable political and social pressure in these directions. For both students and staff, being in a CAE, which could be less hidebound by tradition than at least the older universities, could be an attractive prospect. For people associated with CAEs, social work education was seen as an attractive expanding field into which they might enter, despite there being a general shortage of qualified social work educators.

Basic National Educational Standards for the Social Work Profession

From the mid-1960s, with the development of actual and proposed social work courses, especially in the new and as yet uncertain educational context of the colleges of advanced education, changes in the established social work courses, non-professional welfare courses, and increasing numbers of immigrants with overseas social work and welfare qualifications, the AASW was forced to be more explicit about the standard of minimum educational requirements it expected of its members. A 'Statement of Minimum Educational Requirements for Membership' was adopted by federal council in October 1966 and revised in October 1968.

The Minimum Requirements of the AASW

Six 'Operating Principles' were set down:

- Controlling eligibility for membership was one basic method of maintaining and improving professional standards. Although it was not the function of a professional association to dictate curriculum content to educational institutions, it should set minimum requirements for admission to membership and advise educational institutions accordingly.
- A statement of minimum requirements will need to be under regular review.
- A professional practitioner's knowledge, skill and responsibility must be integrated. Education for social work must be based on the integration of academic learning and supervised practice in the field.
- Student programs must allow time for professional development, and therefore should not be overloaded or condensed.
- The responsibilities assumed by the profession emphasise the need for a minimum qualification in social work which is a university degree or its equivalent.
- Preparation for the primary qualification in social work must be generic, rather than directed to a specific field of practice.

Various detailed requirements were stated for the structure, staffing, and content of the course – a specific educational unit in an institution of tertiary education; a nucleus of permanent teaching staff of professionally qualified

social workers; research opportunities for staff; a university entrance examination or its equivalent; at least a 3-year university degree or its equivalent; an avenue to post-graduate study; a beginning graduate with skill to use differentially a recognised body of knowledge and theory to contribute to the functioning of individuals, groups and communities; and detailed requirements about course areas and field work to achieve this objective.

The course area of theory and method of social work, extending over at least two years, had to provide substantial coverage of the basic principles underlying all social work theory and method. It had to be integrated with supervised field work, and in charge of people with an adequate professional education in social work. The other specified course areas, to be covered in a balanced and coordinated program, were: individual human growth and development, covering physical, psychological and social aspects of both normal and deviant development; the study of society; and the study of social welfare problems, policies and provision.¹⁰ Field work had to be a minimum of 180 days, completed throughout the period of the professional subjects, and in a recognised agency. At least three-quarters of this had to involve the student in direct work with clientele (individuals, groups or communities), in more than one field of practice, and under the supervision of a qualified social worker. Final assessment of the student's performance in field work was the responsibility of the institution giving the qualification and was an essential part of the criteria for the granting of the qualification.¹¹

This statement of minimum requirements was used as the basis of the assessment of the South Australian Institute of Technology course in 1968–69 and the Western Australia Institute of Technology course in 1972–73.

In 1966, the South Australian Institute of Technology (SAIT) announced it would be commencing a three-year diploma of technology (social work) in 1967. Marie Mune would be in charge of the course, within the Department of Social and General Studies. Amy Wheaton, her former teacher at the University of Adelaide, would be a consultant in sociology. (Marie and I had been social work students together at the University of Adelaide.) Also in 1966, a new course in social work emerged in the Western Australian Institute of Technology (WAIT), under the auspice of the Education Department, and had been submitted for accreditation by the AASW. Salaries equal to those for fully professional social workers were being offered to cadets in the new course.

In July 1967, after a visit to Perth for a clarifying discussion with representatives of WAIT and the Public Service and subsequent discussions on the future of social work education in Victoria, AASW president Hamilton-Smith stated:

Our present statement of minimum requirements for membership certainly does not automatically preclude non-university courses, but it does specify conditions

10 I referred to these as the 'basic subjects', for together with the 'practice subjects', they should be providing the essential knowledge-base for social work practice. They were, however, often called 'background' or 'academic' subjects, neither of which I found satisfactory. Too often they did stay just in the background instead of being actively related to social work practice, and, in my view, all of the subjects in professional education in a university should be meeting academic criteria.

11 Australian Association of Social Workers, *Statement of Minimum Educational Requirements for Membership of the A.A.S.W. – Social Workers with Australian Qualifications*, AASW, 1966, 1968.

which appear very difficult to meet outside a university. At this point, the extent to which the new technical institutes will be able to meet these requirements is by no means clear. However, as a nation, Australia has a dual system of Tertiary Education and we must not ignore the overall patterns of educational development. ... the direction which our future policies should take is one of the most important matters to be resolved in the next twelve months.

... Our most acute shortage of personnel is in the senior level – supervisory, teaching, research or consultative posts. ... Early education for social work in Australia provided only a qualification for practice which did not give entry or opportunity for higher study and qualification. Long-term development of social work depends essentially upon provision of opportunity of higher study, and we cannot accept any educational plan which ignores this need.

The suggestion that a small number only need be trained at an academic level, while most are trained only at a practice level appears to me as ridiculous. It is parallel to suggesting that doctors be trained at university for specialist practice, but that the majority be trained at a non-university level for work as hospital residents and general practitioners. ...¹²

In a letter to her colleagues in January 1968, Joan Brown¹³ from Tasmania argued for an ‘open door’ policy towards the colleges of advanced education (or institutes). Bearing in mind the amount of funds available for the colleges and, for example, the thought that was going into the Tasmanian college, it still seemed a real possibility that the colleges could develop in a worthwhile way. She agreed that we must produce teachers, researchers and senior personnel, and at present it seemed more likely they would be products of university courses, but the rise of college courses did not mean the abolition of university courses. She insisted, however, that she was not arguing for two grades of training.

There may be a case for training for certain levels of employment, but to advocate this at the present time in Australia seems to me to be fraught with dangers. The idea of training for social work is really just beginning to percolate into State Government services who are in fact, or should be, the major employers of the profession.

Very few of ‘our masters’ would be sufficiently informed or interested to distinguish between the sub-professional and the university courses. Social work posts at all levels in government services would be filled with ‘sub-professionals’ and our last opportunity of raising the general level of social work in Australia

12 AASW Newsletter, No. 2, January 1968, p. 3.

13 Joan Brown joined the Tasmanian Department of Social Welfare in 1962, after twelve years in child care and family welfare in England. She became a state child welfare supervisor in Tasmania. When the AASW held its 11th national conference in Hobart in May 1969, she was the convenor of the planning committee. She moved onto the national social welfare stage with her appointment in Sydney as secretary-general of ACOSS in 1970. An honours history graduate from King’s College, University of London, she completed an MA degree in history at the University of Tasmania, under the supervision of Michael Roe, who was a fellow PhD students with me at the ANU. Her thesis, which I examined, was published as a book, *Poverty is Not a Crime: the Development of Social Services in Tasmania 1803–1900*, Tasmanian Historical Research Association, Hobart, 1972.

to professional standard will fade away for many years to come. We will in fact have a sub-professional minority vainly trying to exert some influence on future developments. It is true that we are a minority at present; but while we are the only trained officers, we have some influence, if we care to exercise it.

The AASW had been too passive and had not involved itself enough in educational planning.

We seem to have taken the view that educationists do not like to be told they are not providing courses to an adequate level. I find it difficult to imagine any other profession accepting sub-standard courses for their future practitioners without the strongest representation and without deliberate involvement in planning at every stage.¹⁴

Another contribution in the AASW federal newsletter at the same time, came from Murray Geddes. He urged the AASW and the other parties involved in formal training of welfare personnel to clarify 'employment needs in welfare', otherwise there would be a mis-appropriation of scarce manpower and educational resources. Many members of the AASW doubted that 'technically' trained welfare workers would be able 'to evaluate the assumptions of programmes, to be versatile in method in pursuing general welfare goals, and to be attuned to the many-sided forces involved in social change'. This should not preclude the development of welfare technician training. 'The need for welfare-technicians is recognised not only by economy-minded employers but also by our own membership.' 'The Victorian Branch has helped establish a formal course for welfare assistants'.

The thorough distinction of the professional and technician has been prevented by forces which include a substantial number of university social studies graduates who practice like technicians. ... The fact that the Federal Department of Education and Science will encourage the development of Colleges of Advanced Education need not mean that this distinction cannot be preserved. The AASW however, must press strongly for this sort of clarification, probably by Federal level discussions on the pattern needed for adequate welfare education – professional, specialist professional, technical and perhaps voluntary. Right now, unless the AASW gives a strong lead in this clarification, patterns will be formed and entrenched by default. We owe it not only to members, for the protection of their future employment, but also to the future development of Australian welfare.

The AASW should actively stress the need for highly qualified senior personnel as being of first priority, and should clearly define the role and necessary minimum qualifications for welfare technicians.¹⁵

When I was elected the AASW federal president in September 1968, educational and training issues had obviously become of central importance to the professional association – and this was well before the social welfare initiatives of the Whitlam government. At the October federal council meeting, a steering committee was set up, with the Association of Teachers in Schools

14 J. Brown, Letter to the editor, AASW Newsletter, No. 6, January 1968, pp. 4–5.

15 M. Geddes, Letter to the editor, AASW Newsletter, No. 6, January 1968, pp. 5–6.

of Social Work (ATSSW), to examine a proposal for a national council on social work education.

The federal council meeting in April 1969, faced 'a tense and difficult situation'. It appeared that a decision on the accreditation of the SAIT course could not be taken, despite an assessment report, because two branches (Victoria and Western Australia) wanted no decision on non-university courses until a plebiscite of the members had been held. Their written requests for a plebiscite, however, were unclear and did not coincide, and therefore could not be acted on by council. A proposal for a plebiscite on a clearly stated plebiscite question was moved and firmly defeated at the council meeting. In the view of many members, committing a very complex policy matter to plebiscite was quite inappropriate. The two branches could still re-submit an identical plebiscite proposal which council would be constitutionally bound to act upon, but it was now clear this course of action would not be favoured by council as a whole.

At the meeting, council accepted the recommendations of an assessment panel that the SAIT course did not meet the AASW's existing minimal educational requirements, and that those completing the course in 1969 should be referred to the accreditation committee for making up provisions arranged in accordance with principles and procedures approved by the executive committee on behalf of federal council. These decisions were explicitly isolated – to apply only to this course and these particular students. The existing policy on minimum requirements would be reviewed in the light of the report of the Joint Committee on Social Welfare Education expected in July 1969,¹⁶ and other discussions. In the meantime, the AASW would discourage any new courses, except for the one being planned in Tasmania.¹⁷ A special consultant was provided to SAIT to remedy deficiencies in its course, and in 1972 it was fully accredited. The WAIT course was also accredited, in 1973. It was understood that these two sub-graduate three-year courses would be assessed after 1974, along with all the other social work courses. In 1970, the AASW had indicated to all existing and prospective social work educational institutions that from 1974 the minimum educational requirement for membership was likely to be a four-year degree or its equivalent, and in fact this was incorporated in the substantially revised 'Statement of Minimum Educational Requirements' adopted in 1974.

The accreditation committee had been involved in arranging the assessment of the SAIT course. On its recommendation, at the September 1969 federal council meeting, the professional education and accreditation committee (PEAC) was established, with Len Tierney as its convenor. Briefly, its expanded functions were:

- To keep itself informed about professional social work education
- To advise federal council on professional education and accreditation for membership

16 In the event, a first draft report was delayed until December 1969, and was then revised after comments from the sponsoring bodies. Eventually in May 1971, a limited edition of the report was published by ACOSS.

17 AASW Newsletter, No 11, April 1969, pp. 3–5.

- To assess qualifications of overseas-trained applicants for membership
- To arrange the making-up of professional qualifications to reach the minimum requirements for membership
- To discuss with educational and/or other institutions the policies and interests of the Association in regard to professional education¹⁸
- To regularly review and assess Australian courses of social work education, according to policies and procedures adopted by federal council
- To maintain close communication with branches on educational issues¹⁹

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the AASW clarified its procedures, both for consultation with educational institutions establishing social work courses and for assessing them once established. To assist in these tasks, it produced policy documents on 'Definition of Professional Social Work' and 'The Objectives of Social Work Education', as well as the substantially revised 'Statement of Minimal Education Requirements'. Consultations with both SAIT and WAIT, in the 1960s, and with others, were often difficult and confused. The next round of consultations in the early 1970s took place within an organised national system and the new courses at the Preston Institute of Technology (a 4-year degree, from 1974), Monash University (a 4-year degree, from 1975) and La Trobe University (a 2-year postgraduate degree, from 1976) – all were developed in consultation with the AASW, often through social work educators who were active AASW members. The AASW was not, however, happy about having this responsibility, both on grounds of its competence and the resources it absorbed. In 1971, its federal council decided to press for a national council of social work education or another competent body to take responsibility for the assessment of social work courses.

National Councils for Social Welfare Education and/or Social Work Education?

As already mentioned, on the initiative of Tom Brennan at the University of Sydney, an association of teachers in schools of social work in Australia (ATSSWA) was formed in 1967 and I was its first secretary/treasurer (1967–68).²⁰ It held workshops and meetings in Sydney (1968, 1971 and 1972), Melbourne (1969), Canberra (1970), Perth (1973), Hobart (1974) and Melbourne (1975), usually adjacent to AASW or ACOSS conferences. It was a joint sponsor of an inquiry into social welfare education in Australia (1968–71) and some of its members provided trenchant criticisms of the inquiry's draft report.

In 1972, the membership of the ATSSW was extended to teachers in CAE courses accepted by the AASW. Its November 1972 submission to the Campbell committee of enquiry into academic salaries argued for competitive

18 'Where so authorised by Federal Council and after consultation with any Branch directly involved and if possible with its agreement'. All such discussions were to be reported as soon as practicable to federal office. Discussions could be initiated by the committee and the committee might request an officer of the Association to undertake such discussions on its behalf.

19 AASW Newsletter, No 13, October 1969, p. 7.

20 Originally, New Zealand teachers were included, but since none found they could actively participate, reference to New Zealand in the constitution was removed in 1969.

salaries to attract social work educators and candidates for higher degrees. The pool of existing qualified educators was small, pressure to increase student numbers was growing, and social work employment opportunities in both Commonwealth and state government departments were both attractive and expanding. It had some communication with the Australian Social Welfare Commission about resources for social work education (1973), an inadequate survey of these (1974), and the 1975 scheme of postgraduate social work awards. Generally, however, the ATSSWA did not achieve strong commitment from its members, including its office-bearers. It had no financial resources and no institutional base in the schools of social work. By 1973, its future was becoming increasingly uncertain as new organisational alternatives were being examined.

In May 1968, a Joint Committee on Social Welfare Education in Australia was established by the AASW, the ATSSW and ACOSS. It was concerned 'not only with the education of professional social workers, but also with all other paid workers in the welfare field and with the patterns of training available to volunteer workers'. The apparent objective was to prepare evidence on establishing a national council of social welfare education. In October 1968, the AASW federal council endorsed a recommendation that a national council on social work education should be formed and, as mentioned, appointed a steering committee with the ATSSWA, with Len Tierney as its chairman. By April 1969, a body of three interest groups – the profession, educators and the 'consumers' (employers and community representatives) was being suggested. But this initiative became lost as the work of the Joint Committee on Social Welfare Education became protracted.

The delay was attributed to the complexity of the task and a limited budget. A Myer Foundation grant of \$5,000 in December 1968 paid the fees of two research workers for the joint committee. Norma Parker directed the study but could give only a period of two months of full-time work. Elery Hamilton-Smith worked for a period equivalent to four months of full-time work, but could only give extra time on a part-time basis because of his commitments to his own organisation. Financial support from ACOSS was necessary for the joint committee to complete its report. In the event, a draft report went to the sponsoring bodies for comment in December 1969. Eventually in May 1971, a limited edition of the joint committee's report was published by ACOSS. It contained much useful data, but many considered it did not fulfil the Joint Committee's original terms of reference, and the matter of exploring the establishment of a national council on social welfare education still remained. In August 1971, the ATSSWA decided to set up a working party, to draw up proposals on such a council for consideration by ACOSS and the AASW, but nothing eventuated. A final report came from the joint committee in 1973. It recommended establishment of a comprehensive national council on social welfare education. The report was published by ACOSS, as 'a contribution to informed debate on the issue of Social Welfare Education in Australia'.

In 1973, the AASW federal executive invited the heads of schools of social work to meet in Melbourne, to discuss matters of common concern. Again, initiatives to establish both a national social welfare education body and a national

body on social work education proved abortive. At a Canberra meeting in February 1975, the heads of schools formed a standing committee and decided to investigate establishment of an Australian association of schools of social work. Further, the Australian government's Social Welfare Commission had appointed Eva Learner, an Australian staff member of the British CCETSW,²¹ to study and make recommendations about the establishment of a national council on social welfare education. One of the motivations for the heads of schools' actions was to make an effective social work contribution to this study. I, in fact, spent considerable time with Eva Learner in the course of her study. So too did Herb Bisno, the impressive American professorial head of the new La Trobe course.²² It was, however, a pointless exercise almost before it started. The Whitlam government had become disenchanted with the social welfare commission, and anyway in December, 1975, it lost power.

In addition to professional social work courses, the joint committee report had revealed a great variety of specific welfare courses by educational institutions or by employing agencies, and these were added to in the first half of the 1970s. Educational planning issues became increasingly obvious and acute, and in typical Australian fashion were complicated by Commonwealth-state relationships.

As has been indicated, although severely stretched in the period from the mid-1960s to the end of the Whitlam government period, the AASW did achieve greater clarity in defining the role of professional social work despite the social turmoil of the period, and managed to continue to provide the only national standard of acceptable minimal professional social work education for both old and new educational institutions. The hope of more effective educational planning through a statutory body with the requisite resources and authority did not eventuate – and perhaps it was just as well for Australian social work, which retained control over at least its basic educational requirements. If its interests had become submerged in a poorly resourced, inadequate national body trying to reflect the interests and educational claims of all sectors and levels of social welfare activity, the result could have been disastrous and not only for a social work profession.

Registration

State registration of the profession, by name and/or function, seemed a possible solution to defining minimum standards, but whenever it was considered it was rejected as too complicated, especially with a federal system of government, and it could pose a real threat to the necessary autonomy of the profession. The Australian pattern of the professional association accepting responsibility for determining what ought to be the national standard for professional social

21 The Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work was formed in 1971.

22 I saw Herb as the strongest of the professorial appointees from overseas. He was well known in American social work circles, partly because he headed the section on undergraduate education in the major social work curriculum review in the late 1950s. His refusal to be intimidated during the academic witch-hunt of the McCarthy years was a source of personal and professional pride. I enjoyed his company, and in fact, stayed with him when I visited Melbourne for heads of schools meetings.

work practice, could only continue to work, however, if social work educators were willing to participate fully – both in determining and revising the standard, and in serving on assessment panels when courses were reviewed for eligibility for membership of the professional association. The arrangement encouraged the educators and the practitioners to see their respective contributions as essential to the profession as a whole, and to interact far beyond this particular responsibility of assessing courses for eligibility.

A Greatly Expanded Social Work Education

In 1964, the yearly product of the Australian social work training movement was 107; in 1969, 254; in 1974, 353 (23% male). However, by 1974, Australian schools of social work had produced only 8 with advanced degrees. 30 post-graduate social work awards by the Australian government stimulated further postgraduate programs where they existed in the schools. In 1973, this government provided additional funds for staff to add to the numbers in some undergraduate social work courses, and to commence the course in Tasmania. (I told my vice-chancellor that our school should be able to rely on its regular university funding. It should not expose itself to the inevitable problems which would occur when this 'soft money' disappeared.²³)

In 1964, no head of the four university schools was at a professorial level. In 1975, each of the eight university schools was headed by a professor, and a second chair had been agreed upon at UNSW. The University of Queensland school was headed by the one female professor and it had just become a faculty in its own right, the first university faculty of social work in the country. Women headed two of the four CAE courses, although in one of these instances it was a joint appointment with a man. Five of the occupants of university chairs came from abroad – two from Britain, two from the United States and one from Sri Lanka.

The commonly stated objective of the various social work courses was to provide generic training for beginning practice in any field or method of social work. There was still, however, some special concentration by method and/or by field, provided often in the final year. In all schools, there was a marked recent trend towards a greater interest in the broader aspects of social work, additional to interpersonal helping. 46 % of the final year students at the University of Queensland in 1975, specialised in community work.

Assessing Overseas Qualifications

Towards the end of the 1960s, an inordinate amount of the AASW's resources was being spent in determining the eligibility for membership of persons with overseas social work qualifications. Generally, they were expected to meet the same minimum professional educational standards as applied to those with Australian qualifications, although certain rather limited 'making up' arrangements were possible. From October 1966 to September 1968, 201 applications

23 The flourishing school of social work at the University of Michigan had relied heavily on various forms of 'soft money' when I was there in 1967. Loss of much of this had placed it in considerable difficulties.

from twenty different countries were assessed; 38 were considered eligible – 13 of the 83 from the United Kingdom, 13 of the 52 from the United States, and the remainder coming from Holland, South Africa, India, Canada, Denmark and the United Arab Republic.

In 1970, the AASW discussed with the Commonwealth Committee on Overseas Qualifications (COPQ) its difficulties in undertaking assessment of overseas qualifications, and the committee agreed to fund an AASW research project. This produced, in 1972, a substantial report. Subsequent discussion with COPQ about the setting up of an expert panel for assessment of overseas qualifications was, however, deferred in April 1973 until the related issues of a national council on social welfare education and of national registration were further resolved.

When the possibility of national registration of social workers was unexpectedly raised in discussions with the Australian government's minister for health in January 1973, the AASW had argued its desirability only in the context of general social welfare manpower and educational planning. Later in 1973, the Australian Social Welfare Commission set up a working party on social welfare manpower, on which a number of bodies, including the AASW, were represented. It was to include in its considerations 'social workers, psychologists, sociologists and other professional disciplines involved in the area of social policy, as well as all job-oriented personnel, including welfare officers, case-aides, child-care officers, and also voluntary workers'. By mid-1975, it still had not produced any public reports, because of inadequate staff resources and also perhaps because of the conceptual and other problems involved. This contrasted with the report on 'Australian Health Manpower' presented to the minister for health by the Hospitals and Health Services Commission in February 1975. Chapter 27 of this report pointed to 'the pressing need to clarify the place and methods of integration of welfare personnel in the health services', but said it had had to defer specific comment until the outcome of the studies of the Social Welfare Commission were known.

The Professional Journal

A significant part of the literature of a profession worthy of the name is its professional journal. When the headquarters of the journal of the AASW shifted from Melbourne to Sydney in 1966, it became a quarterly under the very able editorship of Mary McLelland at the University of Sydney. In 1972, it changed its name from *The Australian Journal of Social Work* to *Australian Social Work*. To ensure that it was genuinely national in character, the journal committee had members in each state as well as in the hosting state. If the host state had continued to be Victoria during this troubled period, the journal could well have become another focus for discontent and may well have not survived.

National AASW Conferences

In this period of turmoil, the AASW conferences continued to provide a national forum for prepared papers and discussion of common concerns. The proceedings provided a valuable source of professional literature, for educators

and practitioners alike. Four national conferences were held in the period of the late 1960s to the mid-1970s – 1969, ‘Social Issues of Today’, Hobart; 1971, ‘Dilemmas of Development’, Sydney; 1973, ‘Social Work Research in the ’Seventies’, Perth; and 1975, ‘Interface ’75’, Melbourne. As federal president, I had particular responsibilities at the Hobart conference – giving the presidential address, chairing the general membership meeting, writing a foreword to the conference proceedings. I helped to plan the program of the Sydney conference, which involved state working parties preparing material on selected development areas, for example, education (South Australia), civil and political rights (Victoria), housing (New South Wales), income security (Queensland). The conference was held at UNSW and vice-chancellor Rupert Myers hosted the official reception. I could not get to the Perth conference. After the Melbourne conference in 1975, I prepared the fairly extensive historical introduction for its proceedings published in 1976.²⁴ I can recall at that conference, standing up for the role of academics in the development of the profession, responding to what I considered was ill-informed criticism of academics and their motivations.

In my foreword to the proceedings of the 1969 conference in Hobart, I pointed out that for the first time the previous conference in Brisbane, in 1967, ‘Broader Horizons: an Analysis of the Scope of Social Work in Australia’, had taken a systematic look at where the social work profession stood in relation to Australian society which it claimed to serve. It focused on how much influence the profession as a social institution had upon the life conditions of the Australian population. The main focus at the Hobart conference was upon urgent social problems in Australian society, not on concerns over trends in tertiary education and about the organisation of the association, which might have been anticipated.

Federal council decided to re-institute a presidential address at this conference, naming it after the first, highly-respected AASW president, Norma Parker. I had the privilege and challenge of delivering this first Norma Parker address. Free to choose my topic, I might have chosen to discuss the challenges facing the organisation and functioning of the social work profession; or I might have discussed the problems involved in the organisation of a modern school of social work in the light of developments in Australia and overseas. Instead, I took the opportunity to discuss what I called ‘the consumer perspective in social welfare’, which I believed should have very high priority – not only for the social work profession, but also for other human service professions and community welfare services generally.

My Norma Parker Address²⁵

When Norma Parker delivered her first presidential address in 1947, it was a time of post-war reconstruction. Australian society had recently experienced the socially cohesive force of shared danger, a national social security system

²⁴ See p. 52, footnote 9.

²⁵ R. J. Lawrence, ‘The Consumer Perspective in Social Welfare’, *AASW Eleventh National Conference Proceedings*, Hobart, May 1969, pp. 5–14.

had been instituted and Norma could speak of 'deeply felt democratic ideals'. The mood was optimistic and constructive, with anticipation of future growth and development. I contrasted this with the current prevailing social mood which tended to be 'pessimistic and destructive, keen to dismantle existing social arrangements but very uncertain about alternatives, partly because of ignorance of possibilities in a complex industrial society, but also partly because of disagreement among the critics on what values are important'.

'The consumer perspective in social welfare' was not just social work's traditional 'client-centred approach'.

It certainly relates to it, but it is not identical with it. One is referring to professional behaviour, the other to the way the client or consumer views the service and his life in general. It is life on the other side of the helping relationship; on the receiving end of services; it is often life at the bottom of the social status heap; it is typically life in contact with organisations and their officials; it is life where one's dependency on outside help is obvious; it is often life in a black skin; it's life with a permanent physical or mental handicap; it is life with a social stigma; it is life at times of crisis.

Although we are highly interdependent in our modern complex society, we 'know' only a small number of people. 'To have some idea of what life is like for people widely separated from our own life circumstances requires a special effort of the imagination, but unless it is exercised on reliable evidence it will be wildly inaccurate.' Hopefully, much of social work education and experience develops this capacity – what I will call 'social imagination'.

Courses dealing with human behaviour and social environment should be particularly geared to this end. Unless, however, the teaching concentrates on people demonstrating particular behaviour, rather than on the behaviour itself, there is a danger that the cataloguing, classifying and conceptualising typical of the social and psychological sciences will not in fact bring the observer humanly closer to other people. The insights of literature and history which emphasise the full idiosyncratic richness of human personality need to be added to the understanding of continuities in social and personal behaviour provided by the application of scientific method. But however highly developed and accurate a person's 'social imagination' may be, thinking himself into another person's shoes is never the same as actually being that person.

It is incredible how little evidence we have on the way consumers really view our social welfare services, and yet our very 'raison d'être' is to serve the welfare of clients. The derivation of the work 'client' – one who listens to advice, not one who is listened to – is all too apt.

Overseas, especially in North America, the consumer perspective is increasingly articulate and cannot be ignored in policy discussion. In the United States, the 'welfare establishment' has increasingly come under fire not only from militants among consumer groups, but also from social analysts who have exposed the extent to which welfare programs have been oppressive and damaging to those supposedly served, while actually serving the interests of the advantaged in society. I strongly recommended a recent American book by Donald Howard, *Social Welfare: Values, Means and Ends*, which used value analysis to clarify the

problems social welfare had to cope with both nationally and internationally.

I certainly recognise in our own society the values and value conflicts Howard discusses, but because there has been practically no empirical study of values in Australian society, I cannot judge the book's direct relevance. I do believe, however, that unless we become alive to the need for value analysis, social welfare policy discussion will stay at a primitive level. In fact, I would go even further, and suggest that much of the present social ferment in Australia is about the values which supposedly support our social institutions, and part of the problem is that the point or rationale of many of them is far from clear, even to officials of the institutions themselves, and binding them to public silence aggravates the situation.

Those who support and work for the existing services will need to be far better prepared for justifying their existence and activities as we begin to get organised consumer groups in social welfare in this country.

Life may not be exactly comfortable at present, but it is likely to be far less so in the future. Wise, informed social welfare leadership should welcome the consumer interest being organised and articulate. Experience overseas indicates the pathetically moderate aspirations of organised disadvantaged groups, and also their concern for being treated as human beings. Their claims are not likely to be revolutionary, unless the whole thought of disadvantaged people claiming anything as their right is seen as revolutionary.

In the social welfare systems in which the consumer has to enter to receive service, the various participants, including the consumers, have observable status and power.

I do not think we in social work have paid sufficient regard to these dimensions of the social relationships between clients and agency personnel, and between client groups and the rest of society. ... Despite our designation, we have been less alive to social than to personal psychological factors. The social welfare sub-culture and too, the other professional sub-cultures with whom we associate, tend to be paternalistic, talking 'service' language and nervous about facing up to the essential political aspect of much of their work. Further, there is still a certain distaste within the broader Australian culture about facing up to the realities of contemporary social stratification. Yet often within a multi-professional setting, social workers have become only too keenly aware of status and power differentials among different types of professional staff.

I asked the audience to exercise its 'social imagination' in trying to understand what it is like being a consumer of social welfare services in our kind of society, and commented on ten aspects of status and power differences in relationships between social welfare consumers and agency personnel, and between consumers and the rest of society:

- The consumer is not actively sought after by the agency - unless it is connected with some legal transgression.
- Some social welfare consumer groups, just to go on living, must be clients of social agencies.

- Descriptions of what goes on in social relationships with clients within agencies usually come not from the consumer, but from the staff of the agency.
- Because agencies and agency personnel are specialised in terms of handling particular kinds of customers, their knowledge gives them considerable power over consumers.
- Many of the consumers of social welfare services have some stigma which places them in a category of inferiority in relation to the rest of the population.
- The already disadvantaged often have to forego their privacy in order to receive social welfare benefits.
- The social welfare consumer usually cannot aspire to real 'success', as it is decreed by a materialistic society.
- Many social welfare services are inaccessible – because of the potential consumers' lack of knowledge of their existence, the geographic location of the service, and the hours during which services are available.
- The lack of reciprocation in social relationships in Australian social welfare.

I observed that the more the currently disadvantaged participated in the mainstream of our society, the more the existing patterns of privilege would be changed. Although social workers tended to be more alive to the consumer perspective in social welfare than many others working in the social welfare sector or than most in our 'successful' affluent classes, social workers needed to be more active in helping the consumer viewpoint become more fully and fairly represented in our social welfare arrangements. I knew of no-one who had a greater sense of shared humanity than Norma Parker. She had a rare capacity for accurate 'social imagination', and an ability to act upon it.

The Industrial Function of the AASW

For a variety of reasons, often including their gender, Australian social workers had never been comfortable in their pursuit of industrial activities, yet being employees they could not avoid them. Unless their professional association took action in the industrial area, their corporate professional existence was seen to be threatened by them being forced to join various inappropriate industrial groups. In 1950, the case for registration with the Commonwealth arbitration court was put in a memorandum to the general membership and accepted.

The memorandum argued that the professional status and skills of social workers could only be protected by suitably defined employment conditions. The individual discussions of the past had proved ineffectual. Some social workers interested in new developments had taken posts that were underpaid, but it was doubtful whether they served the interests of social workers or their clients if they continued to accept this. Unless recruitment figures could be increased by improved status, salaries and working conditions, 'a period of frustration and stagnation (appeared) inevitable for professional social work in Australia'. To counter doubts about the propriety of a professional group registering as a trade union, the memorandum pointed out that, unlike medicine and law, but like teaching and nursing, the social work profession did not consist primarily

of self-employed persons: further, when doctors were in government employment, they had sought industrial protection. In Australia, trade unionism was widely accepted as desirable for employed persons, and in general, agencies employing social workers would welcome regulated conditions of employment. Registration would prevent the inclusion of social workers in unions foreign to their interests, but would not prevent them joining other unions if they so wished. If some but not all of the association's members registered as a union, it was argued that this was likely to cause bitterness and dissension in the profession, since only a small group would be spending their efforts and money for the benefit of the whole.

The AASW finally became registered with the arbitration court in 1955, but it did not subsequently seek a federal award, even though much of the discussion before registration had concentrated upon this. It was deterred by the possible cost, the difficulty of explaining much of its members' work (although this argument carried much less weight after the 1969 Commonwealth public service 'work value' case), the fear that an award might prevent some voluntary agencies from employing qualified staff, the fact that some state groups might seek state awards, and finally, general uncertainty about the complexities and politics of industrial matters.

In the later 1960s, industrial activity increased in the AASW. In 1966, a re-formed professional practices committee became the federal industrial committee (FIC) under the active chairmanship of Colin Benjamin. This undertook to provide data to member groups participating in industrial negotiation. One of the prime purposes of the AASW study of the employment of social workers in 1968–69 was to contribute to an AASW industrial negotiation kit. Members of the FIC prepared a series of articles on industrial matters in the federal newsletters, and the federal council purchased the 900-page proceedings of the first 'work value' case for social workers in the Commonwealth public service, described as 'probably the most important single document on the profession and its responsibilities which had ever been produced in Australia'.²⁶

An Industrial Milestone for the Profession

This case, pursued through the Commonwealth Professional Officers Association (POA), but with active AASW assistance, was seen as an industrial milestone. The outcome was a starting salary of a male social work graduate better than for an engineer; the salaries for higher grades clearly aligned with other professional salaries and shaken clear of their previous alignment with the so-called medical technologists such as occupational therapists, physiotherapists and radiographers; and equal pay for males and females to be phased in by January 1972. The success of this case was seen as heavily dependent upon the level, type and relevance of professional education, which qualified social workers were said to have undertaken. The AASW's recent concern for maintaining and developing standards of professional education was seen to have contributed to the result. As already mentioned, this concern became better

²⁶ These various developments are documented in the AASW federal newsletters.

focused and organised, with the establishment in 1969 of the professional education and accreditation committee.

Perhaps my most significant contribution as a federal president of the AASW was giving evidence to this ‘work value’ case, which provided a new standard for social work employment conditions throughout the nation, even though the arbitrator’s decision applied only directly to the social workers employed in the Commonwealth public service. The case was heard in Melbourne before the deputy public service arbitrator, W.B. Wilson. I was called as an ‘outside witness’ to open the case on 13 August, to be followed by some ten impressive professional witnesses from within the service – from the Departments of Repatriation, the Interior, the Navy, Health, and Social Services.²⁷ According to Les Irwin, the Association (POA) had expected that I would spend about half a day in the witness box, but ‘his exposition was so magnificent and of such “pied piper” quality that neither the Association’s Advocate, Board’s advocate nor Arbitrator could leave it alone and he was ultimately in the witness box for a day and a half’. Each of the internal professional witnesses had thoroughly capitalised in my ‘brilliant start’.²⁸ A letter from the general secretary of POA on 19 September thanked the AASW ‘for the great support’ it had given the social workers’ group (in the POA) in the prosecution of the case, and mentioned in particular the ‘prodigious efforts’ of Colin Benjamin who had served as liaison officer (between the AASW and POA), Elery Hamilton-Smith, and myself. ‘Mr Holdorf of this Association, who has had 15 years arbitration experience, rated Professor Lawrence’s evidence as the best he had ever heard’.²⁹

Two very able younger social workers, Les Irwin and Wendy Capper, took leave to collect and organise the production of evidence for the case. I was invited to give evidence not only as a federal president, but because I knew the history of the Australian social work profession and could talk with reasonable confidence about the development of social work education. There was no doubt in my mind that it was high time that the industrial conditions for qualified social workers should be mirroring those of other well-established, university-educated professionals. Our course at UNSW was a 4-year degree, and four years of university education was soon to become the basic requirement to qualify for social work practice in Australia.

My statement prepared in advance for the court³⁰ was divided into five parts – personal particulars; the value of social work to the community – as seen in the 1930s; the value in the late 1960s; guiding considerations in developing a school of social work; and the organisation and functions of the professional association. The parts dealing with the value of the profession to the community indicated why I, and others, had committed themselves to this particular kind of work.

27 Mrs W. F. Capper, Mrs E. A. Marshall, Mrs P. L. McLeod and Miss W. S. Ward – Department of Repatriation, Victoria; Mr J. M. Hemer and Mrs E. McGuire – Department of the Interior, Canberra; Mrs B. Hunt – Department of the Navy, Canberra; Mrs P. E. L. Wilson – Department of Health, Canberra; Mr C. M. R. Cornwell and Mr J. D. Hall – Department of Social Services, Queensland.

28 Les Irwin, ‘Memorandum to Social Worker Group Members, 8 September, 1969.

29 A copy of this letter was sent by the AASW federal secretary to councillors, branches and industrial committee, 24/9/69.

30 ‘Statement of Professor R. J. Lawrence, Head of the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales’, August 1969.

THE VALUE OF SOCIAL WORK TO THE COMMUNITY – AS SEEN IN THE 1930s

Through their professional education, social work practitioners share common knowledge, values and skills. To claim value for their work is not new. In the 1930s, when professional education for social work, and therefore the social work profession, was first established in this country, three main types of argument were used – community trends favourable to education for social work, the defects of untrained social workers, and the advantages of trained ones. In summarising these arguments in my study *Professional Social Work in Australia*, I have used the following words:

It was pointed out that social problems were becoming more complex because of industrial and urban growth ... Social service, to be service, needed a new understanding backed by continuous study. As yet social welfare measures had not kept pace with the improvement of industrial technique. Even seemingly simple social problems were more complex than had been realised.

Matching this complexity, so it was argued, was a growing fund of knowledge, which could be used to revise older methods and experiment with new ones. The beneficial pooling of knowledge by professional people – doctors, psychologists, psychiatrists – would come about only if social work was also a profession. The realisation that social service work could be studied systematically was recent, but not to use available knowledge was wasteful in human and monetary terms. Voluntary social workers, because they usually had other claims on their time, could not be expected to study the subject in detail or learn of modern methods and experiments overseas.

It was further asserted that the increased sense of community responsibility, which was demonstrated by the striking growth in social services over the previous fifty years, was less satisfied with 'haphazard and comparatively uninformed tinkering with problems'. This did apply only to all voluntary work. Unless public servants were trained, 'routine administration of social legislation affecting masses of lives' was likely to be detrimental to individual welfare. The growth of social provision emphasised the need for coordination and cooperation if it was to be effective. Money available for welfare purposes was limited ...

... It was stated that the untrained social worker still had a part to play but it should be more restricted. Well motivated amateurs were liable to rush in where professional people would tread with more circumspection. Untrained social workers had to learn through a system of apprenticeship and experience, which, it was claimed, was slow, haphazard, and a strain on the worker, costly in terms of mistakes and general inefficiency; and at least a few of them were aware of this. Mistakes in social work were often paid for by human suffering, a high price for humanitarians. Put bluntly, inadequate social work was worse than none.

It was claimed that mistakes in relief-giving arose mainly from lack of thorough investigation of the circumstances of applicants. Investigation, or study as some preferred to call it, was a necessary prerequisite for assisting people, whether with material or other help. Indiscriminate giving was likely to be harmful to applicants as well as a waste of funds. The untrained worker tended to become immersed in 'doing' and 'giving' instead of finding out the facts of the case, particularly how

the client saw his own problem. Helping people to help themselves was too little the aim and still less the achievement of the untrained workers. If agencies now needed to pay their social workers, to be worthy of their hire they should be trained.

The protagonists of training further argued that general community arrangements for social welfare were not critically evaluated. A common assumption was that because social agencies were in existence, social welfare was being promoted. A closer examination of welfare programs would lead to a greater consideration and respect for other people ... Australians needed to think more about social progress, it was asserted.

The advantages claimed for trained social workers over their untrained predecessors or colleagues were many. It was said that they had learned ways of being reasonably efficient in a complex society. They had knowledge of the community's resources for aid and relief, and were aware of the need among the multiplying remedial organisations for cooperation to prevent overlapping. This avoided imposture, but more important, it meant that handling of cases from a social casework point of view, did not have to be divided. In addition, widespread employment of trained social workers by social agencies would help to make more apparent a shared general purpose for all social services and make cooperation more of a reality.

Trained social workers had had the opportunity to broaden their knowledge of social conditions, not only through academic study but through actual observation and experience. This, together with their knowledge of the social services equipped them to be constructively critical of the community's arrangements for social welfare, and about the social welfare of the community in general.

It was stated that, instead of being content with palliative measures, trained social workers tried to find the root causes of social breakdown, and did something about them, both in individual cases and in community action. It was in this sense that their work was 'scientific'. They recognised that they had an important preventive role to play.

For their responsibilities, trained social workers were equipped with relevant knowledge about individuals and the community, and had skills in tested social work techniques. They were keenly aware of individual differences and were alive to multiple causes of maladjustment. They helped individuals to adjust on a psychological and social level as well as on economic; they recognised that their work affected 'the moral and mental welfare as well as the physical well-being of people'.

It was declared that trained social workers respected the personality of the client. They were not condescending, neither were they 'Nosey Parkers' nor 'Lady Bountifuls', and they did not make themselves indispensable. Apart from other considerations, their aim of helping the client to help himself precluded these things. Not only were they aware of the personality needs of their clients, but they had a heightened self-awareness which helped them to guard against fulfilling their own personality needs at the expense of their clients.

Those who supported training agreed that it was no substitute for natural aptitude for social work, but insisted that aptitude needed to be developed fully. All trained social workers had been screened at least to some extent on the grounds of personal suitability to do the work.

They could be a powerful force for helping people with social problems, and thus reduce the cost of social provision by making it more effective.

I claim that practically all these arguments can still be applied to Australian society in the late 1960s. Together they point to the continuing value of social work to the Australian society and its component communities. The great amount of self-justification and justification by its friends that the social work profession had to engage in its first decades of existence has not been so apparent in recent years, when the demand for social workers has tended to outstrip the supply.

THE VALUE OF SOCIAL WORK TO THE COMMUNITY - IN THE LATE 1960s

Situations Where Social Work is of Value

As I see it, one way of describing the value of social work to our present-day society is to mention briefly situations in which it is of value to have the services of a social worker. (I am using the term only of a professionally qualified worker).

Interpersonal Work

- When a person is seen by himself, his family, or others to have a problem which interferes with, or is likely to interfere with his social relationships and his capacity for social living. Such a person will benefit from discussion with a professional worker who can understand him and his particular social circumstances and can help him to use whatever strengths he has, had knowledge of other people with similar problems, is informed about community resources including other professional services available to assist such a person, can restructure the social field of the person so that he can cope more adequately, and does not impose his own needs upon the other person but keep focussed upon the other person's situation. The problem or constellation of problems can take a multitude of forms – physical handicap, mental handicap, physical illness, mental illness, poverty, old age, widowhood, a legal offence, unmarried motherhood, unemployment, poor education, marital difficulties, membership of a minority group, incarceration.
- When a person's social circumstances are likely to interfere with his attainment of acceptable standards in one or other of the following areas of his life – his health, housing, employment, or education. Agencies specifically designed to improve the population's health, its housing, its employment, or its education sometime recognise their work is more effective and economical if they employ professional workers to help individual customers of the agencies with their social circumstances.
- When the above two broad categories of person will benefit from participation in a group experience under the guidance of a professional worker, and involving other persons with similar problems. The worker will know how to construct and help such a group use the group experience to improve the social functioning of individual group members. Membership of such a group will often be beneficial to persons at a particular stage in their individual and social development rather than possessing specific problems.

Community Work

- When a geographically defined community is deficient in important social services and its members demonstrate inadequate social functioning because of this. Such a community will benefit from a worker who helps the members of the community to clarify its needs and work together to meet these needs.
- When a community itself has recognised that many social needs of its members are not being met. A professional change agent will know how to help the community to clarify its needs and work together to meet these needs.
- The situation may demand the services of a person who can help disadvantaged groups to make their needs known to and recognised by political authorities or large bureaucracies.
- The situation may call for a change agent who can help existing services to work more effectively together, from the point of view of the community.
- These comments apply to communities of interests as well as geographically defined communities.

Administration

- When a social welfare program has been established it needs to be administered by a person who understands managerial processes, and uses these to keep the program focussed primarily upon its social welfare purposes. This entails knowledge of other social welfare programs, evaluation of the effects of the program in terms of the well-being of the clients, being concerned about priorities, handling professional and other staff in ways that maximise the welfare effects of the program, and feeding back to social policy-makers experience gained from the administration of this particular program. Such a person will be alive to the need for a social welfare program to remain accountable to the larger community as well as to its funding sources and sponsoring groups.

Research

- When there is a research task that requires an interest in the values of social welfare and the research techniques of the social and behavioural sciences. Because of the scope of modern social welfare programs, they provide a valuable access for responsible researchers to provide understanding of social conditions, of human behaviour under conditions of need and stress, and of the effects of different types of welfare programs. Necessary research tasks are unlikely to be tackled unless the researcher is interested in the values implicit in social welfare programs. Perhaps no other professional group is more aware of the importance of personal and social values in community life and action and in professional practice than is the social work profession.

All of the above situations typically call for the services of the social worker. The functions implied as being valuable are those for which social workers are explicitly educated and employed. They are seen by the institutions of social work – the schools of social work, the professional association,

and the employing bodies – as coming within the ambit of contemporary social work. From a community point of view it is valuable to have these various functions performed by members of a common profession. The functions are obviously interrelated. They have at their base common knowledge about social structures, social problems, policies and services, and human behaviour, and they are guided by common value positions.

At present in Australia, the social work profession is keenly aware that it needs to redistribute its resources so that a greater proportion of them are devoted to community, administrative, and research functions, rather than being heavily concentrated upon interpersonal helping, commonly termed social casework, and social group work.

The Changing Australian Society

In conditions of increasing industrialisation, and the accompanying processes of urban growth, specialisation and division of labour, secularisation and rational control, all the situations mentioned above are likely to become increasingly prevalent. Much of the current social unrest is in areas which social work can service in ways that are likely to be beneficial to all the society, not just particular groups. If social work does not perform these functions which need to be performed in our kind of society, other professional or citizen groups will try to fill the void, but will be doing so without the benefit of professional education and organisation specifically for these tasks. Social work career prospects need to be sufficiently attractive to induce large numbers of talented professional men and women to perform these necessary functions.

We still live in a society where there is little general understanding of the nature of social welfare and social work functions which are an integral part of any developed society's social welfare arrangements. We need to recognise that the vast array of needs-meeting institutions that are outside of commercial activity and of the family, are an essential component of our kind of society. All of us at different stages of our lives benefit from social welfare services. Social work is in a key position to make these services more efficient and effective in terms of individuals' lives, and also more equitably distributed.

In the next section of my document for the court I set down these considerations which guided me as a head of a school of social work:

- Maintenance of high academic standards in curriculum design, teaching materials and teaching practices.
- Integration of students' learning in the classroom and learning in the field. Field work has always had an important place in social work education.
- Selection of material from the social and psychological sciences and from recorded professional experience in terms of its relevance to the tasks of professional social work.
- Striking a balance between education for present and anticipated professional social work roles.

- Providing students with general approaches to problem-solving on a basis of scientific knowledge and professionally accepted values. Each student needs to learn about the main social work methods – social casework, social group work, community work, administration and research – and needs to acquire initial professional competence in at least one.
- Evaluation of students' performance in terms of their behaviour in specified professional situations, and not just in terms of knowledge area covered. This means considerable individual attention to students and helping them to cope with the emotional as well as intellectual stresses at different stages of the course. Perhaps no other course is so personally demanding. Those who are personally unsuited are either counselled out of the course or they fail at some stage one of the Social Work Practice subjects.
- Development of Australian teaching material in a comparative context.
- Building a research program for the School and encouraging staff to act as consultants to community bodies and professionals in the field.
- Using some of the School's resources to help workers in the field keep abreast of educational developments relevant to their responsibilities. ...

My concluding observation in the final section of the document was this:

Especially when a professional group is almost entirely in the employment of organisations, and a wide variety of them, the professional association plays a crucial role in developing and maintaining standards of professional practice. There is no substitute for the stimulus and collective concern which comes from associating with one's professional peers. Professional groups in an industrial society provide counter-balancing influence against bureaucratic formal organisations within which professional workers increasingly find their employment. A worker who becomes a complete captive of the particular organisation within which he works does not warrant being called 'fully professional'.

In December, Mr Wilson sent me a copy of his determination, 'with warm regards and thanks again for your assistance'. 'You might be interested to see my "value" judgements on social workers'. In my reply, I wrote:

I recall you saying on that most pleasant evening we spent together that after all the interest and often enjoyment of collecting evidence on a case, the 'crunch' of the Determination had to come. In this case there has scarcely been any 'crunch' as far as the social workers are concerned. Those I have spoken to consider that we could not have received a fairer or more understanding hearing, nor a fairer and more understanding determination at its end.

I personally greatly appreciate your values because I think they are close to my own and those of the profession.³¹

31 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to W. B. Wilson, 11/12/69. Early in the proceedings, we knew that we were receiving a sympathetic hearing, because during a break Mr Wilson was heard to say that if he had his time again, social work would be the field he would like to enter!

Chapter 4

Building a University School of Social Work

Although I was the first professorial head of a school of social work in Australia, I was very much aware that social work education already had a considerable history, not only in my own country but elsewhere in the world. In a professorial appointment, I now had opportunities to contribute to what was now a wide-spread expanding enterprise – through heading a school of social work and engaging in the enterprise nationally as well as internationally.¹ This and the next chapter concentrate on the development of the school in the 14 years of my headship – from late 1968 to the end of 1982. By 1969, UNSW had produced 45 social work graduates (3 in 1967, 10 in 1968, and 32 in 1969).² My staff inheritance in 1968 was 1 senior lecturer, 3 lecturers, and 2 instructors. By 1983, the school had produced 964 social work graduates, 26 MSWs (by course work), 6 MSW (by research), and 1 PhD. The staff now consisted of about 23 teaching positions, with 2 at a professorial level. The present chapter gives an account of the undergraduate and postgraduate curricula, the organisation of the school, and staff and student concerns. The next chapter deals with the staffing of the school and the contributions and careers of colleagues in the school during this period.

International Surveys of Social Work Education and Functional Concerns

In the period from 1950 to 1974, six international publications charted the growth in and development of social work education throughout the world. Five of these (1950, 1955, 1958, 1964, 1970) were United Nations publications. The

-
- 1 For an account of the development of the social work education enterprise up to the early 1990s when I retired from the UNSW school, see: *International Handbook on Social Work Education*, Thomas D. Watts, Doreen Elliott, and Nazeen D. Mayadas (eds), Greenwood Press, Westport Connecticut, London, USA, 1995. This has a foreword by Katherine Kendall. I was responsible for the chapter on Australia.
 - 2 Those who graduated in 1969 completed their course in 1968. All of the graduation figures relate to completions in the previous year. I am grateful to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences administration for providing the graduation data.

most recent, in 1974, was the *World Guide to Social Work Education*, published by the International Association of Schools of Social Work, an organisation that then had a membership of 459 schools in 66 countries, including Australia.

Katherine Kendall was responsible for the pioneering 1950 survey. From the definitions of social work submitted by thirty-three countries in widely differing circumstances, this found three major categories: (i) social work as individual charity; (ii) social work as organised activity, under governmental and non-governmental auspices, directed towards the solution of problems associated with economic dependency; and (iii) social work as professional service, under governmental and non-governmental auspices, potentially available to every member of the community, irrespective of his means, to assist him in achieving his full potentialities for productive satisfying living. The survey concentrated on the professional training of social workers, but recognised that programs for the promotion of social well-being called for, in addition to social workers, 'large numbers of public officials with the most widely varied professional backgrounds (lawyers, doctors, economists, statisticians, sociologists, accountants, etc.), large numbers of administrative and clerical workers carrying responsibilities for social functions, large numbers of institutional personnel and, in some countries, large numbers of volunteers'.³

The 1958 survey, prepared by Eileen Younghusband⁴, contained significant discussion of social work functions and appropriate educational planning to meet them. Social work was seen as an occupation that, at varying rates in different countries, was demonstrating the hallmarks of a profession, as distinct from a technical or craft occupation. The further this process went, the more the element of universality appeared, as knowledge, skill and attitudes and professional codes became capable of being taught and practised anywhere. It was recognised, however, that although the professionally qualified social worker was emerging as an expert in working with man in his social relationships, other professional and non-professional workers also needed a psycho-social orientation in their work. The survey clarified and discussed various 'auxiliary' roles – between members of different professions, including social work, and between professional social workers and non-professional workers, whether trained or untrained, with whom they work.⁵

Graduation Address, May 1969

My 'occasional address' to the graduating students of the Board of Vocational Studies in May 1969 was delivered in a generally critical, restless social climate. What I said was aspirational not just for social work and its present and future graduates, but for Australian society generally. In our field especially, the two were inseparable.

... We appear to be in the midst of a socially restless period when increasing numbers

3 *Training for Social Work: An International Survey*, U. N. Department of Social Affairs, New York, 1950, pp. 7–9.

4 She and Katherine Kendall were close colleagues.

5 *Training for Social Work: Third International Survey*, U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, 1958, pp. 54–5, 121–5.

of participants in 'occasions' are insisting on making known how they personally view them. Many who previously were bound by convention to remain silent, or were made to listen passively to the viewpoints of their elders or of those in authority, or who would not have been articulate in stating their point of view – they are now demanding to be heard and claiming that their viewpoint is at least as valid as anyone else's.

This seems to be putting under strain our established social arrangements – the school, the university, the family, the church, the social welfare system, the professions, the legal system, and the rest. We are being forced to wonder how widely shared are the values on which these institutions are based – indeed, what are the values which support these institutions and which we have uncritically accepted for so long? Further, whose values are these? We are becoming painfully aware that we live in a pluralistic society. Taken literally, however, 'pluralistic society' is a contradiction in terms. For a society to persist it must have certain agreed upon basic value positions. The continuing pluralism of western democratic society has been possible because of general agreement about the importance of the rule of law, certain civil liberties, and subservience of the armed forces to civilian authority. Perhaps most important of all has been acceptance of known non-violent procedures for deciding upon courses of action amid the claims and counter-claims of the interest groups of a mass industrial society.

Inadequate, partial and obsolete as many of our institutions are, our society cannot persist without institutions. It is very easy to be a destructive social critic, especially when it is the fashion, but it is difficult to be constructive – that is, suggest what might replace that which ought to be destroyed. Proposed new solutions too often would merely replace new tyrannies for old, or they ignore the need for organisation and at least some degree of self-discipline to achieve collective human objectives. And too the gap between talk and effective action is often very wide.

A person's values are revealed as much by his actions as by what he says they are. There is a great deal of talk which appears to be challenging established values, especially in the mass media, but how much of this is just talk is difficult to tell. For example, television public affairs programs now give fairly regular coverage to social problems occurring in Australian society. Yet rarely is a program in depth and rarely is it part of a carefully managed campaign to bring about changes in policies and services related to the social problem. At least an appearance of ferment and social criticism is achieved, and many people previously publicly silent have had a chance to air their views to a wider audience. But does any of this find expression in changes in the behaviour of the people who can actively affect the social problem? I doubt it – although careful studies of the values of Australians and of changes in these are almost non-existent.

Characteristic of much of the new talk is reference to the way our institutions affect the lives of individual people – especially the people who have little money, or who are physically or mentally handicapped, or who are old, or who have not yet been granted the rights of an adult, or belong to an ethnic minority. Increasingly, these people speak for themselves or other members of the society take it upon themselves to speak on their behalf. Their increased visibility and assertiveness will not, however, automatically achieve for them a better deal. In fact it may merely

underline how relatively powerless they are.

The vulnerable and more powerless sections of the society have traditionally been social work's concern, and as an institution itself, social work had been fairly accused of being over-concerned with helping individuals come to terms with and adjust to our society's institutions. The major alternative is to try to change the institutions so that they are seen as more just and less harmful in their effects upon individuals.

Coping with the social problems of modern industrial society in ways that respect the rights of all members of the society, and not just the rich, the powerful, the educated, and the physically active, is a complex and skilful task. Amongst other things it requires professional manpower that genuinely identifies with the total community and at the same time with the full range of individuals who are said to compose it; that is well-informed about the society and its institutions; and that is willing and has the skills to change institutions so that they enrich rather than damage people's lives. This is a tall order – and is certainly beyond the responsibility of any single profession. Unless, however, we educate this kind of expert manpower, we could find ourselves in a disintegrating society increasingly aware of social injustice but not knowing what to do about it.

We are not short of prescriptions, but we are short of well-informed ones that can be implemented and that reflect value positions that most people would support. Australia is singularly lacking in well-informed and skilful leadership in its social affairs – at the political level, at the administrative level, and at the citizen level. And this is a country that once prided itself on its social leadership. Our universities have so far been a dismal failure in this respect. They have produced high level leadership in many fields but not in this crucial one. University schools of social work are now receiving their fair share of talented students and there is a growing awareness of the need for them to educate at least some of their students for much broader roles than helping people on an individual basis. I certainly hope that this University's School of Social Work will make its contribution to the social leadership of the future.

... 'A fair go for all' has been a much quoted basic Australian value. I would like to think that 'the Australian way of life' of the future will make this much more of a reality than in the past, and that all of you in your various professional roles – teachers, social workers, hospital administrators, and graduates in industrial arts – will be working at least partly to this end.

I suspect, however, that the majority of you – and this unfortunately may include social work graduates – will not see it as your concern, that you will be preoccupied with making your own way in the world, that you will complain about paying taxes which finance the social and other essential community services, that you will become encapsulated in a fairly comfortable professional world far distant from others supposedly in the same community, and that you will develop cynical 'do-nothing' attitudes towards community affairs in general. Occasionally one of you will be thrust into a position of heavy dependency on community services. You will have a mentally retarded child; or you will suffer severely disabling illness yourself; or your aged parent will no longer be able to manage in his own home; or you will have a daughter who has a child out of wedlock. Then you will feel resentful about the inadequacy of the available community services, and about

the indifferent general community and political attitudes which sustain them.

Student attributes of social concern, idealism and enthusiasm are too easily shed as having been part of the growing up process and as being inappropriate in what is called the tough, practical, hard-headed world of adult maturity. In fact, of course, adults tend to become captives of the values prevalent in their work-place and their socio-economic group, and they replace many of their more general community identifications with more narrow self-regarding ones.

A great deal is said these days about the need for periodic re-education of professional people to keep them abreast with new knowledge and techniques. I see this as essential for the additional reason that it can place professional people again in a context where they are required to view themselves and their work in broad community terms.

I wish you well in your respective spheres, but hope, for the community's sake, that you never become merely clever technicians. Unless you keep alive a concern about social ends to which your knowledge and techniques are being put, you will not live up to my ideal conception of the university person or of the professional person.⁶

How was all of this going to be reflected in the development of the school of social work for which I now had responsibility?

The Existing BSW Degree at UNSW

My situation at UNSW was strengthened, but also complicated, by taking over responsibility for an established undergraduate degree. Under my much-respected predecessor Associate Professor Norma Parker, the BSW had achieved some stability and recognition after a very rocky start. It would have been easier, and certainly more comfortable, just to modify and extend what was already in existence. However, after considerable discussion with immediate colleagues and taking into account what I knew of the social work education scene, both historically and currently, I decided a substantial revision was needed. Also, new post-graduate opportunities were urgent. The revised program began to be phased in from 1970 – after I had steered it through the Board of Vocational Studies and the Professorial Board, and it had received Council approval.

Under the existing arrangements, students had to study sociology I and 11, and psychology I and 11, and had to choose four additional courses from a range of subjects in the social sciences and humanities. At least one of the subjects chosen had to constitute a major interest taken in at least three consecutive years. This meant that a student could major in psychology, sociology, or a variety of other approved subjects, and study these in at least some depth. For students who wished to extend their general education in this way, or who wished to keep open career alternatives, this was attractive. And the arrangement was also attractive for a social work school with very limited staff resources.

Older schools, like those at the University of Sydney and the University of Melbourne, had a 2+2 pattern. In the first two years, students undertook

6 R.J. Lawrence, 'University of New South Wales Graduation Address, 16th May, 1969'.

approved subjects in the social sciences and humanities, and only studied social work practice subjects, and other subjects specifically designed for social work education in the third and fourth years. In the existing BSW at UNSW, the social work practice subjects did commence in the second year, but only one other subject, public health and social medicine in the third year, was specifically designed by the school. This meant that most of the teaching of social work students was done outside the school in subjects for which the school had little or no responsibility. Social work education depended heavily on the development of the social and behavioural sciences, both locally and more generally, to provide a sound knowledge-base for the profession. Work in these subject areas was, however, becoming more diversified, specialised, and fragmented. Scholars interested more generally in the state of society were seeing the need for a more collaborative, interdisciplinary approach to human behaviour and social organisation. The introduction of social work practice and field work in the second year at UNSW recognised that usually more than just two years was needed for successful 'professional socialisation' in a field like social work. A regular complaint from social work students at the University of Sydney, and other 2+2 programs, was their feelings of isolation from each other in the first two years of the course.

A More Integrated BSW

I decided the social work school at UNSW should move in the direction of a much more 'integrated' four-year BSW, with the school being directly responsible for the design and teaching of all of the curriculum after the first year, except for two general studies electives. In the first year students would continue to do sociology¹ and psychology¹, but one of the two arts electives was replaced by two shorter prescribed subjects – political science and introduction to social welfare. The new subjects in the subsequent years, human behaviour I and 11, and social welfare systems 1, 11, and 111, would be taught in their own right and would contain content from various disciplines. Seeing and understanding people as a whole, interacting with each other and with organised social systems, was vital to effective social work practice. An explicit social philosophy and policy subject, which I initially taught, tackled directly the normative and value questions to be addressed in the use of this knowledge. The underlying normative focus was human well-being.

A Revised Field Education Program

In 1970, in the course of my troubled dealings with the Benevolent Society, I provided a general statement on the School's field education which would operate from 1971. This statement described the content of the field education subjects, the anticipated student numbers in each, the role of student units, the principles in establishing a unit, and field education outside student units.

As a professional school, we give high educational priority to the learning of professional behaviour – the relevant knowledge, skills and attitudes – in actual practice settings. There are three field subjects specifically designed to accomplish

this, and the School is doing all it can to improve the teaching and learning in these subjects. These in fact constitute a basic requirement for the professional recognition of the degree. The Field Instructors used are normally selected members of the social work profession.⁷

Staffing Implications

The new curriculum and increased student numbers needed a substantial increase in the school's staff – at a time when well-qualified social work educators were still in short supply and in considerable demand. Also, staff would need to be in general agreement with the educational mission of the school and the design of the revised curriculum, be able to undertake the developmental work required both in the new subjects and in the social work practice subjects, and be willing to work towards a higher degree if they did not yet have one.

In the handbook for 1970, I described the revised BSW in this way:

The revised undergraduate course may be taken full-time over four years or part-time over six years.⁸ This course is designed to prepare students for the professional practice of social work.

The social work profession is primarily focused on problems in man's social relationships – in his interaction with other human beings and the man-made structures.⁹ The profession is concerned with the patterns, directions, quality, and outcomes of man's social relationships. It seeks to enhance social functioning by directing attention both to the capacity of individuals, groups, organisations and communities for effective interaction, and to the contribution of socially-provided resources to social functioning.

Through their professional education, social work practitioners share common knowledge, values and skills. To become a professional person, the social work student needs to be as well informed about broad social welfare problems, policies and provision and individual, group and sociocultural determinants of behaviour, as he is skilful in the use of social work methods. Members of the profession are particularly concerned that all people are treated with understanding and respect, especially those experiencing difficulties in their social living.

The objective of the course is to lay the ground-work for a variety of professional social work tasks. It is concerned with general approaches to problem-solving on a basis of scientific knowledge and professionally accepted values. While each student learns about all the main social work methods – social casework, social group work, community work, administration, and research – special care is taken to ensure that he acquires initial professional competence in at least one. In the

7 See pp. 288–92, for the full statement.

8 In 1975, this was changed to: '(The course) is normally undertaken as a four-year full-time program. However, at the discretion of the Head of School, a student unable to study full-time may, under special circumstances, take the course over a period not exceeding ... seven years'.

9 The convention of the time was still to use 'man' to refer to all human beings, and 'his' to cover both genders. In retrospect, I regret adhering to this sexist convention, especially when most of my social work colleagues and students were female. I cannot, of course, change a direct quotation. Later, it became School policy 'to discourage unnecessarily gender specific language in official documents, lectures, theses, essays and other academic work'.

later stages of the course the student concentrates upon the professional method of his choice.

Field Work

An important aspect of the course is work in the field ... under the supervision of a field instructor, usually in a social work agency, while he learns to apply principles of professional practice in an actual practice setting. A student's field work placements will be in more than one type of social work setting. Some of the settings used are: psychiatric, medical, family and child welfare, services to the aged, parole and aborigines' welfare. Voluntary¹⁰ agencies and agencies at all levels of government are included in the program.

Students were asked to note that lack of facilities had caused restriction on entry to the course. (A quota of 100 was set.) Except with permission of the head of school, a student could not proceed to the next year of the full-time course, or the next stage of the part-time course, until the requirements of the previous year or stage had been fulfilled. Students wishing to graduate with honours had to apply to the head of school at the end of the third year of the full-time course, or the end of the fifth stage of the part-time course, for permission to enrol in the subject Social Work (Honours). Honours were awarded on the quality of the work performed throughout the course, as well as in this subject. The gradings used for the honours degree were first class, second class (division 1), second class (division 2).

The 3-term academic year stretched from the beginning of March to early November. Most subjects were full-year subjects, with three one-hour lectures weekly and an associated program of one-hour tutorials.

THE REVISED 1970 BSW FULL-TIME CURRICULUM¹¹

Year 1

In their first year, students studied Psychology I (3, 1), Political Science (1, ½), Sociology I (3, 1), and one other subject approved as counting towards the BA degree. In addition, was Introduction to Social Welfare (1 hour weekly throughout first and second terms):

A general introduction to the scope and nature of social problems and to social welfare activities in western industrial societies –the social welfare problems, policies and provisions that are characteristic of societies at different stages of modernisation. Students are introduced to the social welfare literature and each student begins the compilation of a handbook on social welfare which is added to throughout the length of the course.

10 Changed to 'non-government' in 1971.

11 *Board of Vocational Studies 1970 Handbook*, The University of New South Wales, Kensington, pp. 61–2, 100–4. Unless otherwise stated, each subject ran on a weekly basis for three terms. The figures in brackets refer to the weekly teaching contact hours (lectures, and tutorials etc). The six stages of the part-time course were carefully planned. See pp. 62–3 of the Handbook.

Year 2

Social Philosophy and Policy (2, 1):

The analysis of social norms and the underlying values which regulate behaviours in the modern welfare state:- (a) The diverse forms of norms, rules or behavioural prescriptions which exist in this kind of society, and methods of classifying these. (b) The language and logic of rules. (c) Societal values and ideologies (social, political, religious), and their relationship to behavioural prescriptions. (d) The various principles and modes of justification used to support behavioural prescriptions – key social concepts like justice, rights, obligation, equality, democracy, legality, morality. (e) The need for and limits of rationality. (f) The values of social welfare. (g) The values of the social work profession. Professional ethics. As an exercise in social philosophy and policy analysis, students examine in seminars policy issues under current public discussion in the press.

Social Welfare Systems I (1, 5):

Through observation of selected Sydney agencies, and classroom lectures and discussions, students become familiar with social welfare systems that provide services to people at each of the major age stages – infancy, childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and ageing. An agency is viewed from the point of view of its clients, objectives, resources (financial and manpower), the services and alternative strategies of assistance. Special emphasis is placed on a system as a whole rather than on the role of social workers in the system. The program extends from mid-First Term to mid-Third Term, occupying 40 working days.

Human Behaviour I (3, 1):

The processes of “normal” growth and development, using a multi-disciplinary approach. The maturational phases of the life cycle, beginning with the prenatal period, proceeding to birth, new-born, infancy, pre-school, childhood, adolescence, young adulthood, middle years, old age. The various frames of reference – biological, psychological, and sociological – used to define and interpret the phases. The interaction of physical, intellectual, emotional, spiritual, and social influences and attributes in a human being. Individual “careers” – varying conceptions of effective social functioning and well-being. Particular attention is given to the influence of social structures (e.g. families, groups, organisations, communities, and societies) and social processes on the behaviour of individuals; and also on the behaviour of groups and communities. The nature and changing character of these structures in interaction with individuals, groups and communities. The potential for change in the social functioning of individuals, groups and communities. Classroom learning is reinforced by observation of behaviour, under simulated and actual life conditions.

Social Work Practice I (3, 1):

The professions in modern societies. The professionalization of social work. The organisation of the social work profession in Australia, the U.S.A. and Britain, and internationally – its educational institutions, employment agencies, and

professional associations. The size, characteristics, location, objectives, and values of the profession. An introduction to each of the main problem-solving methods of professional social work practice – social casework, social group work, community work, administration, and research. The historical and present level of development of each method – the problems of social functioning it is concerned with, its knowledge-base, values, and principles of practice. The organisation of practice – by methods, by fields. Current challenges and growing points of the profession. Modern approaches to the teaching of techniques relating to personal and group interaction are used – tape recordings, video-tapes, role playing.

General Studies Elective (1, ½)

Year 3

Social Welfare Systems II (3, 1):

Characteristics and Size of the Social Welfare System and Subsystems: Social problems and the defining characteristics of social welfare systems; the size of the social welfare enterprise in Australia and other modern states; its distribution among social problem areas; major historical determinants of its growth. *Organisational Analysis of Social Welfare Systems:* The relevance of organisational theory for understanding social welfare systems. Four concepts of organisational level – societal, community, agency, and professional. Dimensions of the system – the objectives, clients and potential clients, the use and availability of resources (personnel, fiscal and technological), auspice or sponsorship, location, external and internal influences, stability and change, the politics of the system. Policy issues inherent in the range of alternatives within and between dimensions. *Social Welfare Subsystems:* A comparative study of the main social welfare sub-systems in an urban industrial society, with particular reference to Australia. Categories of sub-system: (a) Defined by a common social goal – income security, health, housing, education, employment, recreation, family well-being. Each sub-system is studied in terms of its major organisational dimensions. Its efficiency and effectiveness.

Human Behaviour II (3, 1):

An interdisciplinary approach to the development of deviant behaviour at various age stages, in individuals, groups and communities – biological, psychological, and social deviance. Concepts of disease and pathology; of social problems – definition, incidence, aetiology. Differences and similarities. Classroom learning is reinforced by observation of behaviour, under simulated and actual life conditions.

Social Work Practice IIA (3):

Students develop their learning in the application of professionally relevant knowledge, values and skills, in the solution of problems of social functioning. Depending upon the nature of the problem and its possible solutions, the professional roles taught are those of the caseworker, the group-worker, the community worker, the administrator, and the researcher. At this stage, however, special attention is given to interpersonal helping, i.e. social casework and social group work.

Social Work Practice IIB (– , 14):

Under supervision of the field instructor, usually in a social work agency, a student learns to apply the principles of professional practice in an actual practice setting. The program of learning occupies a minimum of 40 working days, normally extending from April to September.

General Studies Elective (1, ½)**Year 4****Social Welfare Systems III (3, 1)**

Social Welfare Subsystems: A comparative study of the main social welfare subsystems in an urban industrial society, with particular reference to Australia. Categories of sub-system: (b) Defined by population category – age groups, physical disability, mental disability, sex, ethnicity, war service, religion, socio-legal deviance, geographic location, occupation, economic status. Each sub-system is studied in terms of its major organisational dimensions. Its efficiency and effectiveness. *Social Welfare Planning:* Different bases of planning and coordination: (a) The relationship between different levels of social organisation, functional divisions on the one level of social organisation and other linkage questions. (b) Definition of a social problem as a basis for organisation. Students undertake a project on a selected social problem, studying its definition, incidence, theories of causation, and policies and provision to cope with it. (c) The role of the social worker and the social work profession in social welfare planning. The objective of the subject is to develop sound professional judgement in relation to social welfare problems, policies and provision, not to teach social policy practice roles as such.

Social Work Practice IIIA (3, 0)

For most of the year, students concentrate upon learning initial professional competence in *one* of the following professional methods – social casework, social group work, community work, or administration. (The last two can be chosen only under certain conditions.) Towards the end of the year, all students combine in a series of professional competence seminars which examine the responsibilities of the individual social worker and the social work profession in present-day and future Australian society. These seminars occur during the latter stages of students' final field work placement and in two weeks in January.

Social Work Practice IIIB (– , 14*)

Under supervision of a field instructor, usually in a social work agency, a student learns to apply the principles of the professional practice method of his choice, in an actual practice setting. This consists of two field work placements – one occupying a minimum of 40 working days, normally extending from April to September; the other a block placement of 40 working days extending from the last week in October to just before Christmas.

* *From April to September. In addition, there is the block placement and seminars of 35 hours a week, plus the two weeks of seminars in the following January.*

Social Work (Honours)

In the course I inherited, students who wished to graduate with honours had to apply to the head of the department at the end of the second year for permission to enrol in the honours seminar program in the final two years and were required to submit an honours thesis. Under the revised 1970 curriculum, there would be only separate honours work in the final year. Before this was phased in, however, a separate honours program was discontinued. From 1972, an honours degree was awarded for superior performance throughout the course with greater weight being given to later years. This was more suitable for a professional degree, it no longer created a separate elite amongst the student body, material previously in the honours seminars in 1970 and 1971 (on research design and implementation, and on issues facing the profession in the USA, Britain, and Australia) was now being incorporated into every student's basic professional education, a substantial research assignment requirement could distract a student from other final year work – and it freed staff resources for the developing postgraduate program of the school. Three classes of honours were awarded – first, second (division 1), and second (division 2).

School Organisation for Developing the Curriculum

Designing a curriculum for the practice of a profession is obviously a complex, difficult task, especially when the field is still relatively new and underdeveloped, at least locally. And of course, a curriculum can only be adequately assessed from the experience of it – and that takes time. I set up structures in the school to ensure that as much as possible the development of the curriculum, and other essential aspects of the school, would become a collaborative task.

In the 1973 'Policies and Procedures' handbook, school organisation was described in these terms:

To facilitate effective implementation of the School's educational goals, a committee system has been established, in which both staff and students participate.

The committees review the various educational programs conducted by the School, concerning themselves with such matters as curriculum content, teaching materials and teaching methods (Subject Development Committees); co-ordination of course programs in each year of the course (Year Committees); oversight of the whole BSW and MSW course structures (Curriculum Committee); development of Library resources (Library Committee); and development of the School's research programs and facilities (Research Committee)¹²

From the outset, each school subject had a subject coordinator, who was responsible to the head of school for the administration and development of the subject. These responsibilities were subsequently developed and clarified. In 1978, they were set down in considerable detail in the school's 'Policies

12 School of Social Work, UNSW, *Policies and Procedures*, July 1973, 2.1. Names of the membership and current convenor and chairman of each committee were provided in the handbook.

and Procedures' publication.¹³ They included: making recommendations on any changes in the general subject description and/or the hours scheduled for a subject to a general staff meeting;¹⁴ keeping the director of field education informed about the purpose, content, and program of the subject; and providing at the end of lectures in November a full description of the subject as it had been organised and pursued, so that a consolidated record could be kept for planning and general reference purposes.

CHANGES IN THE BSW 1971 - 82¹⁵

Responding to both internal and external influences, the curriculum was not, of course, static but an evolving phenomenon. Various changes occurred during the period of my headship of the School, but the general structure and intention of the revised BSW phased in from 1970 continued basically intact. A more integrated and relevant education for contemporary and future social work practice continued to provide the general rationale for the program. The following detailed account of the changes (pp. 90–102) is organised chronologically within each year of the 4-year course. It may, of course, be skipped by the reader not interested in such detail. It can be noted that the changes took the form of –

- new separate subjects (Australian social organisation, social philosophy I & II, the social work profession) relocating and extending material already existing in other subjects
- completely new subjects (social and behavioural science, social work research methods I & II)
- changing content within subjects and shifts in emphasis and timing
- renaming existing subjects (dropping 'systems' from 'social welfare systems' subjects, dropping 'social work' from 'social work research methods' subjects)

A Semester System Introduced

In 1971, UNSW changed from a 3-term (30 week) to a 2-semester (28 week) academic year, with a mid-year recess from mid-June to the third week in July. New semester-length subjects of 14 weeks could now be introduced, but year-long two-semester subjects could continue if that was still educationally preferable. From 1974, the Faculty handbook no longer indicated how the required weekly class contact hours in each subject were used. Each subject continued to have small-group educational experience (tutorials, seminars, group exercises, etc) as well as lectures, with some variation of the mix amongst the subjects.

13 School of Social Work, UNSW, *Policies and Procedures*, July 1978, 2.0 'A Subject Coordinator's Responsibilities'.

14 Any changes needed to be approved by the Faculty at its June meeting to enable them to be implemented in the following year.

15 The data used is from the Faculty handbooks of the period. The changes described here (pp. 66–77) reflected various internal and external influences on the curriculum during my headship of the school. They can easily be skipped by the more general reader.

CHANGES IN YEAR 1

In first year in 1972, the two half-subjects political science and introduction to social welfare were replaced by Australian social organisation, a new full school subject. This examined:

... the demographic characteristics of Australia, (and) a number of major organisational areas of Australian society ... , for example, its organisation with respect to industry and commerce, government, the law, religion, and the institutions of social welfare.

Up to 1972, the sociology subject taken by social work students in their first year dealt with basic issues of theory and method in sociology, 'illustrated mainly by reference to social institutions and processes in Australia'. In 1972, however, this reference to Australian society was dropped in the general description of the subject. There was no question that the content of the Australian social organisation subject was essential in a social work curriculum, and the school was fortunate in its teaching of the subject area.

The new Australian social organisation subject was designed and taught by Audrey Rennison, an institutional sociologist interested in social welfare and social work. She was a senior lecturer with considerable university teaching experience. On her retirement from the school in February 1980, Elspeth Browne became the subject coordinator. She had been involved in the teaching of the subject from the outset, and had full responsibility for the subject when Audrey was on study leave in 1974. Despite frequent disagreements, Elspeth and Audrey had respect and affection for each other, and worked well together. Audrey was 'a character', with a tendency to talk too much. When she was in the School of Sociology neither Morven Brown nor his successor Sol Encel could tolerate her, and others found her difficult. However, she was very good friends with sociological colleagues like Athol Congalton and Gillian Lupton, who could appreciate her as a person and also as a scholar with substance.

In 1976, sociology I was split into two one-semester units – IA: An introduction to sociology, with particular reference to the history and development of social thought; and IB: The institutions, processes and belief systems of modern industrial society. Also, the Arts one-subject elective changed to two first-level semester-length Art units. In 1978, sociology IA and IB were replaced by introduction to contemporary industrial society, and introduction to social theory. This reverted back to a year-long introduction to sociology in 1979:

An introduction to major issues in Sociology. Two main themes: culture, society and institutions; and, social inequality. Issues: social control, power, racism, sexism, work and leisure, class distinctions are treated both factually and theoretically. Considers these issues as they relate to the situation in Australia and in the developing countries.

In 1981, the Arts elective component in first year of 3 hours a week was now 12 first-level credit points approved as counting towards a BA degree. (The Arts Faculty had moved to a credit points system, which gave greater flexibility in educational planning and student choice.)

CHANGES IN YEAR 2

In 1971, Social Welfare Systems I was changed to a first semester subject with 3 class contact hours (2, 1), no visits of observation, and a revised description:

The defining characteristics of social welfare systems. The nature of the social welfare enterprise in Australia. The major historical determinants of its pattern of development: overseas and local influences. Students begin the compilation of a handbook on social welfare which is added to throughout the remainder of the course.¹⁶

The Social Welfare I subject as described in the 1977 faculty handbook:

Australian social welfare history. An exploration of the rise and development of Australian social welfare institutions, provisions and ideology within their Australian context.

In that year, the three subjects studying social welfare and its organisation no longer used the term 'systems', because of problems with 'systems' theory.

In 1977 and 1978, Social Work Research Methods I was relocated from the second session in third year to the first session in second year (3 weekly contact hours), renamed Research Methods I:

The focus of the course is on the consumption of social research – philosophical bases of science and social science – what is science, what is social science, what are the generally accepted attitudes and why. The relevance of these philosophical questions to social workers. The important historical and normative linkages underpinning current thinking about social work research. The nature of evidence examined in the contexts of the major types of social research and research designs. A discussion of the techniques of data analysis and measurement appropriate to particular designs, so that research studies can be critically evaluated for their usefulness and generalisability.

Social Work Practice I (3, 1) became Social Work Practice IA (2, 2) in 1971. The content was unchanged, but the organisation of practice and the introduction to the main problem-solving methods now came before the comparative and historical material on the professions and the social work profession. In 1972, the class contact for the subject was for most of session 1 (1, 3), but thereafter it was (3, 1). The content of the subject was now described in these terms:

The analysis of various forms of interpersonal communication with particular emphasis on its behavioural effects: the principles and techniques of interviewing. Emphasis is placed on experiential learning – through role-playing and skill-practice exercises, video-tapes and tape recordings, students learn preliminary skills for interpersonal helping.

This was added to the subject description in 1973:

... An introduction to social casework – its historical and present level of development, the nature of basic social casework theory.

16 This seemed like a good idea at the time, but was not pursued in subsequent years.

A brief introduction to the social work methods of social group work, community work, and social welfare administration. Relationships between the major social work methods.

In 1975, this second part of the subject was changed to:

A general systems model for social work practice is presented; within this framework students begin to develop the analytical, discriminative, and interactional skills necessary for its effective use over a range of intervention situations.

This reflected the work of Pincus and Minahan at the University of Wisconsin. Their basic assumption was that 'regardless of the many forms social work practice can take, there is a common core of concepts, skills, tasks, and activities which are essential to the practice of social work and represent a base from which the practitioner can build'.¹⁷ Social Work Practice 1A continued to have 4 weekly class contact hours in each session.

In 1977, an additional hour a week was added to first session. In 1978, instead of a general systems model for social work practice, 'unitary models for social work practice' were presented, and these provided the framework for the skill learning in the subject. These changes reflected the advent of Ron Baker, a second professor of social work, with a specific mandate to develop practice theory in the school. In 1979, the subject description of Social Work 1A was changed to:

Introduction to generic themes of social work practice as a base for further study: settings, historical developments, boundaries of practice, principles and values, qualities and attributes of a competent social worker, multicultural issues, communication theory, writing, recording, and meeting procedures, interviewing. Development of action and interaction skills related to these themes. Introduction to five unitary models of social work practice: Bartlett, Loewenberg, Compton and Galaway, Pincus and Minahan, Baker.

In 1982, this was abbreviated to:

Introduction to general themes in social work practice: settings, historical developments, principles and values. Selected unitary frameworks of social work practice. Introduction to theory and skills of effective communication – verbal, non-verbal, and written. The theory and skills of interviewing.

From 1979, the weekly class contact hours in Social Work Practice 1A were 4 (1, 3) in session 1, and 3 (1, 2) in session 2.

The first field work requirement was incorporated in a new subject called Social Work Practice IB, introduced in 1971:

Under the supervision of a field instructor of the School, usually in a fairly structured social work agency, a student begins to learn to apply the principles of professional practice. The emphasis is on work with a broad range of clients and of social problems, rather than on depth of experience. Students study, either within

17 Allen Pincus and Anne Minahan, *Social Work Practice: Model and Method*, Peacock, Itasca, Illinois, 1973, p. xi. The authors were members of the school of social work at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

or in connection with the agency, examples of all of the main social work methods, and examples of social welfare services. The prime purpose, however, is to begin to acquire, in an actual practice setting, skills and responsibility in interpersonal relations. The duration of this first field work placement is 42 days (294 hours). [2-week block in mid-year recess + 2 days a week (no recess) for second half of the academic year.]

This subject was reduced to 40 days (280 hours) in 1978. In 1979, the subject description was modified. The first sentence remained, but the rest now read:

... Emphasis is on a range of work and learning rather than on depth of experience in particular situations. Aim is to acquire in an actual practice setting, skills and responsibilities in interpersonal relations and social work interventions.

In 1973, the weekly class contact hours for Human Behaviour I were increased to 6 (4, 2) in first session, but remained at 3 (2, 1) in second session. In 1977, the weekly contact hours in the first session of the subject were reduced to 3, and a new subject of 3 weekly contact hours filled the space. Social and Behavioural Science – Basic Theory considered: a series of concepts, frameworks, models, theories in the social and behavioural sciences of particular relevance for social work practice. In 1979, the subject was extended over two sessions with class contact of 2 hours a week. In 1982, the subject was described as:

Theories and concepts in the social and behavioural sciences of particular relevance to social work practice: individual behaviour, families and other groups, organisations, 'communities', and change, stability and control in social systems.

Research Method I (3 hours a week in session 1) was introduced in the second year in 1977:

The focus of the course is on the consumption of social research – philosophical bases of science and social science – what is science, what is social science, what are the generally accepted attitudes and why. The relevance of these philosophical questions to social workers. The important historical and normative linkages underpinning current thinking about social work research.

The nature of evidence examined in the contexts of the major types of social research and research designs. A discussion of the techniques of data analysis and measurement appropriate to particular designs, so that research studies can be critically evaluated for their usefulness and generalizability.

In 1979, this subject was relocated to session two in third year, with a revised description:

After a general introduction to the characteristics of scientific methods, the research process, research terminology, and types of research, students concentrate on hypothesis testing, using one or more samples, and are introduced to multiple comparison procedures.

The subject Social Philosophy and Policy continued until 1977, when it was replaced by Social Philosophy I and II, successive second-semester subjects, 3

hours a week, in the second and third years. In 1979, their class contact hours were reduced to 2 hours a week, and Social Philosophy II became a first-semester subject in the third year. The description of Social Philosophy I:

A general introduction to moral philosophy especially normative ethics. Beliefs about means and ends in social living. Scope of ethics. Relativism. Ideals of life. Intrinsic and instrumental value. Different ethical theories – deontology and teleological. Free-will. Meta ethics.

CHANGES IN YEAR 3

In 1971, Social Work Practice IIB consisted of two parts:

Part 1 – Usually as a member of a student unit located in a social work agency and supervised by a field instructor of the School, the student has learning experiences which help him to acquire skills in casework method at some depth. Stress is placed on gaining self-awareness, understanding of conscious use of self in interpersonal relationships, and understanding of the diagnostic process and the development of treatment skills. The duration of this second field work placement is 45 days (315 hours). [3-week block in February + 2 days a week (no recess) for session 1.]

Part 2 – The emphasis in this third supervised field work placement is upon field evaluation of aspects of service, using a theoretical basis gained from classroom teaching. For instance, students may devise means to evaluate their own clinical practice or the agency's method of delivery of service to clients or the effectiveness of a particular form of social work intervention. Where possible, a student studies in depth an aspect of social work practice in which he has developed a particular interest. The duration of this placement is 40 days (280 hours). [8-week block in January and February of the next year.]

In 1973, Social Work Practice IIB consisted only of Part 1; Part 2 becoming Part 1 of Social Work Practice IIIB¹⁸. The description of the former now included reference to 'skills in problem definition and interpersonal helping' and to the student gaining 'understanding and responsibility in job management'.

The subject description for Social Work Practice IIA in 1972, read:

One stream deals in turn with further learning in social casework, social group work, community work, and social welfare administration. A parallel stream considers: The professions in modern industrial societies. The professionalisation of social work in Australia, the USA and Britain, and internationally – in educational institutions, employing agencies and professional associations. The size, characteristics, location, objectives, and values of the profession. Current challenges and growing points of the profession. In Session 2, workshops are held on research methodology as related to problems in social work practice.

The weekly class contact hours were 4 (3, 1) in first session and 6 (3, 3) in second session. In 1973, the class contact hours were 4 (3, 1) throughout the

18 See p. 100.

academic year. In 1974, the workshops on research methodology no longer featured in the subject. In 1977, weekly class contact hours were increased to 5 in both sessions and Social Work Practice IIA now consisted of:

Further learning in social work practice, including drawing on the contributions of social casework, social group work, community work and social welfare administration.

The material from the parallel stream on the professions and the social work profession was relocated to the fourth year in a new subject The Social Work Profession.

In 1978, the focus of Social Work Practice 11A shifted to:

Further learning in a general approach to social work practice, developing different aspects of unitary models.

The following year, 1979, this was elaborated to:

An analysis of the basic social work roles of therapist, supporter, enabler, advisor, mediator, administrator, advocate, coordinator, educator, broker, caretaker, consultant, and researcher. The areas of knowledge and specific tasks and techniques inherent in the respective roles. The application in social work practice of the concepts of system, process, role, culture, task, crisis, need, power, dependence, ego, exchange, stigma and stress. A simulation program and student task forces are an integral part of the subject.

Weekly class contact time was now 4 hours in each session.

In 1982, after Ron Baker had left the school and Tony Vinson had joined us, Social Work Practice 11A returned to a multi-method approach, but now building upon general and unitary perspectives:

Building on the general and unitary perspectives provided in Social Work Practice 1A, social work practice is analysed through a multi-method framework. The contribution to practice of the major social work methods of social casework, social group work, community work, and social welfare administration. Concepts and selected basic skills relevant to each method. Linkages between unitary and multi-method perspectives.

Social Work Research Methods I was commenced in 1973 (2 hours weekly in second session):

A general introduction to the philosophical basis of research: relationship between propositions; the nature of concepts and theories; theory and theory building; exploration and prediction; relationships between knowledge, research and practice, with particular reference to social work. Basic statistical procedures: collection and classification of data; descriptive statistics; inferential statistics; non-parametric statistics. This course provides students with the opportunity to develop competence in the selection and use of appropriate statistical procedures. Emphasis is placed on preparation for third field placement, in which students are required to carry out a statistical analysis of certain aspects of social work practice in at least some of which they are directly involved.

The revised subject description in 1975:

A general introduction to the philosophical basis of scientific research as an underpinning to the objectives of developing students' knowledge about how social work research is carried out and how completed research is critically evaluated. Examples are presented from the literature to demonstrate the utility and abuse of research methods. Types of research in social work: historical and cross-cultural; literature review; use of available statistical data; experimental; quantitative-descriptive; exploratory; combinations and other. Overview of steps in the research process, with particular reference to evaluative research; defining program and research objectives; involvement of the sponsor.

Research design: defining and operationalizing the independent and dependent variables: problems of reliability and validity.

As already mentioned, in 1977 and 1978, the subject, now called just Research Methods I, was relocated to second year. In 1979, it was returned to the second session of third year (3 hours weekly), with this brief description:

After a general introduction to the characteristics of scientific method, the research process, research terminology, and types of research, students concentrate on hypothesis testing, using one or more samples, and are introduced to multiple comparison procedures.

In 1982, it was revised to:

General introduction to the characteristics of scientific method, the research process, research terminology, and types of research. Sampling, review of descriptive statistics, hypothesis testing using one or more samples. Introduction to multiple comparison procedures

The concept and general description of Human Behaviour II was unchanged throughout the period, but weekly class contact hours for both sessions were reduced from 4 to 3 and a half in 1979.

In 1972, the initial historical material at the beginning of Social Welfare Systems II was relocated to Social Welfare Systems I, which now focused on social welfare history. This gave more time for Social Welfare Systems II to concentrate on organisational analysis of social welfare systems, and then sub-systems defined by the common social goals of income security, health, housing, education, and civil and political rights. In 1977, instead of 4 hours a week in both sessions, this was changed to 3 in first session and 5 in second session; in 1979 it was 2 in first session and 3 in second session; and in 1980 the second session was increased to 4 hours weekly. From 1979, the subject was described in this way:

Social welfare arrangements in Australia are studied within a broad societal framework which encompasses organised provision for citizens to achieve such common social goals as income security, employment, health, housing, education, recreation, and civil and political rights. The approach is analytic and evaluative. The perspectives of various social theories are used to develop insight into the organised arrangements, their modes of operation and underlying values, intended

and unintended effects, factors affecting conservation and change issues. Issues involved in various policy alternatives are examined. Some comparisons are made with social welfare arrangements in other societies.

Social Philosophy II was taught for the first time in 1977 – 3 hours a week in second session:

Analysis and critical evaluation of beliefs about means and ends in a society with a liberal democratic system of government. The state and society. Power, authority, sovereignty. Moral and other grounds of political obligation. Liberal democracy. Challenges and alternatives. Freedom. Rights and duties. Justice and equality. Justice and desert. Verification issues.

In 1979, the subject was relocated to first session – 2 hours a week. The description now read:

Analysis and critical evaluation of beliefs about means and ends in a liberal democracy. Particular examination of the state and society, power, authority, sovereignty, political obligation. Challenges and alternatives to liberal democracy. A consideration of different philosophical perspectives on rights and obligations, freedom, equality and social justice.

CHANGES IN YEAR 4

In 1977, a new subject¹⁹ The Social Work Profession (2 hours a week for two sessions) was introduced:

The professions in modern industrial societies. The professionalisation of social work in Australia, the USA and Britain, and internationally – in educational institutions, employing agencies and professional associations. The size, characteristics, location, objectives, and values of the profession. Current challenges and growing points of the profession. Contemporary issues facing the social work profession – its distribution within social welfare services by professional methods, and geographically: its sex composition: problems of professional organisation; international responsibilities; relationships with client and other population groups; relationships with other professions; relationships with other welfare personnel; the profession's priorities.

Social Work Research Methods II commenced in the final year in 1974 (two hours a week in first session):

A general introduction to the design, execution, and evaluation of social work research: principles of experimentation; research design; formulating objectives and hypotheses; sources of data; observations and methods of making them; classifying observations; parameter-statistic relationships, presenting conclusions; evaluative and non-evaluative research; ethical considerations; elementary computer programming. The objective in this subject is to develop both students'

19 As mentioned, the first part of this subject was relocated from Social Work Practice 11A in the third year.

knowledge about how social work research is carried out and their ability to critically evaluate completed research.

In 1975, this was changed to:

A continuation of the analysis of the research process which was begun in 63.621 Social Work Research Methods I. Types of data collection, emphasising the advantages and disadvantages of each: questionnaire: closed, open; interview: in-depth, structured; projective tests; content analysis of the literature; observation; census type approaches. Data analysis: selection and use of appropriate parametric and non-parametric statistics; preparing tables and statistical analysis based on hypotheses; collating the study findings. Preparation of the research report. Value questions and social research.

Research Methods II in 1977:

The social worker as experimenter – the methodology of intensive and extensive research with particular emphasis on the utility of evaluative research. The process from problem formulation to publication of findings examined in a workshop setting with the aim of operationalizing projects which go beyond a simulation exercise.

In 1979:

Various forms of experimental and survey research designs and a range of sampling techniques. Forms of data collection and the development of measuring devices. Validity and reliability concepts. Correlation analysis and prediction problems. Introduction to multivariate analysis.

In 1979, the weekly class contact hours in Social Welfare III were reduced from 4 to 3, and the subject description was revised:

Social welfare arrangements in Australia are studied within a broad societal frame of reference which encompasses organised provision for people in particular population categories. These include such categories as dependent children, aged, migrants, aborigines, physically handicapped, mentally ill, mentally retarded, rural families, legal offender. Each population category is studied in terms of its access to the common social goals examined in Social Welfare II. The approach is analytic and evaluative. The perspectives of various social theories being used to develop insight into the organised arrangements for the particular population category. Issues involved in various policy alternatives are examined. Some comparisons are made with social welfare arrangements for a similar population category in other societies. An overview of Australian social welfare arrangements considered in Social Welfare II and III – their characteristic features and implications for future developments.

Social Work Practice IIIA (3 class contact hours weekly in both sessions) in 1971:

All students gain further learning in administration and interpersonal helping. In addition, each student concentrates on learning initial professional competence in one of the following methods – social casework, social group work, community work, or administration. (The last two can be chosen only under certain conditions.)

Towards the end of the year, all students combine in a series of professional competence seminars. These examine the responsibilities of the individual social worker and the social work profession in present-day and future Australian society.

Social Work Practice IIIA (2 hours of lectures and 3 hours of seminars etc weekly for both sessions) in 1972:

Divided into two major concurrent sections. The first section, taken by all students, deals with social welfare administration, followed by a study of social work practice delineated by field, such as the health field, family and child welfare, corrective services. The second section, which uses a variety of educational methods, concentrates upon gaining professional competence in one of the following social work methods – social casework, social group work, community work, or social welfare administration. The last two of these elective methods can only be taken with the permission of the lecturer concerned.

In 1975, the weekly class contact hours in first session were extended to 7. The weekly contact hours were reduced in 1977 to 5 in first session and 3 in second session), and the subject description was revised:

Through a variety of educational means, students concentrate upon gaining professional competence in the following social work methods – social casework, social group work, community work, and social welfare administration. A student chooses one of these as a major elective through the year, and one as a minor elective in Session 1.

The 1979 description added at the beginning,

'Builds on an understanding of unitary social work practice gained in Social Work Practice I and II',

and at the end,

'Each major method elective in Session 2 includes evaluation research studies relevant to the method'.

In addition, each of the electives was briefly described:

Social Casework. Major: the development of basic skills and competence in case-work interviewing, assessment, intervention and evaluation, theoretical bases underpinning contemporary casework practice, enhancing self-awareness and promoting a critical research-oriented attitude towards casework. *Minor:* experimental learning in small groups, improving interviewing and assessment techniques and skills through role plays, theoretical input from extensive reading list. The frame of reference is the family.

Social Group Work. Major: Elements in group formation and maintenance, program activities, structuring, diagnosing and dealing with problems in group functioning; various theories/modalities of working with groups; group work with various populations and in various settings. There is equal emphasis on theoretical and experiential learning. *Minor:* Basic elements of group formation and maintenance; limited number of theories/modalities of working with groups eg psychodrama,

behaviour modification. More emphasis on theory but some experiential learning.

Community Work. Major: Development of an understanding of the role of community work in the current social system; its possible forms and outcomes. Theory, issues and skills necessary in implementing and maintaining effective community work services. *Minor:* Understanding the place of community work as part of the overall welfare system, emphasising skills pertinent to work in organisations based on other methods.

Social Welfare Administration. Major: Understanding the role of administrator, administrative theory, learning skills relevant for competent administration. *Minor:* Management processes in welfare organisations, understanding the role of administrator, developing skills in working within organisations.

In 1982,

'The relationship of social casework to other social work methods'

was added in the *Social Casework Major*, and the *Social Casework Minor* was reworded:

Within the family developmental cycle, students focus on selected clusters of casework theory and practice concerns, using a variety of learning methods.

Finally, changes in Social Work Practice IIIB were as follows:

1971

Usually as a member of a student unit located in a social work agency and supervised by a field instructor of the School, the student has further learning experiences in the method on which he has elected to concentrate in Social Work Practice 111A. [3-week block in mid-year recess + 2 days a week (no recess) until the end of November (1-week break for examinations) – 51 days (357 hours)]

1973

Part 1 – The emphasis in this third supervised placement is upon field evaluation of aspects of service, using theoretical insights gained from classroom teaching. For instance, students may devise means to evaluate their own interpersonal practice of the agency's method of delivery of service to clients or the effectiveness of a particular form of social work or social welfare intervention. [8-week block in January and February – 40 days (280hours)]

Part 2 – Usually as a member of student unit located in a social work agency and supervised by a field instructor of the School, the student has further learning experience in the social work method on which he has elected to concentrate in Social Work Practice IIIB. [3-week block in mid-year recess + 2 days a week (no recess) until the end of November (1 week break for examinations) – 51 days (357 hours)]

1975

Part 1 – This placement is taken in one of a wide variety of agencies, some beyond the metropolitan area. These agencies represent a complete range of social work methods so that students may gain practice skills in one of more of the methods as

presented in the preceding practice subject, Social Work Practice 11A. This placement also expects of students an increased level of autonomy in practice, within the authority of their agency service. [no change in duration (40 days) or timing]

Part 2 – no change in the description [3-week block in mid-year recess + 2 days a week during Session 2, + 1-week block after the end of session – 51 days (357 hours)]

1977

Part 2 – change in duration [3-week block in mid-year recess + 2 days a week during Session 2 to end of week 14 – 45 days (315 hours)]

1979

Part 1: Under the supervision of an instructor of the School, this placement is taken in one of a wide variety of settings, some outside the metropolitan area. In the choice of placement, consideration is given to ensuring that each student has had a broad range of practice experiences covering the roles, tasks and skills delineated in Social Work Practice I and 11. [no change in duration (40 days) or timing]

Part 2: Often as a member of a student unit ...

The general introduction to the social work degree in the faculty handbook remained unchanged until 1979, when it was reworded:

Professional social work is a world-wide occupation and discipline concerned with helping individuals, families, groups, organisations, communities, and societies, to deal with social problems, and to develop more satisfying and equitable social conditions generally.

The aim is to produce a social worker who has a sound general foundation for continuing professional learning, and can undertake independent professional practice at a basic level of competence, utilising relevant knowledge and skills in accordance with the profession's values.

This aim is achieved through developing the student's understanding of:

- normative and factual aspects of the various social systems (political, economic, and social) in which people live their lives. This involves teaching materials which give insights into what values people hold, how they attain them, and competing views of what ought to be the situation.
- the nature and extent of social problems and social conditions for people at different stages of the life cycle and in various socio-economic, psycho-social, biological, and geographic circumstances.
- policies and services, and various 'helping' occupations, specifically created and maintained to enhance the well-being of people within their society.
- the development of social work as an organised occupation: its history, its relationship to its society; its relationships to social welfare systems and other 'helping' occupations; its composition and organisation; its various tasks and the knowledge and skills necessary to undertake them; and its new directions for development.

In this first professional qualification the student learns a generic or unitary approach to social work practice, but in the final year the student also has the

opportunity to choose major and minor concentrations from among the social work methods of social casework, social group work, and social welfare administration.

.... The widening range of social work tasks and roles means that a variety of people are suited for social work practice. However, all forms of professional social work require interpersonal skills, a disciplined mind, and adherence to the profession's community service ethic, and social work often involves working with people and organisations under stress and in situations where there is conflict.

In 1982, this was unchanged, except that the second last paragraph above now read:

In this first professional qualification, through unitary, multi-method and single method approaches, the student is expected to gain understanding of the main dimensions of contemporary and future social work practice. In the final year, each student concentrates on a major social work method and complements this with a minor elective in some other method or aspect of social work practice. In addition, all students examine issues facing the social work profession.

Postgraduate Qualifications

To match and stimulate the growing responsibilities and opportunities for the social work profession in Australia, it was important and urgent for its schools of social work to begin to produce social workers with local postgraduate qualifications. For too long, Australian social workers had to depend on finding postgraduate educational opportunities in the USA or Britain – or in adjacent fields in Australia. The numbers who did this were small, and legitimate questions could be raised about the relevance of their postgraduate learning for social work practice and teaching in the Australian context. Reasonably qualified social work educators were in obvious short supply, and so too were social work researchers, senior administrators, and leaders especially in the newer endeavours of group work and community work.

In 1970, the school announced that it provided opportunities, both in its regular subjects and in occasional special courses, for experienced social workers to keep abreast of educational developments in their specialised field, or method of work, or in some other field or method in which they had new responsibilities. It also offered for the first time an MSW degree.

MSW by Research

In 1970, the faculty handbook contained the conditions for the award of Master of Social Work. An applicant was required to hold a BSW degree at an honours level; or a pass degree in social work, or equivalent qualification, and have had at least one year of acceptable professional experience, and have successfully completed qualifying work and an examination as approved by the Board of Vocational Studies.²⁰ In every case, before permitting the registration of a candidate, the Board of Vocational Studies had to be satisfied that adequate

20 This was, of course, subsequently changed to 'Faculty of Professional Studies', when our governing body changed its name.

supervision and facilities were available. Every applicant, full-time or part-time,²¹ was required to carry out a program of advanced study extending over one academic year, and to prepare and submit a thesis 'embodying the results of an original investigation'. The thesis topic had to be approved by the Board of Vocational Studies²² on the recommendation of the head of school. The thesis had to conform to the requirements of the University for the preparation and submission of higher degree theses. Each candidate would have at least two examiners appointed by the Professorial Board on the recommendation of the Board of Vocational Studies, one of whom would, if possible, be an external examiner. In 1973, 'if possible' was eliminated; a candidate 'may now be required to attend for an oral or written examination'; and added to students in full-time or part-time attendance at the university was a third category, a 'student working externally to the University'.

MSW by Course Work

The introduction of a full-time course work masters degree in 1973 was a significant development. It aimed to extend the professional knowledge of qualified social workers. Candidates could specialise either in interpersonal helping or in community work and administration. Applicants had to hold an acceptable BSW degree at a level approved by the higher degree committee of the Board of Vocational Studies, and at least one year of acceptable professional experience. Qualifying work to demonstrate fitness for registration might be required before admission. A candidate had to undertake a course of formal study and submit a report on a project not later than one session after the completion of the course. The report was examined by two examiners appointed by the higher degree committee of the Board of Vocational Studies, and a candidate might be required to attend for an oral or written examination.

The course work occupied 18 hours a week of class contact time throughout one academic year. The subjects:

Social Work Research Methods II (2 hours weekly, session 1): Content the same as in the BSW subject introduced in the fourth year in 1974²³

Advanced Social Work Practice I (Interpersonal Helping) (4 hours weekly, session 1): This course is concerned with existing and established social casework and social group work theory. Various casework and group work models are critically evaluated, particular attention being paid to their local applicability. The notion of interpersonal helping as including both social casework and social group work methods is introduced, emphasis being placed on the integration of the two methods.

AND

Advanced Social Work Practice 11 (Interpersonal Helping) (4 hours weekly, session 2):

21 The thesis had to be submitted between 4 and 6 terms for full-time students; between 6 and 9 terms for part-time students, unless permission was granted to do otherwise.

22 In 1973, this became 'by the higher degree committee of the Board of Vocational Studies'.

23 See pp. 97–8.

Further detailed analysis of the commonalities of social casework and social group work practice, including the following topics: accountability, sanction and authority, supervision, consultation, teamwork. Interpersonal helping as part of professional social work practice is compared and contrasted with the related practice of other helping professions. An analysis by fields is made of local social work practice; the current situation in each field is examined, special attention being directed to challenges in growth and development in particular fields. Current controversial views about interpersonal helping are examined, emphasis being placed on problems of integration.

OR

Advanced Social Work Practice I (Community Work and Administration) (4 hours weekly, session 1): Different types and aspects of organisational theory and various approaches to community analysis. Dimensions and structure of the Australian community, and the organisational arrangements for the delivery of social welfare services. Forces which bring about change and different methods and strategies of directing change and modifying social policy and organisational structure. Laboratory training and field experience designed to increase skills in management and community work process.

AND

Advanced Social Work Practice II (Community Work and Administration) (4 hours weekly, session 2): This subject builds upon the work in the previous subject dealing with advanced organisational theory and programming and community work method. Special attention is given to practitioner skills in community work and administration looking at common elements and differences between each. In laboratory training and field experience attention is given not only to the acquisition of skills but also to the development of attitudes and values appropriate to the various tasks.

Issues for the Social Work Profession (1 hour weekly, session 1): Contemporary issues facing the social work profession – its distribution within social welfare services, by professional methods, and geographically; its sex composition; problems of professional organisation; international responsibilities; relationships with client and other population groups; relationship with other professions; relationships with other welfare personnel; the profession's priorities.

Behavioural Science Seminar (1 hour weekly, session 1): Recent and current developments in the behavioural and social sciences.

Interpersonal Competence Seminar (1 hour weekly, both sessions): Through both structured and unstructured group experiences, students have the opportunity to assess and increase their level of interpersonal competence, to develop greater ability to be empathic with others, and to understand better the dynamics of small groups.

Practice Theory and Social Welfare Organisation (2 hours weekly, session 2): This course will review the contemporary development in all four methods of social work practice – casework, group work, community work and social welfare administration – and the implications of these developments for the structuring of social

welfare services. Candidates will contribute knowledge of their own elective method gained from Session 1 and its application to organisational structures.

Project (7 hours weekly, session 1): A research project will be undertaken by each candidate ... The project will be an original but limited investigation into some area of social welfare. Each candidate will have a project supervisor.

Project Seminar (2 hours weekly, session 2): Candidates will be expected to present formally the progress of their projects. This will provide for discussion of projects between candidates and an opportunity to deal collectively with problems encountered.

Social Policy Analysis (2 hours weekly, session 1): A comparative examination of the development of social policy and social administration as a subject area in Britain, Australia and the United States, and other countries. Boundary problems, characteristic concerns, social policy and economic policy, social policy and the social sciences, the movement towards more systematic analysis.

*Practice Applications of Contemporary Behavioural Science*²⁴ (2 hours weekly, session 2): This subject builds upon the work done in the *Behavioural Science Seminar*. Recent behavioural science theory is applied to social work practice.

OR

*Social Planning*²⁵ (2 hours weekly, session 2): An analysis of social planning processes – task definition, policy formulation, programming, and evaluation and feedback. Australian and overseas examples. The location and scope of planning structures. A critical review of the stage of development of social planning theory.

Subsequent Changes

1975

Professional Interpersonal Competence (1hour weekly, in both sessions): The various roles of the profession from the perspective of the interpersonal competence required. Various theories with possible application for increasing professional competence in personal interaction. [This replaced *Interpersonal Competence Seminar*.]

Social Work Research Methods (2 hours weekly, session 1): Uses and abuses in research in social work: types of research in social work; steps in the research process; defining program and research objectives; involving the sponsor in the research process; research design; defining and operationalizing the independent and dependent variables; problems of reliability and validity; types of data collection; data analysis; preparing the research report; value questions in social research. [This was a change of name, but the content was similar to that of *Social Work Research Methods II* in 1975.²⁶]

Changes in the class contact hours: The weekly hours increased to 5 in both sessions in each of the electives in *Advanced Social Work Practice 1. The Behavioural*

24 To be taken only by students specialising in Interpersonal Helping.

25 To be taken only by students specialising in Community Work and Administration.

26 See p. 98.

Science Seminar in first session was increased to 2 hours weekly, and the *Project* hours were reduced to 5 in the first session, and 6 in the second session. The overall class contact hours for each session continued at 18.

All students were required to do Social Planning (2 hours weekly, session 2), and *Practice Applications of Contemporary Behavioural Science* was discontinued.

1976

For the first time, the MSW (by formal course work) was made available as a one-year program or a two-year part-time program. The subjects to be taken in each of the four sessions of the part-time program were prescribed.

The second elective in *Advanced Social Work Practice I* and *II* was now separated into community work, and administration. Each of the three electives now had 4 class contact hours in first session, and 6 in second session. The revised subject descriptions:

Advanced Social Work Practice I (Interpersonal Helping): Existing and emerging social casework and social group work theory. Various casework and group work models critically evaluated; emphasis on their local applicability.

OR

Advanced Social Work Practice I (Community Work): Recent developments in advanced social work practice at the community level.

OR

Advanced Social Work Practice I (Administration): Theory related to organisational processes: communication, decision-making, leadership, efficiency and effectiveness. Organisational goals. Bureaucratic organisations. Relationship of statutory welfare organisations with the political aims of Government. Role of Boards in voluntary social welfare organisations, relationships of administrator with Board. Service delivery and evaluation.

Advanced Social Work Practice 2 (Interpersonal Helping): Following (the interpersonal elective in session 1), examination of a range of appropriate strategies of intervention. Method application within client, worker and agency systems. Current controversial views about interpersonal helping with reference to problems of selection and integration.

OR

Advanced Social Work Practice 11 (Community Work): Develops the community work elective in session 1, dealing with a further analysis of community work method and practitioner skills. Auspice for community work practice, its implication for practice methods; relevance to organisational goals and policy.

OR

Advanced Social Work Practice II (Administration): Develops the administration elective in session 1 and deals with the theory and practice skills related to the managerial task: planning, directing, organising, staffing, controlling. Budgeting

and finance of social welfare organisations. Methods of organisational analysis. Organisational change process and strategies. Relationship of organisations with the environment: public, consumers, the welfare sector co-ordinating bodies and representation.

Social and Behavioural Science (now 3 hours weekly, session 1): Recent and current developments in the social and behavioural sciences; psychodynamic theory, phenomenology, behaviourism, general systems theory, communication theory, small group theory, organisational theory, with relevance to social work practice.

Class contact hours in *Professional Interpersonal Competence* were changed from 1 in each session to 2 in session 1.

Practice Theory and Social Welfare Administration (2 hours weekly in session 2): Implications for the structuring of social welfare services, of contemporary developments in methods of social work practice. Professional development and staff development; relative responsibilities. Professional supervision; structures and processes. [A revised subject description.]

Class contact time for the *Project* was reduced to 4 hours weekly in session 1, with 6 hours weekly retained for session 2.

In 1979, classes for the MSW (by course work) were scheduled in the evening, and the course was now normally taken on a part-time basis over 3 years.²⁷ The re-organised program:

Year 1 (Part-Time)

Advanced Social Work Practice – General I (2 hours weekly, session 1): An overview and critical analysis of contemporary social work practice theory. Method, multimethod, and unitary approaches to social work practice are explored along with the examination of assumptions, ideologies and primary concepts that underpin each orientation.

Social and Behavioural Science (3 hours weekly, session 1): Recent developments in the social and behavioural sciences that have special relevance to social work practice. Emphasis is on Australian applicability.

Advanced Social Work Practice General II (2 hours weekly, session 2): This unit builds on and extends understanding of material introduced in (the above first subject). Central concepts that are generic to social work intervention such as 'social functioning', 'relationship', 'task', 'direct and indirect service', are critically reviewed in terms of contemporary practice. The application of these concepts with selected target groups, client or non-client, are the special focus of the initial part of this unit. In addition, contemporary issues facing the social work profession in Australia and internationally are examined. These include problems of professional identity and organisation, inter-professional relationships, social work in welfare bureaucracies, the composition and deployment of the social work workforce in welfare services, relationships with other welfare personnel, and the profession's international responsibilities.

²⁷ A candidate could take the program over a shorter period with the approval of the head of school.

Social Work Research Methods (3 hours weekly, session 3): Experimental research using factorial and nested designs. Survey research and various random sampling techniques. Review of multivariate research procedures. Reliability and validity concepts.

Year 2 (Part-Time)

Advanced Social Work Practice – Elective I (4 hours weekly, session 1) and *Elective II* (4 hours weekly, session 2): Four major electives are offered, not all of which may be available in any one year: Interpersonal Helping, Community Work, Policy Development and Administration, Social Work Education. Students select one of these elective. The focus is on the development of advanced skills in the chosen area.

Interpersonal Helping: Existing and emerging social casework and social groupwork theory. Casework and group work models are critically evaluated in terms of local applicability, practice experience and research. Controversial views about interpersonal helping are explored with reference to strategies of intervention, appropriateness with particular target groups, and contemporary social problems.

Community Work: Recent developments in advanced social work practice at the community level. Detailed analysis of community work methods, and development in depth of selected practitioner skills. Implications of various auspices and perspectives for policy and program.

Policy Development and Administration: Theory related to organisational processes – communication, decision-making, leadership, efficiency and effectiveness. Organisational goals. Bureaucratic organisations. Relationships of statutory welfare organisations with the political aims of Government. Role of Boards in voluntary social welfare organisations, relationship of administrator with Board. Service delivery and evaluation. Theory and practice skills related to the managerial task – planning, directing, organising, staffing, controlling. Budgeting and finance in social welfare organisations. Methods of organisational analysis. Organisational change-process and strategies. Relationship of organisations with the environment – public consumers, the welfare sector – co-ordinating bodies and representation.

Social Work Education: General principles and educational methods in teaching social work practice. Field education. Different models and approaches. Curriculum planning and design. Issues arising. Specific practice education for Interpersonal Helping, Community Work, Policy and Administration.

Social Policy Analysis (2 hours weekly, session 1)

Social Policy Analysis (2 hours weekly, session 2)

Year 3 (Part-Time)

Project (10 hours weekly, session 1)

Project Seminar (2 hours weekly, session 1)

In 1980, *Advanced Social Work Practice – General I and II* were amalgamated into a year-long subject (2 hours weekly); and *Advanced Social Work Practice – Elective I and II* were also amalgamated into a year-long subject (4 hours

weekly). In 1981, *Project* and *Project Seminar* were also amalgamated (12 hours weekly, session 1):

A study project undertaken by each candidate. The project is an original but limited investigation related to social work practice. Each candidate has project supervisor. Candidates expected to present formally the progress of their projects in work-in-progress seminars. These seminars provide for discussion of projects between candidates and an opportunity to deal collectively with issues and problems encountered.

In 1982, the overall aim and design of the MSW (by course work) program continued to be:

... to prepare social workers for professional practice at an advanced level in inter-personal helping, community work, policy development and administration, and education. Each candidate specialises in one of these areas, depending upon her or his educational qualifications and experience. A common basis for advanced social work practice is provided through subjects covering recent developments in the social and behavioural sciences, the analysis of social policy and social planning, research methods and contemporary social work practice theories.

The Social Policy and Social Planning Requirement for All Postgraduate Students

All of the school's postgraduate students – MSW (by research), MSW (by course work), and PhD – were required to study the two postgraduate subjects Social Policy Analysis and Social Planning, which I taught myself. These subjects were intended to ensure that whatever the specialised interests of the students these would be understood within a critical understanding of the social policy and social planning context in which they were operating.

In 1979, the acting dean of our faculty, Professor Ray Golding, asked each head of school to prepare, under suggested headings, a document on their school. This was intended to give each of the heads of schools and the dean a better understanding of each school's situation and of the faculty in general. We thought this was a good idea and hoped it would enable the faculty to be more competitive with other faculties. I was very much aware of the 'political' nature of the document. All of our lecturing staff had a double opportunity to contribute to the document, first before I prepared a draft, and then after I prepared a draft. What went forward had their full support.²⁸

THE UNSW SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK 1979–84

The comprehensive document I prepared discussed the present and anticipated situation of the school in the following five years, under the follow headings – student profile (higher degree and undergraduate), courses offered and current enrolments, course changes, manpower planning, staff profile, local

28 R.J. Lawrence, 'The University of New South Wales, School of Social Work, 1979–1984'.

travel requirements, equipment requirements, materials and minor equipment, and space and accommodation requirements. I welcomed the opportunity to engage staff in this over-view of the school and its needs, and to set it down in writing so that our situation could be more widely known and discussed within the faculty, and in the university more generally. Some indication of its main contents follows:

We anticipated a larger proportion of our students would be in the higher degree category, and a greater commitment to continuing education in its various forms could lead to a greater proportion than projected. The aim was to achieve relative stability in the over-all size of the school's teaching commitment. The undergraduate component would be somewhat reduced and made more educationally effective. It was proposed that the first-year intake in 1980 should be reduced from 132 to 122. There were four main categories of entrants to the BSW degree – those entering only on the basis of their recent HSC results, those with other educational experience since matriculation, mature-age students considered suitable for university study and offered a place by the school and the faculty admissions committee, and those with sufficient tertiary subjects to gain admission into second year. There were no obvious grounds for changing the present proportions. Some of the staff were concerned about the lack of experience and maturity of students in the first and by far the largest of the categories, and desired to teach older and more experienced students. Other staff were not convinced that chronological age and life experience were necessarily key educational factors. 'However, in the next 5 years there is likely to be increasing staff support for students to defer for a year before taking up their place in the course, or to take a year's leave of absence possibly mid-way through their course. Already a number of students are choosing these options'.

No major course changes in the BSW were anticipated during the next 5 years. There was general agreement that the more specifically social work focus of years 2, 3 and 4 were essential for effective professional socialisation. In general, it was anticipated that the main curriculum development would take the form of better theoretical and logistical planning within and between the existing subjects of the BSW, and relating these more carefully to students' learning capacities. The MSW (by formal course work) had been recently reviewed and revised, and was unlikely to need a major revision in the near future.

Concern about a great shortage of qualified social workers in the early 1970s had led to many courses increasing their intake, some new courses, and the Australian Government's scheme to help social work educators gain higher degrees. The work of the social welfare commission on manpower planning had been brief and superficial and it had not been developed since.

All manpower planning is notoriously difficult in a 'free' changing society. It is perhaps especially so in social work

- because of problems in defining inter-professional roles, professional and technical roles, and professional and lay roles
- because social workers are employed by a wide variety of government and non-government organisations, which have fluctuating fortunes and interests

- because there are many possible areas of social work practice which are as yet under-developed in this country – social work in industrial settings, school social work, social work with the unemployed, social work with the aged, social work with families, social work in legal and correctional settings, local community social work, social welfare administration and policy development, private practice, and so
- because the great majority of qualified social workers are female, which means that changes in sex roles can significantly affect the size and deployment of the social work work-force
- because of different government and community responses in times of economic recession and expansion

Australia's 14 million people were being served by not more than about 4,000 qualified social workers. Recently new graduates had found difficulty to obtain relevant employment, but no-one was arguing that Australia had a sufficiency of qualified social workers in comparison with the community's need for their services.

The current 13 recognised schools of social work were graduating about 650 a year. Our school's contribution was about 86 a year and Sydney university's the same. None of the courses was experiencing recruitment difficulties and all had established quotas for entry. The UNSW school was strongly competitive for school leavers, with other schools in the university and with Sydney university's school of social work, and could be expected to remain so. In the foreseeable future, no new school of social work was likely to be established, and existing schools were not likely to increase their bachelor degree intakes. The employment demand could, however, increase quite quickly if a state government, or state governments, or the federal government were to decide to implement new or revised social welfare programs and/or some of the possible fields of social work practice were opened up. There appeared to be a continuing demand for social workers in special areas of employment and in more senior positions, which require further professional education and experience.

In September 1979, our academic staff profile was 2 professors, 1 senior lecturer, 14 lecturers, 1 senior tutor, and 2 tutors – a total of 20. The general staff consisted of 1 laboratory assistant, 1 administrative officer, 2 stenographers (1 half-time), 2 typist office assistants, and 1 office assistant – a total of 6.5. Other important components in the school's teaching resources were part-time teaching paid by the school and part-time teaching not paid by the school. The former covered parts of the curriculum which required knowledge, expertise and current practice experience which full-time staff did not possess, or which could not be covered by the full-time staff because of their teaching loads.²⁹ The latter was provided by social agencies – for social work practice IB (100 students), 6 student unit instructors in 6 agencies, and 51 field instructors in 40 agencies; for social work practice IIB (108 students), 8 student unit instructors in 8 agencies, 57 field instructors in 45 agencies; and for social work practice IIIB (75

²⁹ In 1979, the cost of this teaching was \$33,944 – about a half of this was for lecturing, a quarter for tutoring, and another quarter for field education subjects.

students), in Part 1, 55 field instructors in 52 agencies, and in Part II, 2 student unit instructors in 2 agencies, and 53 field instructors in 43 agencies.

The existing staff situation had no slack in it, and in fact required to be eased in a number of respects. The academic staff situation was not very secure. This largely reflected the school's relatively recent development and the general shortage of well-qualified, experienced social work educators. Only 8 of the school's teaching positions were currently occupied by tenured staff. The one senior lecturer was retiring shortly. 12 of the 14 lecturer-level appointments had not yet had the opportunity to benefit from a special studies program. However, with careful handling and encouragement the school's present staff could, in the next 5 years, develop into a well-balanced, reasonably secure, well-qualified and experienced staff.

The present academic staff were under a variety of pressures, some of which were especially prevalent in a school of social work:

- To provide students with sufficient individual feedback on their work and general consultation, for these are essential in a course so personally demanding.
- To prepare new course materials, especially local Australian ones.
- To cope with large marking assignments.
- To teach in more than one subject and to coordinate their work in each subject with other teachers in the subject.
- To ensure that the teaching in the field education subjects is linked with the teaching in the rest of the curriculum.
- To contribute to the general coordination of the different parts of the curriculum.
- To coordinate the contribution of external teachers in subjects where these are used.
- To undertake scholarly writing, and complete a postgraduate degree if this is still to be done. (This pressure is especially felt by those who are untenured.)
- To collaborate with other professionals in the development of professional practice.
- To contribute professionally to a variety of community concerns.
- To maintain the relevance of their work in the context of economic and social change.

Compared with 1979, 1980 and subsequent years would bring some additional teaching requirements. These were briefly sketched. The field education staff needed an additional full-time senior tutor appointment. This would enable the field education staff³⁰ to give more even consideration to all students' field placements, to make two visits to each placement, to provide greater consultation with each student in planning and allocating placements, to establish regional groups of field instructors meeting monthly, to have greater opportunity for their own professional development and to take their recreation leave in a block, and to undertake a small amount of direct teaching in the school's classroom program.

30 The director of field education, 1 other lecturer, 2 senior tutors, and 20 hours a week of part-time assistance.

The need for part-time teaching paid by the school would certainly not be less in future years and could well be greater. Part-time teaching not paid by the school but by social agencies was expected to continue, although trends elsewhere might change the local situation. The school's field education program was heavily dependent on the continued support of a wide range of social agencies which provided field education placements and field instructors for the school's students. Whether the field instructor was a social worker teaching a single student as part of her or his duties, or was a student unit instructor whose duties largely consisted of teaching a group of about 6 students, each agency provided the instructor's salary. At present agencies saw this as reasonable because they accepted that they should make some contribution to the professional education of the next generation of social workers, they valued the link with the university and the stimulation this provided, there was some substantial service component in the students' work, especially when they were involved in a student unit, and they sometimes recruited good future staff in this way.³¹

The school expected to add three more units to its 8 units then operating, but was unlikely to develop any further units for it wished to maintain a balance between unit placements and individual placements.

Adequate performance of the work of the school required a profile of at least 21 academic staff (possibly 22), 8 general staff, and about the same amount of part-time teaching as at present – assuming no basic change in the availability by agencies of field instructors and student unit instructors.

The document ended with a consideration of the space and accommodation requirements of the school. Its present fringe location was unsatisfactory on three main counts:

Its geographic isolation from the main library and the special significance of this because the professional concerns of social work cover such a wide range of general and specific topics which only the main library's holdings can attempt to cover.

Its geographic isolation from almost all the other schools in the university relevant to its work – sociology, psychology, political science, economics, geography (social), philosophy, general studies, health administration, community medicine, town planning, law, AGSM.

Its geographic isolation from the newly-established social welfare research centre.

Apart from its location, the school's present accommodation was unsatisfactory because:

Many of its teaching staff were still housed in 'temporary' hut accommodation, and the school's physical lay-out was far from ideal.

Almost all its small group teaching was undertaken in 'temporary' hut accommodation.

These huts were difficult to clean and maintain in good repair, and cold in the

31 These were the arguments which I used especially in persuading agencies to establish units, and they proved persuasive.

winter and hot in summer, were high security risks, and continued to provide accommodation which was clearly inappropriate for a university, let alone any other type of educational institution.

The lecture rooms on Day Avenue were especially noisy, particularly at certain times of the day.

Almost all the teaching rooms were affected by traffic noise from Anzac Parade.

The use of the greater part of Western Campus facilities by other sections of the university was making the time-tabling of the classes of the schools of social work and education increasingly difficult.

The school did not anticipate a need to increase to any great extent its present space utilisation. The one advantage of the present hut accommodation was that it tended to provide more flexibility than a permanent building.

Earlier the university had accepted the school's functional need for a more central campus location, and the school was to have moved within the coming 5 years. Given the almost complete cessation on university buildings, this now seemed highly unlikely. The school certainly would not want to move if this involved reduction in its space. There was also concern that the school could lose some of its identity and its 'human' character if it were located in a large, anonymous, 'economy', concrete building, which staff, students and visitors found alien to the concerns of a social work school. The school should be located in a moderate-sized building specifically planned for its activities, and positioned on a central campus location which gave it reasonable access to the main library, other relevant schools, and the social welfare research centre. The inadequacies of the present teaching accommodation needed to be addressed if the school is to remain in its present location.

Austin Hukins took over from Ray Golding as dean of our Faculty in 1980. He had done an excellent job in coping with a very difficult situation in the School of Education, and his appointment as dean of the Faculty made sense since it was clear that Ray Golding's time as acting dean should not continue much longer and Austin was the only real possibility at that stage. My only reservation was whether he would be sufficiently competitive on our Faculty's behalf, in the politicking for scarce resources with the other deans. Austin's specialty was science education. My experience of him as dean was that he was thorough and very fair, an admirable person of integrity who could be underestimated because of his quiet, considerate manner. He and I and our wives have continued to be good friend sharing news about our respective families. Sadly, Muriel Hukins has recently died. She and Austin were good Christians in every sense, although I did not share their enthusiastic faith.

School Organisation

In mid-1969, I produced the first of the School's 'Policies and Procedures' document, with this foreword:

Without common and clear guidelines, both for staff and students, uncertainty, inefficiency and inconsistencies are likely to occur. The School is, therefore, making explicit and widely known its policies and procedures relating to various aspects of

its work. These will be periodically reviewed in the light of the experience of them by all members of the School – the different categories of staff and the students.

To help the various participants in the School's work to be better informed, this document also includes sections on the staff and the lay-out of the School.

The school's staff met for two hours each fortnight on a Friday morning throughout each term or semester. Items for the agenda were requested to be submitted to my secretary, a couple of days earlier. Periodic revisions of this handbook throughout the 1970s and 1980s, provided necessary up-to-date accurate information on the school's policies and procedures. The useful sections on the staff³² and school lay-out did not, however, survive the expansion of the school – perhaps regrettably.

These handbooks reflect that a great deal of time and effort was put into getting reasonable planning and accountable structures in the school – by myself and other staff, and at least some of our students.

Accountability of a Head of School in Field Education

In 1977, I prepared the following brief statement on a head of school's perspective on accountability in field education, for a meeting of the heads of schools of social work:

'Accountability' can be ... used ... to mobilise political support, or to persuade people to be more morally sensitive about the effects of their actions. But unless the concept ... is backed by specific arrangements, it is in danger of being used merely as a manipulation slogan. ... In any particular instance of its use it should be possible to state who is (or ought to be) accountable to whom, for what, when and how.³³

In our University, there are reasonably clear policies and procedures relating to the appointment and responsibilities of a Head of School. Very briefly, the Head of School is responsible for the over-all teaching and research programme of the School to the University authorities (the Council, the faculty, the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean, to the School's staff, to the School's students, and more generally to the community and the profession, however these concepts are operationalised. It is a continuous challenge and fascination for a Head of School to cope with the over-all responsibility for the School and its programme, in an educational institution which places traditional emphasis on the academic freedom of each staff member and on peer relationships rather than hierarchical ones.

With my appointment as Head of School came an over-all responsibility for that part of a social work course which tended to be called field work. In my earlier historical study of professional social work and my experience from teaching in a social work school, I had observed many unsatisfactory features of this long-established part of a social work curriculum. Now I had the opportunity and indeed responsibility, to do something about them.

The various steps we have taken in the School to improve the field component of the course may be seen as trying to be more clear-headed about the purposes

32 Brief biographical sketches, checked by each staff member.

33 See R.J. Lawrence, 'Accountability', *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 29, No. 3, September 1976, pp. 15–21.

in this part of the curriculum and setting up arrangements to ensure that we are accountable in terms of these purposes.

The University agreed to appoint a Director of Field Education who is accountable to the Head of School for the organisation, teaching standards and assessment, of the School's education programme. This is an important academic appointment and is supported by a number of other academic appointments of people whose work is primarily in the field education programme.

The field education programme consists of named university subjects, which are assessed in terms of specified criteria. Teaching assessment in these subjects is undertaken by field instructors who work closely with the School's field education staff. The older terms of 'field work' and 'supervisor' have been replaced by terms which emphasise the educational and learning purposes of the field experience.

The School has developed a number of student units in its field education programme. This has involved the Head of School and the Director of Field Education clarifying with the senior social workers, their administrative heads, and the student unit instructors, the respective roles, responsibilities and expectations of the School. The document which contains the mutually agreed upon principles in relation to these matters³⁴ sets down clearly who is accountable to whom, for what, when and how. Other schools may well wish to compare this document with their own policies and procedures.

Because of the special responsibilities of its student unit instructors, the School has given priority to this group to help develop their educational work, and to integrating this with the other parts of the curriculum. It has, however, been relatively neglectful of the large number of other field instructors that it continues to use.

An extensive system of written reports helps the field education programme to be accountable in its various aspects. In addition to the regular written assessments by both instructors and students on individual placements, there are the annual reports by student unit instructors and agency senior social workers on the functioning of the student units, and there is an annual report by the School's Director of Field Education on the functioning of the School's field education programme.

Four times a year, the Head of School, the School's other Professor of Social Work, the School's field education staff, the student unit instructors and their respective senior social workers, meet together to discuss matters of common interest and concern. At each meeting the Head of School, the Director of Field Education and a spokes-person from the fortnightly meetings of the student unit instructors present reports on developments in their respective spheres.

A number of small research projects have recently been mounted on various aspects of the field education programme. These include examining typical patterns of student learning in the field and instructors' teaching styles, identifying generic skills, and analysing the range and types of field learning experiences available in the agencies used by the School. There needs to be far more systematic research of this kind before the School can be seen as fully accountable in its field education programme.

Although it can be easily distorted or even forgotten by some of the interested parties, the main purpose of field placements in a social work course is the

34 It was attached in an appendix, with the comment that it was periodically reviewed.

professional learning of the student. This involves many different accountability relationships. A Head of School needs to have some understanding of these and try to ensure that they operate in a clear and explicit fashion in the educational programme for which he is responsible.³⁵

My Report on a Student Placement in the School

As head of school I provided written comment on this placement which occurred in the second half of 1978. From the experience of this placement I did not consider another similar placement was warranted, either from the point of view of the student's social work learning, or from the point of view of the over-all functioning of the school. As I had made clear from the outset, as head of school I must see a placement proposal in the school from both points of view.

The two placement students were judged by the relevant staff to have achieved at least a passing standard of performance in the placement. I had no doubts about the amount of work they put into the placement or that these particular students were at least pass students in their usual level of performance. I had serious doubts, however, about the clarity of focus of the placement as it proceeded, about the students' own role confusion, and about the quality of their data gathering, and it was clear that only a project much more limited in scope could have been effectively accomplished in the time. Experience of this placement had confirmed my view that a School placement was likely to demonstrate serious role confusion on the part of the students involved. They were immediately interested parties with political interests to pursue while at the same time they were School functionaries accountable in their placement work to the organisation and its head. I did not consider that another placement in the School should be even considered without there being a much longer planning time to enable expectations and roles on the part of students and staff to be clarified and settled prior to a decision.

Even then, for the reasons I had discussed, such a placement might be judged to be undesirable by the director of field education, Professor Baker, and the head of school.³⁶

My Various Roles and Tasks – in 1978

As part of their placement, these students had asked me to give an account of my various roles and tasks and the communication involved in them. I provided them with a list and said I was happy to discuss with them communication aspects of any of these:

- Subject coordinator for Social Policy Analysis and Social Planning (subjects taken by all postgraduate students in the School).
- Supervisor of various postgraduate students undertaking a research thesis or a research project.

35 R. John Lawrence, 'A head of school's perspective on accountability in field education', 1977.

36 R. J. Lawrence, Comments by the head of school on 'The Final Report, December 1978, Student Placement in the School of Social Work – on Type and Nature of Communication in the School', UNSW School of Social Work, 2/5/79.

- Supervising work of a research assistant.
- Acting as an examiner of theses and projects.
- Being consulted by academics, other professional colleagues, social agencies, the media, book publishers, etc. on various projects and problems.
- Financial and manpower planning and management for the School.
- Staff recruitment.
- Selection of academic staff of the School, academic staff of other schools in UNSW, of professors of social work in other universities, and of non-academic staff of the School.
- Staff development and review of academic staff and non-academic staff of the School.
- Allocation of duties academic staff and non-academic staff.
- Development of the undergraduate and postgraduate curricula of the School including chairing the School's Curriculum Committee, and piloting changes through the University's decision-making system. Acting as MSW (by course work) Coordinator in 1978.
- Oversight and development of the School's assessment program including chairing the Assessment Timetable Meeting and the School's Examiners' meetings, and being a member of the Faculty's Examinations Committee.
- Development of the School's field education program through field education staff, student units, chairing regular meetings of senior social workers, student unit instructors and field education staff.
- Development of the Library's holdings relevant to the School including working with the School's Library Liaison Officer and being a member of the Social Sciences and Humanities Library Advisory Committee.
- Organising part-time teaching.
- Organising ad hoc seminars, lectures, etc.
- Member, School's Staff Committee.
- Member, School's Staff-Student Liaison Committee.
- Preparation and revision of the School's Policies and Procedures Handbook.
- Handling difficulties referred by staff and students.
- Discussion with students considering changing their course.
- Member, Faculty's Admissions Committee.
- Handling School's recommendations on mature-age non-matriculated applicants.
- Dealing with accommodation planning, allocation of rooms, equipment, furniture, security, etc.
- Member, Faculty of Professional Studies (FPS).
- Member, FPS Executive.
- Member, FPS Higher Degree Committee.
- Member, FPS Education Committee.
- Member, Professorial Board (PB).
- Member, PB's Resources Allocation Advisory Committee.
- Member, PB's Health Personnel Education Committee.
- Member, Management Committee, Institute of Administration, UNSW.
- Helping the University establish the Social Welfare Research Centre.
- Convenor, Joint Liaison Committee on Continuing Social Work Education in New South Wales.

- Member, Welfare Work Advisory Committee, Sydney Technical College.
- Member, Standing Committee of Heads of Schools of Social Work in Australia.
- Organised at UNSW, for ASSWA now ASWE, in May 1978, national meeting of social work educators and students included a day to which agency members were invited.
- President of ASWE.
- Member, Exective Board, IASSW.
- Member, Program Committee, XIXth Congress of IASSW, Jerusalem, 1978.
- Represented ACOTA (Australian Council on the Ageing) at IFA meetings, Jerusalem, 1978.
- Co-convenor, International Committee of ACOSS.
- Advisor, SWADCAP, Philippines.
- Honorary Life Member of AASW, of ASWU.
- Financial Member of ACOSS, of NSW COSS, of NSW Council on the Ageing, of Mental Health Association of NSW, of Staff Association of UNSW.
- Reporting on the School's activities to AASW, for UNSW publications.
- Writing references.

Student Unrest

Rosemary Sarri reported in June 1969 that they in the School of Social Work at Michigan University had had a trying year,

... but I think that things are now on the up-grade. I am sure that it has been extremely difficult for both Vinter and Fauri so if the student movement comes to Australia, as I am sure it will, you may wish to commiserate with them.³⁷

I replied that my life had been both exciting and trying these past few months, but fortunately had not had to contend to any great extent with student unrest. The main problems connected with the school had been basic organisational ones – accommodation, staff, a new curriculum, building library resources, etc..³⁸

Simmering student unrest at the University of Sydney School of Social Work Department in 1976 developed into a full-scale dispute culminating in a 6-week strike by students in mid-1977, with junior members of the staff striking in sympathy with the students. Some of these students unsuccessfully tried to persuade our students to go out on strike in sympathy. The accreditation of the Sydney University course by the AASW came under threat. I can recall going to the University of Sydney to discuss the situation with Professor Tom Brennan. The spraypainting of 'Go home pommy bastard' in the foyer of the department I found repulsive and unacceptable, particularly in a social work school. Not surprisingly, Tom was unwilling to have an extended discussion with me. I took no comfort in the troubles of the other school of social work in Sydney, although it was suggested that these would be to our school's advantage.

³⁷ Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 10/6/69.

³⁸ Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 2/7/69.

I could see that the reputation of social work education and profession would inevitably be the loser in this very public dispute. On a personal level, some of the people caught up in all of this were my former colleagues and friends at the University of Sydney where I had taught for eight years.

I believed that a significant reason for the 'troubles' at the University of Sydney was the continuing inadequacy of the structures of the school, although of course personality factors were also operating. It was a professional social work school still headed by someone without a social work qualification. When Mary McLelland retired, there was no-one of sufficient academic and professional standing to replace her as supervisor of professional training and this had exposed Tom's impossible situation as director of the school. The strike at the school was resolved when the university appointed a committee of inquiry which resulted in the establishment of a chair of social work filled in 1978 by Stuart Rees. The students' 'demand for full democracy in the workings of the department, from curriculum to administration and staff appointments', was not acceded to by the university.³⁹

Student Unrest and a Tragic Death

In 1980, we had our own episode of student direct action in the UNSW School of Social Work, but it was stopped in its tracks by the tragic death of one of the two staff being specifically targeted. The social work students at UNSW, in fact, had had much less to complain about than the students at the University of Sydney because we had in place structures which could seriously consider student concerns when they arose. However, in mid-1980 inflammatory articles appeared in *Tharunka* and *The Australian* newspaper, and two staff members were specifically targeted for removal, with graffiti on the walls of their rooms, on the outside wall of the western campus lecture theatre and elsewhere on the campus. The supposed purpose of the graffiti 'GROYN' and 'GROML' was for me to 'get rid of' each of the two staff members – a superficial silly strategy for effective change, especially in a school of social work. The other graffiti were, unbelievably, multiple swastikas. The vice-chancellor Rupert Myers asked me what was going on and I told him, to the best of my knowledge. I understood that a small group of final year students specialising in community work were responsible. Their field education instructor was someone who had been involved in the 'troubles' at the University of Sydney. Over the years, Rupert had sometimes heard about social work students complaining about being over-worked, but not about the relevance of the curriculum or the teaching.

On 5 September, 1980, I wrote the following difficult letter to June Huntington, one of our staff who was on study leave in London:

I am sorry that I have to tell you the terrible news that Yvonne Nadas was killed in a car accident on Saturday. She was returning from a brief holiday with her family, sitting in the back seat with her two children, with David driving. Apparently David veered off the road to avoid a head-on collision and the car hit a telegraph pole. Yvonne was killed instantly. One of her children has both legs and her pelvis broken,

39 Michael Horsburgh, *Doing Well: Social Work Education at the University of Sydney. 1940–2010*, pp.23–28.

but David and the other child are not seriously hurt.

Yvonne's funeral was held yesterday. She is buried in the Jewish section of the Rookwood Cemetery. A large number of people, including many students, were at the funeral.

We are all, of course, very upset, especially because of the circumstances that had been running in the School immediately prior to Yvonne's tragic accident. I am sending to you as a member of the School the enclosed statement. I think it is self-explanatory.⁴⁰

June, in fact, wrote to us all on 6 September on hearing 'the dreadful news' in aerograms from Elspeth Browne and Ron Baker. She had already heard what was going on in the school and realised how much tension, and anger and hurt there must be around. Her feelings were very much with all of us in the School, staff and students. It was surely a time to be kind to each other and not allow feelings of guilt/punishment/retribution to win over those of care and concern. She had had a particularly good relationship with the current 4th year students from her experience with them in human behaviour I in their second year.

I was therefore utterly shocked when I learned of the swastikas sprayed around, particularly around Yvonne's office, because to me any human being who can plant swastikas anywhere near a Jewish person has either no sense of history or worse, no humanity. I cannot, however, think that the person(s) who did that can, given the present turn of events, feel nothing or indeed feel joy. ... I should think they might well need a great deal of help and support.⁴¹

'Social work students' sent a telegram to 'Professor Lawrence and staff' - 'Our deepest sympathy at the loss of your friend and colleague Yvonne'. Three second year students wrote to me in appreciation of my statement of the facts as I saw them and my expressed concern to make 'our school into a more constructive learning place'. They had been tutored by Yvonne and had 'admired her warmth and genuineness and respected her professionalism: the commitment and dedication to her work and to the people this involved'. 'We sincerely hope that in our practice we might be able to emulate just some of the many things Yvonne taught and represented to us'.

In view of our respect, admiration and appreciation of Yvonne and in view of the events stated within the letter to school members, it is our hope, that somehow, at an appropriate time and an appropriate manner, the sentiments contained within this letter might be conveyed to those to whom Yvonne was dear.⁴²

I passed on the letter to David Howard, saying these students' thoughts and sentiments were widely shared.

40 Letter, John Lawrence to June Huntington, 5/9/80. My statement written for all members of the school set down what I knew of what had been happening in the school and the circumstances of Yvonne's death.

41 Letter, June Huntington to Prof. R. J. Lawrence and all the staff, School of Social Work, UNSW, 6/9/80.

42 Letter to Professor Lawrence from Leanne Craze, Rhonda Mangan, and M. P. Campbell, 15/9/80.

The New Vice-Chancellor

When I wrote to Ron Baker on 14 August, 1981, I commented on the new vice-chancellor Professor Michael Birt:

The farewells to Rupert, and to Rex Vowels, have now run their course. I like very much what I have seen of Michael Birt. His very fluent statement to the first meeting of the Professorial Board was impressive. Obviously almost every member of the Board had made a special point of attending to see what he is like – I have never seen the Council Chamber so full.⁴³

The new vice-chancellor asked each head of school to prepare a brief statement on their school's objectives, activities, problems and plans. Like the document I had prepared in 1979 for Ray Golding,⁴⁴ this proved a useful collaborative exercise, not least because it involved Tony Vinson in an overview of the School shortly before he took over the responsibility for heading it. Much of it was based on that earlier document but brought up-to-date as required. For me, it reflected where we had reached after 13 years of striving for social good on my watch.

The UNSW School of Social Work, November 1981⁴⁵

A PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

The School of Social Work is part of the Faculty of Professional Studies. Its teaching, research, and community involvements are in the field of professional social work. This is a world-wide occupation and discipline concerned with helping individuals, families, groups, organisations, communities and societies, to deal with social problems and to develop more satisfying and equitable social conditions generally.

EDUCATION⁴⁶

The School is involved in three levels of professional education – initial professional education, formal post-graduate education, and other continuing education.

Initial Professional Education

Through its 4-year BSW degree program, the School aims to prepare a social worker who has a sound general foundation for continuing professional learning, and can undertake independent professional practice at a basic level of competence, using relevant knowledge and skills in accordance with the profession's values.

Students undertake first year Sociology and Psychology, but most of their subjects are specially designed for a social work curriculum – Australian Social Organisation, Human Behaviour, Social and Behavioural Science – Basic Theory, Social Philosophy, Social Welfare, Research Methods, and Social Work Practice.

An integral aspect of the BSW program is organised learning in field settings. The School has 4 academic staff who concentrate mainly on developing and making

43 Letter, John Lawrence to Ron Baker, 14/8/81.

44 See pp. 109–14.

45 'The University of New South Wales School of Social Work: Objectives, Activities, Problems, Plans' – A Brief Statement prepared for Professor Michael Birt, Vice-Chancellor and Principal, November 1981.

46 Each section and paragraph in the document are numbered for easy reference. This numbering is omitted in what follows.

educationally effective the BSW field education subjects. In these subjects the direct teaching is undertaken by 8 student unit instructors of the School and a large number of social workers also working as field instructors of the School. The care taken in field education is a special feature of the program and is a major achievement of the School.

Problems

1. Some difficulties with the changing and uneven content of first year Sociology and negative stereotypes of social work held by Sociology teachers.
2. The challenge of developing and teaching adequately subjects which do not conform to the separate subject disciplines in the social and behavioural sciences.
3. Disagreements over the utility of general frameworks of social work practice which seek to establish a common base of and for the various forms of practice.
4. Too much reliance on overseas teaching materials, especially in social work practice.
5. A shortage of senior academic staff.
6. General levels of staffing which preclude more intensive small group and individual tuition, and perhaps have perpetuated an over-reliance on lectures in some subjects.
7. The continuing challenge of a predominantly female student body and work force in a society which still discriminates against women.
8. Students trying to combine part-time work with the requirements of a full-time course which involves some field education outside of University teaching sessions.
9. A reduction to an HSC cut-off of 298 for the 1981 BSW intake. (It is difficult to know if this will return to the earlier much higher levels.)
10. The current threat to the educational functions and commitments of hard-pressed social welfare agencies which in the past have provided field education placements.
11. Developing suitable field placements in new fields of practice.
12. High turn-over amongst the School's student unit instructors.
13. The continuing challenge of effective professional education with relatively young students in a field as personally demanding as social work.

Plans for Change (to about 1985) in BSW degree

The Curriculum

The basic structure of the BSW degree is likely to remain, but a number of course changes are anticipated from 1983 onwards. Under serious consideration are:

1. The extension back into the second half of Year 1, of the first Social Work Practice subject.
2. The adoption of a student problem-solving approach to introduce students to social work practice.
3. The relocation to later in Year 3, of material on unitary models of social work practice.

4. The introduction of a much wider range of electives in Social Work Practice in Year 4, on the assumption that by the end of Year 3, each student will have received a basic grounding in the major aspects of social work practice.
5. Three instead of 4 field placements for students, with a greater emphasis on their educational quality and more emphasis on skill learning in the classroom.

There is general agreement that the more specifically social work focus of Years 2, 3 and 4 are essential for professional socialisation in social work. Some would like to see the present Year 1 which covers Psychology, Sociology, and Arts elective, and Australian Social Organisation, to be extended into a two, or even three-year program covering a range of possible subjects for students to complete before entering the present Years 2, 3 and 4 of the BSW. Others see this as unrealistic and/or unnecessary.

In 1980, the General Studies elective was dropped from Year 3 of the BSW. Some would like to see the General Studies elective eliminated completely to give more curriculum space for the professional purposes of the degree, but others value retaining the General Studies subjects because of the educational choice they provide to students, and because they also provide at least some interaction with students and teachers outside the School.

In addition to the possible developments mentioned ... the main curriculum development is likely to take the form of better theoretical and logistical planning within and between the existing subjects of the BSW, and relating these more carefully to students' learning capacities.

Intake

The School wishes to achieve at least a small reduction in its BSW intake – to be more educationally effective especially in conditions of scarce teaching resources, including those in field education. It does not, however, consider a substantial reduction in numbers is desirable.

The rest of the section on intake repeated almost unchanged the material on Australian social work manpower and manpower planning (or lack of it) contained in the 1979 report.⁴⁷

Postgraduate Education

The School has been keen to develop formal postgraduate education for social work graduates, as a contribution to the profession and also as a source of stimulus to its staff members. It provides opportunities for graduate social work study leading to the award of the research degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the MSW (by Research), and the MSW (by Formal Course Work) degree. All postgraduate students in the School undertake two graduate subjects, Social Policy Analysis and Social Planning, to ensure that whatever is their specialist interest, they are reasonably educated in broad social policy and planning issues.

The purpose of the MSW (by Formal Course Work) degree is to prepare social workers for professional practice at an advanced level in interpersonal helping,

⁴⁷ See pp. 110–1.

community work, policy development and administration, or education. A common basis for advanced practice is provided through subjects covering recent developments in the social and behavioural sciences, the analysis of social policy and planning, research methods, and contemporary social work practice theories. Each candidate also undertakes and reports on a project related to social work practice. From 1979, the MSW (by Formal Course Work) was redesigned on a part-time evening basis to make it more attractive to experienced social work practitioners.

Problems

1. The School still has only a small number of research degree postgraduate students.
2. Since 1979 the School had aimed to have a first year intake of 14 students in the MSW (by Formal Course Work) part-time degree. Each year, despite wide publicity and enthusiasm on the part of students in the course, the intake has fallen short of this aim. The 1981 intake was only 8.
3. With such low numbers in the MSW (by Formal Course Work) degree, only one of the Advanced Social Work Practice Electives has been able to be offered in any one year. Even so, the course has been very resource-intensive for the School.
4. The prospect for a viable intake for 1982 looks bleak at present, at least partly because of the threatened re-introduction of fees.

Plans for Change (to about 1985) in the MSW Degree

... Because of the continuing low number of enrolments, the School may ... be forced to offer the course only in alternate years, and may also be forced to revise its apparent offering of 4 separate electives in the Advanced Social Work Practice Electives subjects.

Continuing Education

The School believes that it has an important responsibility to be involved in the continuing professional education of social workers. In 1979, 1980 and 1981, it has run a week-long Summer Studies program in February. 140 attended 12 workshops in the 1981 program.

School research funds have been used on a continuing education project in the School, and in February 1981 a day-long consultation on the subject was attended by 90 social workers from agencies throughout New South Wales and the A.C.T.. The School is staffing a workshop for experienced practitioners in Canberra in December 1981.

Problems

1. The report on the School's continuing education project has been delayed because of teaching pressures on the joint authors of the report.
2. This report will help to clarify possible respective roles for the schools of social work, the employing agencies, and the professional association, but a commitment to these roles will still have to be achieved.
3. The School unsuccessfully sought a special development grant covering 1982-4 in the area of continuing education. A crucial purpose of

this grant was to explore the longer-term financial resources which the School could use in developing its continuing education program. Unlike other professional fields, social work has very limited financial resources likely to be made available for continuing education. In a field like ours, it seems highly desirable that at least some of the time spent by the School's academic staff on continuing education activities should count as part of the regular duties for which they receive their salary.

RESEARCH

The School has a definite commitment to knowledge evaluation and knowledge development. After earlier difficulties, teaching of research methods in both the BSW and MSW degrees is now done effectively.

For a number of years, the School has been responsible for a national family research project funded by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. The project's final report is shortly to be published and will contain the first full description of the structure and function of families in Australia. The project's work has already made an important contribution to the work of two recently established national research centres funded by the Commonwealth Government – the Social Welfare Research Centre at our University and Institute of Family Studies in Melbourne.

The Head of School has been closely associated with the establishment and development of the Social Welfare Research Centre. The School values its development and maintains an active relationship with the Centre.

In the more recent period, there has been a noticeable, if not dramatic, increase in the research output of the School – as some staff have met the requirements for research degrees and for tenured appointments, and as some staff have securely established their teaching role.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND INVOLVEMENT

In addition to their teaching and research activities, the School's staff have a considerable involvement in a variety of professional community activities, locally, nationally and internationally. In an alive professional school, this is encouraged both in its own right and also because of its contribution to the School's teaching and research program. Trying to strike an appropriate balance between these professional involvements and the immediate claims of the School's teaching and research is a continuing challenge for the School's staff.

ACADEMIC STAFF

The staff situation in February 1982 will be: 2 professors, 1 senior lecturer, 13 lecturers (5 tenured, 5 tenurable), 1 lecturer position being advertised, 2 senior tutors, 1 tutor, and 3 half-time tutors – a total of 23. Only 8 of the teaching positions are occupied by tenured staff. 1 senior lecturer retired in February 1980, another is resigning in December 1981. Only 3 of the staff have yet had the benefit of a special studies program.

Again I asserted that with careful handling and encouragement, the present staff could develop in the next few years into 'a well-balanced, reasonably secure, well-qualified and experienced staff'.

PROBLEMS

The various pressures on the academic staff of the School were again listed, with recognition that some of these were especially prevalent in a school of social work, where teaching and professional demands were taken seriously.⁴⁸

THE SCHOOL'S ACCOMMODATION

The School's accommodation situation remained unchanged.⁴⁹ This document for Professor Birt concluded with a section reconfirming the inadequacies of its present fringe location on the western campus, and what needed to be done to improve its present accommodation while waiting for its eventual relocation to a more central campus location.

All things considered, I thought the school was in reasonable shape when it was Tony Vinson's turn for the headship – with one major exception. Our output of social workers with postgraduate qualifications had been disappointing and, as indicated, the outlook in this crucial respect was not promising. We at UNSW had certainly provided the relevant structures for postgraduate professional education in social work, but for a variety of reasons including gender, few in the profession had taken advantage of them. In fact, not until 1986 did the school produce any other PhD graduates after its first in 1978. When I retired from the school in 1991, the grand total since the school's inception had only reached 10. After the 6 MSW (by research) graduates we had produced to 1983, only 2 more had been added (in 1990 and 1991), making a grand total of 8. In all then we had produced only 18 graduates with research degrees, a poor record for a university discipline worthy of the name. The MSW (by course work) was expected to be more attractive for most social work graduates in practice, but in fact it also had a low long-term output – by 1988, only an additional 48 after 1983, making a grand total of 74 since the program started. Because I taught all of our postgraduate students, in the subjects social policy analysis and social planning and supervised some of their research theses, I had the opportunity to appreciate their quality, and continued to enjoy getting to know them individually, but I regretted that in the bigger picture, there were so few of them.

UNSW Social Work Graduations

Graduation day was usually an important event for students and their families, and for all of us who had contributed to the education of the graduates. The person giving the occasional address had the challenge of talking to graduates and diplomates from the different member schools of our Faculty of Professional Studies. It was customary for the chancellor to invite the speaker, the dean and the relevant heads of schools and their partners to a formal lunch before the ceremony. Justice Gordon Samuels, UNSW chancellor 1976–94, was a memorable chancellor, who presided over a huge number of graduations

⁴⁸ See p. 112.

⁴⁹ See pp. 113–4.

bringing to each one his genuine interest in the graduates. Whenever he spoke at university occasions, his words were appropriate to the occasion. He and his wife Jacky made a great contribution to UNSW; it was appropriate that Pat O'Farrell asked him to provide a foreword for his 50-year history of the university in 1999. At that time he was governor of New South Wales. I knew him well enough to want to write to him when he was appointed, congratulating and commending him on his controversial decision to stay living in his own home, opening up government house to the public. His written response included the comment, 'I realise that managing change is not always the easiest of tasks!' I recall sitting beside him at a university luncheon telling him of my general work on professional ethics. He was interested that I knew of Richard Hare's work on moral philosophy at Balliol, the college he had attended in Oxford.

Chapter 5

Colleagues in the School

Staffing the School of Social Work

As head of school I had a major responsibility in the recruitment, selection, management and career development of the staff. Reasonable success in performing the educational, research and community service functions of the School obviously depended on both the individual and collective quality of the staff. Much of my time was inevitably taken up with staffing matters. While I retain personal memories of my relationship with almost all of the people we appointed and have kept some record of my dealings with many of them,¹ this obviously will not be covered in detail. This chapter does, however, give an account of many of the people on whom I depended in the development of social work education at UNSW when I was head of school.

A general guide to the development and changing pattern of the School's staff is provided by the following listing of staff appointments while I was head of school.

THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK STAFF 1969-1982²

Professor and Head of School

R. John Lawrence, BA DipSocSci *Adel.*, MA *Oxon.*, PhD *A.N.U.* 1969-82

Professor of Social Work

Ron Baker, MA *Brad.*, CertPSW *Manc.*, DipSocStud *Leic.*, SRN, SRMN 1977-80

P. Anthony (Tony) Vinson, BA DipSocStud *Syd.*, MA PhD DipSoc *N.S.W.* 1981-82

-
- 1 I have 8 boxes of 'persons' files in my archives, and these of course included my colleagues in the school as well as colleagues and others elsewhere.
 - 2 Because of inadequate records, secretarial and other support staff, apart from the main administrative position, are not listed. In September 1979, our academic staff profile included 6.5 general staff – 1 laboratory assistant, 1 administrative officer, 2 stenographers (1 half-time), 2 typist office assistants, and 1 office assistant – a total of 6.5. See p. 111.

Senior Lecturers

- A. Spencer Colliver, BA DipEd DipSocStud *Melb.*, MSW *Mich.* 1969–73
 G. Audrey Rennison, MA *Cantab.*, CertSocSci & Admin. *L.S.E.* 1969–80
 Robert U. Doyle, BA *St Francis Xavier U.*, MSW *Dal.*, PhD *Tor.* 1976–77
 W. Claire Bunday, BA *N.S.W.*, DipSocStud *Syd.* 1977–78
 June Huntington, BA *Lond.*, PhD *N.S.W.* 1980–81
 Margaret T. Lewis, BSocStud *Qld.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1981–82

Visiting Fellow

- Ted T. Tarail, BA *City, N.Y.*, DipSocWk *Col.* 1975–76

Lecturers

- Mrs Kathleen Colby, BA DipSocStud *Melb.*, MS *Col.* 1969
 Malcolm R. McCouat, BSocStud *Qld.* 1968–71
 P. Tony Vinson, BA DipSocStud *Syd.*, MA DipSoc *N.S.W.* 1969
 Frank Pavlin, BA, DipSocStud *Melb.* 1970–73
 Mrs. Claire Bunday, BA *N.S.W.*, DipSocStud *Syd.* 1970–78
 C. Maxwell R. Cornwell, BA BSocStud *Qld* 1971 – 82
 Bethia Stevenson, BA DipSocStud *Melb.* 1971–75
 Pamela M. Thomas, BA DipSocStud *Syd.*, MS *Col.* 1972–78
 M. Dee Barlow, BA MSW *Calif.* 1973–76
 Mrs June Huntington, BA *Lond.* 1973–80
 Margaret T. Lewis, BSocStud *Qld.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1974–80
 Colin J. Marshall, BA DipSocWk DipCrim *Syd.* 1974–82
 Susan M. Burgoyne, BA *N.E.*, DipSocWk *Syd.* 1975
 Brian A. English, BSW *N.S.W.* 1976–82
 Elizabeth J. Lloyd, BA DipSocWk *W.Aust.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1976
 Shirley J. Barnes, BA DipSocWk *Syd.* 1977–81
 M. Elspeth Browne, BA DipSocStud *Syd.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1977–82
 Erkan Ongel, BS *Ankara*, MSW PhD *Pitt.* 1976–79
 A. John Toohey, BSW *Qld.* 1976–78
 Christopher J. Williams, BA *Camb.* DipSA *Manc.* 1976–78
 Jennifer W. Wilson, BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1978–82
 Martin S. Mowbray, BSW *N.S.W.*, MSW *Syd.* 1979–82
 Yvonne G. Nadas, BSW MSW *N.S.W.* 1978–80
 Richard J. Roberts, BA DipEd *N.E.*, BSocStud *Syd.* 1978–82
 Norman J. Kelk, BA BSW *Qld.*, PhD *N.S.W.* 1979–80
 Rosemary E. Berreen, BSW *N.S.W.* 1980–82
 Sandra Regan, BA *Boston S.C.*, MSW EdM *N.Y.State* 1980–82
 Damian J. Grace, BA PhD *N.S.W.* 1981–82
 Betsy M. Wearing, BA LittB *N.E.*, ASTC 1981 – 82
 Diane M. Zulfacar, BA DipSocWk *Syd.*, MSW *Smith* 1981–82
 Deidre T. James, BA *Syd.*, PhD *Macq.* 1982

Instructors

- Mrs Claire Bunday, DipSocStud *Syd.* 1969
 Mrs Julia Moore, DipSocStud *Syd* 1969–71

Senior Tutors

Murray J. Geddes, BA DipSocStud *Melb.* 1972–73
 Elspeth Browne, BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1974–77
 Jennifer Wilson, BA BSocStud *Syd.* 1975–77
 Elizabeth A. Fernandez, MA *Madr.* 1979–82

Tutors

Jennifer M. Caldwell, BA, DipSocStud *Syd.*, MSW *Smith.* 1970–71
 Murray J. Geddes, BA DipSocStud *Melb.* 1970–71
 Michael D. Horsburgh, BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1971
 Mrs Elspeth Browne BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1972–74
 Norman J. Kelk, BA BSocStud *Qld.* 1972–73
 Mrs Caroline A. Bray, BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1973–75
 Mrs Susan M. Burgoyne, BA *N.E.*, DipSocWk *Syd.* 1973–74
 Jane C. Fishburn, BA BSW *N.S.W.* 1974–76
 Elizabeth J. Lloyd, BA DipSocWk *W.Aust.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1975
 Yia Ly, BSW *N.S.W.* 1975
 Elizabeth Leu, BSW *Qld.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1976
 Judith E. Taylor, BA DipSW *W.Aust.*, MSW *N.S.W.* 1976
 A. John Toohey, BSW *Qld.* 1976
 Jan Mason, MA *Syd.* 1978
 Mark D. Schlosser, BSW *N.S.W.* 1978
 Betty Simon, BSSW *Ohio* 1977 – 79
 Rosemary E. Berreen, BSW *N.S.W.* 1979
 Carmel P. Flaskas, BSW *Qld.* 1978–80
 Susan J. Beecher, BA *Macq.*, DipSocStud *Syd.* 1981–82
 Brenda Smith, BA *Manc.*, DiplApplSocSt *Lond.* 1981–82
 Jane R. Eales, BA(Social Work) *Witw.* 1981–82
 Robert C. Mowbray, BSc BSocStud *Syd.* 1981–82

Teaching Fellow

Geoffrey N. Channon, BSW *N.S.W.* 1975–77

Senior Research Officer

Diane M. Zulfacar, BA DipSocWk *Syd.*, MSW *Smith* 1979–80

Research Assistant

Rosemary Berreen, BSW *N.S.W.* 1977
 Judie Suttor, BA *N.S.W.* 1977–78

Part-time Supervisor

Joan M. Lupton, MA *Oxon.*, CertSocSci & Admin. *L.S.E.* 1969

Administrative Assistant

Patricia McPaul, BA DipSocWk *Syd.* 1971–73

Administrative Assistant

Audrey Ferguson, BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1976–79

Administrative Officer

Patricia McPaul, BA DipSocWk *Syd.* 1973–75
 Audrey N. Ferguson, BA DipSocStud *Syd.* 1980–82

Universities in seven countries contributed to the education of the staff – 9 Australian universities, 8 in USA, 7 British, 3 Canadian, and 1 each in Turkey, India, and South Africa. Within Australia, the staff had 17 qualifications from UNSW, 14 from the University of Sydney, 7 from the University of Queensland, 4 from the University of Melbourne, 3 each from the universities of New England and Western Australia, 2 from Macquarie University, and one each from the universities of Ankara, Madras and Witwaterstand. I valued having this reasonable variety of geographical, educational and cultural backgrounds amongst the staff. Almost two-thirds of the teaching staff, and all of the secretarial and administrative staff were female. Given the gender-composition of our student body, I was keen to attract well-qualified female applicants for the second chair, but was not successful.

Appointment Processes

An important function of the general university administration was to make sure that all of the School's appointments were made and reviewed in accordance with the university's personnel practices. All significant positions had to be advertised publicly. For lecturing and more senior appointments, selection committees usually had the benefit of reports from nominated referees and interviewing of short-listed candidates. The dean of the faculty chaired these committees which were usually composed of the head of the relevant school, another school member, and someone from another faculty. For professorial appointments, the committee was more extensive and more senior in composition and included members from outside the university.

Tutor-level appointments were only for a year, but could be renewed depending on performance and the school's budgetary position. Lecturer – level appointments were usually for three-years. These could be on a convertible contract where the lecturer could be granted tenure before the end of the three years. Or they may be on a fixed-term contract, when the future funding situation was uncertain. Some-one on a fixed-term contract could apply for the same position if it was re-advertised, and obviously would be strongly competitive if they had done well in the position. At this stage of the School's development and of the development generally of postgraduate opportunities for social work educators, many of the staff did not already hold postgraduate qualifications when they were appointed, and this put them under some pressure to gain university postgraduate qualifications if they were to continue in an academic career. Especially for the teaching of the social work practice subjects, their professional practice experience obviously contributed to their understanding and credibility as teachers, but the academic role clearly called for more than reflecting and passing on their own experience. The staffing of non-professional schools, for example in the Arts Faculty, did not have this particular challenge. Some of our staff members coming from working in social work agencies found the academic environment and pressures very different and took time to adjust; others took to it like 'ducks to water'.

Staff Qualifications

It will be noted how few of the school's staff at that stage had academic qualifications at a doctoral level, although an increasing number had a master's degree from our own school. Academically we were pulling ourselves up by the bootstraps. Our school produced the first Australian 'home-grown' PhD in 1978. When Norman Kelk, a University of Queensland graduate, was employed as a full-time tutor in 1972 and 1973, his tutorial work in my social philosophy and policy subject helped to stimulate his developing concern for analysing and understanding the philosophical underpinning of social welfare activities. I found him to be a conscientious, interesting colleague, with a mind of his own. He went on to write a doctoral thesis which analysed the writings of the influential American pioneer social worker Mary Richmond from a philosophy of science viewpoint. His examiners were Dr Randall Albury of the School of History and Philosophy of Science at UNSW, and two well-known social work educators, Professor Noel Timms at the University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in England,³ Dean Harold Lewis at Hunter College, City University of New York.⁴ In 1980, Norm returned as a lecturer mainly to teach social philosophy 1 and 11, but resigned the following year, unhappy about the level of commitment to learning of the students, the difficulty of doing substantial research, educational practices in the school with which he disagreed, and his loss of clinical practice skills.

Spencer Colliver – A Crucial Senior Appointment

As already described,⁵ with my assistance Spencer Colliver had been admitted to the second year of the MSW degree at the University of Michigan, and had lived with our family and in our attic, in the second half of 1967. A Churchill Scholarship had given him the opportunity to study overseas in the area of social welfare administration and management. His journey home included visits to various social welfare services in Washington, New York, Boston, Scotland, London, Birmingham, Belgrade in Yugoslavia, and Israel.

Invited to reflect on the development of his professional career in 1977,⁶ Spencer Colliver said the year of study overseas was 'a critical turning point'. It 'crystallised many of the problems (he) had experienced in managing a large and complex voluntary welfare organisation. ... The theory drew together and explained many of the dilemmas and difficulties (he) had faced. The course (at Michigan) also showed how intractable are some of the problems of social welfare and that answers for the improvement of society are always likely to fall short of the desirable'.

About his earlier working life:

3 I had met Noel Timms while I was on sabbatical leave in York in 1973. He was interested in the theoretical base of social work seen in a broad social policy context, and was perceptive about the social work/social policy situation in Britain.

4 At that stage I had not yet met him, but I knew and admired his work.

5 Vol. 2, pp. 317–9.

6 'Spencer Colliver', in *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, UNSW School of Social Work, 1978, pp. 14–22.

I was one of those who in my teen years was caught in the latter part of the Great Depression in the '30s, left school Third Form, became apprenticed to the engineering trade, and undertook seven years' work and study in the trade, finishing working in tool-making and design. ... After I completed my engineering work, I undertook two years of theological study which opened up not only an understanding of the theological and religious perspectives of life but also new vistas of literature and learning unknown to me. ... The Principal of the theological college ... encouraged me to further my education at the tertiary level.

He completed adult matriculation and the BA degree in the University of Melbourne while working as a field officer of the scripture union in Victoria. Part-time lecturing in the engineering school of the Melbourne technical college enabled him to pay his way through the first part of his further education. Next came school teaching full-time and completing the diploma of education part-time, but it became clear that his particular interests in working with children were not in school teaching: he found the formal educational system 'stifling'. A growing interest in the institutional care of children led to his appointment as superintendent of the Kildonan Presbyterian Homes for Children in 1957–61. He was disturbed by the behaviour of the children on his regular visits, particularly their constant demand for affection, but would go back to organising things for them, which everybody told him they needed – special activities and trips as a group, being taken out by holiday hosts, and so on. It was fairly easy to get caught up in the administrative task and rationalise that you were doing your best.

One thing was clear to me: being a teacher was not an adequate professional preparation for running a large children's home.

He found he had a great deal to learn about the emotional needs of children and that 'the knowledge and skills which social workers possessed seemed to be essential for the task which (he) had undertaken'. With the help and encouragement of Len Tierney who was then the acting head of the Department of Social Studies at the University of Melbourne, Spencer Colliver completed the social work course part-time. In the subject on human growth and development, through a gifted teacher Dr Elwyn Morey, he began to understand 'the deeper emotional needs of children and the problems of the institutional child'.

Through that course I began to understand that when a child lacks warm, continuous, consistent, loving relationships; emotional stimulus; physical contact, cuddling and caressing; the rich varied stimuli of sound and sight and kinaesthetic sensations, the child is seriously deprived and begins to manifest this deprivation through different kinds of abnormal behaviour and undertakes a desperate search for deep and satisfying relationships which can, in adult life, end in disaster.

The administrative implications of such knowledge were the need for selection of better staff, the need for better training of staff, and 'more importantly, the need for a complete change of the social situation in which children were placed.

As a matter of policy it seemed necessary to work towards doing away with the

large institutions and placing these children in the care of a married couple in a family situation and not in some enormous building outside of the normal domestic structure of our society. There is an expectation that a child in Australian society should grow up in an ordinary suburban home in an ordinary street, living and interacting with other children.

A family group home was established with a married couple who had had some experience of this kind of care in the United Kingdom. The general development and adjustment of children in both the institutional and family group setting were compared, and it was quite clear that children in the family group care were more contented, overcame emotional problems much more quickly and began to achieve the normal development patterns of their age. The Victorian state government purchased Kildonan to be used as the state reception home for children. With the proceeds a comprehensive system of family welfare as well as child care was established. It consisted of the Kildonan children dispersed into 8 family group homes, social workers employed to undertake family counselling at the point of intake, a foster care program and adoption work.

At the time I learned a great deal about the need for better administration in social welfare and realised that the social work course did not give many insights into good administrative practices.

1962 to 1968, the Presbyterian Assembly appointed Spencer Colliver as director of Presbyterian Social Services, with responsibility for 15 institutions, including homes for the aged, delinquent girls, babies, infants, and single mothers, and two hostels. He was also expected to represent the Presbyterian Church on external committees. At one stage he was a member of 45 committees. It was not surprising that he chose an elective at Michigan to study the place and process of boards and committees in voluntary social welfare. His years as director of Presbyterian Social Services in Victoria were extremely hectic and busy, 'filled with all the tensions that go along with voluntary welfare which tends to attract people with high ideals and strong-mindedness.

Voluntary social welfare is a quagmire of personal values – all the personal values of the members of the committees and the senior executive staff. Often I found that committee members were not interested in listening to the findings of the social sciences which might be applied to the task. They wished to apply their own personal values and charitable instincts to the care of people. ... in spite of these attitudes there was steady growth in the professionalisation of the work and when I eventually left ... there were 16 social workers where there had been none.

In the mid-1960s, Spencer Colliver was appointed to the Family Welfare Advisory Council of Victoria and later became its chairman. Exciting changes were occurring in the family and child welfare area of social welfare.

A number of institutions were moving to family group care, many were adding social workers to undertake family counselling and others were making their services much more comprehensive than institutional care of children. What came through in all these changes was the importance of having an enlightened

committee or board. ... It is my conviction that the most important single factor for change and progress in voluntary social welfare is the board which controls the institution. The board is the policy-making body; it is the body which appoints the senior executive who either does or does not possess the qualities necessary to institute progressive social welfare.

Spencer described Len Tierney as 'a warm friend and penetrating critic. He had a deep commitment to the profession of social work and a strong belief in the power of the well-trained social worker to facilitate social adjustment in people and social change in the community'. For two years before Spencer's Churchill award, Len had invited him to give some lectures on social welfare administration and management to final year social work students at the University of Melbourne. He had also monitored lecture series in the university's MBA course.

An Important Letter

In July 1968, I wrote a crucial letter to Spencer Colliver:⁷

Welcome back and warmest congratulations on your U. of M. results! Your sustained work and the sacrifices of all the Collivers made for so many months deserved to be well rewarded, and I'm sure the rewards will continue into the future. You must be so pleased to be reunited with the family.

I apologised for not writing earlier; life had been far too busy for comfort ever since I had returned from my year at Michigan. Amongst the various activities I mentioned, was the paper I gave on the role of social work services in the Commonwealth Department of Social Services. I enclosed a copy for him and said I had 'spent some time with Mr Hamilton (the Director-General) and other senior departmental officers, and I think established relationships which can certainly be built on in the future'.⁸

My book? I occasionally think of it last thing at night – just before fading out on yet another hectic day.

I then told Spencer of my appointment as professor and head of the school of social work at UNSW, and gave him some details about the school and its staffing. Since mine was a new position, Norma Parker's position would still be available on our establishment. Usually it would revert back to a lecturer status. However, according to Professor Willis, pro-vice-chancellor and chairman of the Board of Vocational Studies, I could get approval for a senior lectureship if I argued for it. I had mentioned Spencer to Professor Willis and he had urged me to go ahead immediately and sound him out.

I know, Spencer, that Len has had his eye on you for years, and that you may not wish to move from Melbourne. However, I did want you to know that I would be extremely pleased if you would consider coming on the staff of N.S.W. as a Senior

7 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to A. S. Colliver, 3/7/68.

8 This proved to be the case.

Lecturer. I think it could be arranged fairly quickly if you are interested. As you know, I am very keen to build up a School interest, both teaching and research, in Social Welfare Administration. The University of N.S.W. already has a general interest in many aspects of management and administration, and would welcome the Social Work School's additional interest in this direction. Your academic interests and my own, of course, combine very well. You would certainly not be involved in a part of the School's work neglected by the School's head!

I am looking forward to my new responsibilities, although have no illusions about the difficulties involved. Developing the School will be a considerable challenge. I'm sure you would make a valuable contribution to the School's development and derive much personal and professional satisfaction from it.

This is a weighty decision to put before you so soon after your return, but I did want you to know quickly about the possibility before you are irretrievably committed in other directions. If you won't leave Melbourne under any circumstances, you may like to use my approach as a lever on Len to come good with his Senior Lectureship in the Melbourne School!

Len Tierney did, in fact, advertise a similar job at a senior lecturer level, giving Spencer a real choice. I was hopeful that despite his family circumstances, the competitive advantage, especially in the long-term, might lie with the UNSW School. When I wrote to him about the selection committee⁹ for our position, I told him Paul Glasser from Michigan was interested in coming to Australia for a year, and that I had nominated him for a Fulbright attached to the UNSW School.¹⁰ After an interview in October, Spencer was offered our position and accepted. Extricating himself from his appointment with the Presbyterian Church was complicated and took time, and he had to remain until the end of February 1969 'to get the year moving for the Department (of Presbyterian Social Services in Victoria)'. The family shop and home in Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, had to be sold, and Spencer and Hazel with their five children (Ross, Andrew, Margaret, Deborah and Susan) had to find suitable accommodation in Sydney. Ross and Andrew had done very well in their schooling in Melbourne and were accepted for admission to Sydney Grammar. We offered to have them to stay until the family moved into their new home at Leppington,¹¹ but Spencer found hostel accommodation for the boys. He wrote:

You will be busy enough settling into your own home.¹² It is hard to imagine you in any other place than Balgowlah Heights – at least in Australia.

He concluded his letter with:

Some incredible things are happening in Pres. Soc. Serv. now I am leaving. Must tell you all about it some time.

9 This consisted of Professor Willis (chair), Professor McCallum (political science), a mathematics professor (someone outside our field), and myself.
 10 Letter, John Lawrence to Spencer Colliver, 31/9/68.
 11 This was a Presbyterian property about 55 km south-west of the city of Sydney.
 12 See p. 7.

When I wrote to Spencer on 12 December 1968, I sketched a proposed teaching program for him that would allow him 'to ease into the School without too much strain'—

- a university extension course on social welfare administration as we had planned, from June throughout second term
- an introduction to administration as a professional method some time in third term
- material on administration as a social work method possibly later in first term. (You could well use material you have already prepared for the Melbourne University course.)¹³

In April, 1969 I received a letter from Ruth Hoban in Melbourne. She and her husband Max Crawford were setting off on 12 months sabbatical leave later in the year, and they were wondering how my first term at N.S.W. was going. She was delighted to know that Spencer Colliver has joined me there. 'He will be a tremendous help, I am sure'.¹⁴

As I had expected, Spencer proved to be a tower of strength in the School during the five years of organisational change and stress that he was with us. I could go to Manila on a very significant international assignment from 18 August to 12 September, 1970, knowing Spencer would be an excellent acting head of school in my absence despite his relative inexperience as an academic administrator. By the time I was due for a 6-month sabbatical leave in 1974, he was no longer with us. He found his experience in the School frustrating and difficult, partly because the new curriculum and the changing staff situation required him and others to teach in a number of different course content areas, although he did enjoy lecturing and the inter-personal contact he had with the students. In his 1977 reflections on his career, he commented that perhaps if circumstances had been somewhat different, he might still be in the School 'making a contribution in research and teaching in areas which are of so much interest to me'. 'I still have very fond memories of those members of staff with whom I taught – and of many students who made the life of a lecturer more pleasant than is usually acknowledged'.¹⁵

Part of Spencer Colliver's task was to stimulate local interest in social welfare administration as a professional social work method. To this end, he provided in the second term of 1969, the university extension course on social welfare administration. Invitations were extended to selected executives who had substantial responsibility for the administration of social welfare services in both voluntary and statutory organisations. In the early part of 1970, Spencer conducted an in-service staff development course for personnel from the top and middle-management of the Benevolent Society of NSW, 'a multidisciplinary approach to management training in the human service professions'. Both of these courses were extremely well received.

13 Letter, John Lawrence to Spencer Colliver, 12/12/68.

14 Letter, Ruth Hoban to John Lawrence, 24/4/69.

15 'Spencer Colliver', *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, School of Social Work, UNSW, 1978, p. 22.

I knew we would be lucky to hold on to Spencer because of his rare Australian combination – experience as a senior social welfare administrator, combined with academic learning in social welfare management, and was not surprised when he applied for a couple of very senior academic positions elsewhere. The main difficulty for him, however, was that he had not yet had very extensive academic experience either in teaching or research. In a reference I wrote in September 1971, I stated that his teaching responsibilities in the School's courses in human behaviour and social welfare systems had encouraged him to think more systematically and theoretically about social problems, policies and provision. This was particularly evident in the child and family welfare field where he had a long-standing interest. His plan for a national doctoral study in this area was, however, still in its early stages, partly because very quickly many New South Wales community groups had sought his services for talks, lectures, and consultation, and he had had some trouble in keeping this to manageable proportions.

When Spencer Colliver and Michael Horsburgh conducted a survey of voluntary welfare organisations through the NSW Council of Social Service in 1972, they found that only two of the 95 respondents thought any training was necessary for board members. His comment on this, in 1977, was:

It is astounding when you consider that a person who may be erudite in other fields can come onto a social welfare board ignorant of the factors relating to social welfare and be responsible for making critical policy decisions about clients – families, children, aged people and others – who are cared for. If any group in the whole field of voluntary social welfare needs training, it is the members of boards and committees. Yet in most cases it is the same people who see themselves as being above the need for such training. As a result of their policies and the programs which give those policies effect, the lives of many people are changed (sometimes irrevocably), and those life changes are not always in the best interests either of the person or of our society.¹⁶

In May 1972, Spencer contributed a paper on 'The Explosion of Knowledge and Social Welfare' to the 7th ACOSS national conference, and in August 1972, another substantial paper, 'Social Reality and the Development of Goals for the Disabled', to an international seminar on social planning for the disabled. Spencer found gratifying his work on ACOSS committees which he helped to form and on working groups to produce reports. He played a leading role in its Standing Committee on Family and Child Welfare and in the effort to establish a national body for family and child welfare. He regarded Joan Brown, then the ACOSS secretary-general, as 'a writer and thinker on social welfare issues who had few peers'.

When the Commonwealth Department of Social Services, with the full support of the state departments concerned with child and social welfare, commissioned the UNSW School of Social Work to establish the Family Research Unit in 1972, Spencer Colliver was the Unit's administrator and a member of the

16 'Spencer Colliver', *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, School of Social Work, UNSW, 1978, pp. 20–21.

steering committee which I chaired.¹⁷ Spencer was widely known and respected for his work on family policy, and was a major reason why this project came our way. This was the first project of its kind sponsored by the Commonwealth Department. According to Kewley, as a joint commonwealth-state-university venture it was unique.¹⁸ (The directors of the state welfare departments, at their meeting in April 1972, had requested the Commonwealth Department to mount a project, but Max Wryell told me Bruce Hamilton thought it should be done by a university.) In the first research bulletin of the Family Research Unit in 1973, produced by Spencer Colliver and Adrian de Winter, the director of the Unit, the project was said to reflect 'longstanding and widespread concern ... in Government and voluntary agencies, and the community at large, about the increase in the number of deserted wives and unmarried mothers'. Spencer continued as a member of the steering committee when he joined the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. June Huntington, a sociologist in our school, became a member of the steering committee and replaced Spencer as the administrator of the family research project.

In September 1973, Spencer was notified of his appointment as first assistant director-general (social welfare) in the newly-named Australian Department of Social Security.¹⁹ He headed a new division which had the responsibility for handling many of the new initiatives of the Whitlam government in social welfare, which included the Australian Assistance Plan. In addition, the division was responsible for the general development of policy and standards of practice amongst the social workers and welfare officers employed by the Department, and for formulating advice and policy on social welfare services and the relationship of services to income maintenance programs. Spencer was looking forward to 'becoming associated with the development of the Australian Assistance Plan ... one of the most imaginative pieces of social welfare in Australia'. When he spoke of his career in 1977, he said, 'There is a great deal I would like to say about the Australian Assistance Plan both as I saw its prospects and the way it developed which I am not at liberty to share with you at this time'.²⁰

The AAP was an election promise which originated from experience in the welfare sector in Victoria. In September 1973, Bill Hayden, the minister for social security, described it as 'an attempt to bring together the threads of planning, regionalism, true democratic participation, community development, and regular critical evaluation of the performance of programs to ensure their continuing relevance and satisfactory operation'.²¹ The idea was to provide resources to a regional council for social development to enable planning and coordination of matters affecting social development. All levels of government, community

17 The other members were Max Wryell, representing the Commonwealth Department, and Bill Langshaw (representing the state departments). We all knew each other quite well.

18 T. H. Kewley, *Social Security in Australia 1900-72*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1973, p. 387.

19 His appointment was not, however, finalised until November, and he resigned from our school as from 10/2/74.

20 Spencer Colliver, *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, School of Social Work, UNSW, 1978, p. 22.

21 B. Hayden, 'Planning and integration of welfare services: an Australian government viewpoint', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 9, No. 1, p. 7.

organisations, groups and individuals, were encouraged to be involved, with the employment of community development and planning officers. According to Edna Chamberlain, a member of the Social Welfare Commission:

The idea caught fire and leapt ahead of experimentation ... Questions arose relating to RCSD autonomy, how to reconcile social planning from the top ... with community participation at the bottom, how to engage low-income and minority groups, how to divert take-over bids by municipal aldermen and professionals.²²

Hayden came to the conclusion that concepts behind the program were deeply flawed. 'Users could not be integrated into these sorts of systems at the level of responsibility and involvement conceived by the planners'. 'State and local governments should have been given the management of the program with fewer expectations about user participation'.²³

The AAP was a major early initiative by the Whitlam government, and so also was the Social Welfare Commission which was charged with piloting its early stages. Both were intended to be part of a national system of integrated services. The Commission was specifically required to recommend ways of achieving 'a nationally integrated welfare plan'.²⁴ It soon, however, lost political support, and so too did the AAP. It soon became apparent that each was ill-conceived in relation to existing governmental structures, some of those involved were both politically and economically naïve, and the time scale for expected change was far too short. In 1974, Hayden told Whitlam he had made a major mistake with the Commission. In 1975 Whitlam agreed. The Fraser government abolished it the following year. The Commission recommended the continuation of the AAP on a regional basis throughout the nation but this did not occur. It claimed that cooperative activity had been enhanced, and debate about the shape of Australia's welfare services had been stimulated.

Despite his general disillusion with many in the welfare sector²⁵ and his shift politically from being a democratic socialist to being 'a liberal humanist within a democratic, pluralist state', Hayden believed, in 1996, that his Department of Social Security had been transformed 'from being dominantly a bookkeeping manager of a well-established range of benefits to an active policy department and provider of a much wider range of services'.²⁶ Spencer Colliver played a central role in this process. In May 1975, he gave a paper on manpower issues in social security to the 14th national conference of the AASW at Monash University in which he traced the expanded scope and scale of the Australian Department of Social Security and the role of the new Social Welfare Division.²⁷

22 E. Chamberlain, 'Welfare and equality in Australia', reprinted in *Perspectives in Australian Social Policy: A Book of Readings*, ed. A. Graycar, Macmillan, South Melbourne, p. 72.

23 B. Hayden, *Hayden: An Autobiography*, Sydney, Angus & Robertson, 1996, pp. 190–1.

24 Marie Coleman, 'An Idea Before its Time', Australian Social Welfare Commission, April 1976. (Its final statement.)

25 'I found the lack of rigour, discipline and balanced conduct especially galling'. Hayden, 1996, pp. 192–3.

26 Hayden, 1996, p. 182. He was leader of the opposition 1977–83, minister for foreign affairs and trade 1987–88, governor-general 1989–96.

27 A. S. Colliver, 'Manpower issues in social security', in *Social Work in Australia: Responses to a Changing Context*, P.J. Boas & J. Crawley eds, Australia International Press, Melbourne, pp. 49–61.

Amongst his Division's tasks was taking over responsibility for the AAP after the Social Welfare Commission's piloting of its initial stage. Spencer recruited Kevin O'Flaherty to carry direct administrative responsibility for it. Kevin was a promising younger Australian social worker, who had recently completed a doctorate at the University of Michigan, but it was already a lost cause politically. Despite its wide-ranging responsibilities, the Social Welfare Commission was placed under one portfolio, instead of being accountable to the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and independent of particular welfare portfolios.

Although he did not talk much about it, Spencer found his relationship with Marie Coleman, chair of the Social Welfare Commission, difficult and he was certainly not alone. My social work colleagues Edna Chamberlain and Ray Brown, who were members of the Commission would sometimes talk at length with me about their problems with the way the Commission was being handled. Professor Eric Saint resigned in protest at one stage. I recall Marie Coleman coming to UNSW to discuss the idea of the AAP with Spencer and myself well before her appointment. We both raised the obvious structural problem of how it would relate to the different levels of government. In the event, whatever the structural issues, Marie did not prove to be a suitable appointment to head the Commission which required the development of a very wide range of cooperative relationships. She had a social work qualification from the University of Sydney, experience as a journalist, and had successfully taken on the medical profession in the health insurance debate, but her combative confidence as chairman was often not helpful.

After he moved to Canberra, Spencer and I did not stay in close personal contact, but he continued to be interested in the work of the Family Research Unit and played a significant departmental role supporting the eventual establishment of the national Social Welfare Research Centre at UNSW.

In 1976, he was a co-founder of the Zadok Institute for Christianity and Society which helped people apply Christian faith to Australian life. After his retirement from the public service, he and Hazel provided a respite care facility for clergymen near Canberra. Spencer re-married and moved to Queensland after Hazel's death from cancer. In later years, he wrote and taught extensively about small group Christian communities. He died in 2009 at the age of 88; I regretted we had lost contact in recent years.

Another significant figure in the early years of the School was Claire Bunday.

Claire Bunday (1923–2013)

On the invitation of Norma Parker, in April 1966 Claire was appointed field work organiser in the Department of Social Work within the School of Sociology, in the unusual university category of instructor because she did not hold a university degree. She had general responsibility for arranging field work placements, for following their progress, for securing assessments of the performance of students from supervisors, and for exploring new possibilities for placements. She became a key participant in a joint committee of the two social work schools in Sydney and the NSW branch of the AASW, to explore and rationalise the field work resources available. By the time I arrived in late

1968, the very troublesome field work situation was becoming more manageable, thanks to Claire. Like Norma Parker, Claire was widely known and well respected in the social work community. I knew and greatly appreciated her continuously active role in the NSW branch of the professional association – as member of the committee of management, treasurer, vice-president, president and delegate to federal council.

Claire's father was a builder in Sydney. She enrolled for a science degree at the University of Sydney but after meeting a friend who was studying social work, she changed course, saying she realised she 'did not want to work with inanimate subjects'. She completed the two-year social work diploma at the University of Sydney, and then the one-year medical social work course run by the NSW Institute of Hospital Almoners. She was a single parent with responsibility for her son Chris after her marriage ended in 1952. For 13 years before joining the UNSW in 1966, she practised social work in a medical setting – at Rachel Forster Hospital (1954–60), Broughton Hall Psychiatric Clinic (1960–64), and Gladesville Hospital (1964–66). In 1970, she was appointed to a lectureship position in the School of Social Work at UNSW after completing impressively, over four years part-time, an honours BA in sociology and the history and philosophy of science. She was 47 years of age, with experience in casework, group work, administration, education in the field, an extensive knowledge of Sydney social agencies, and a strong commitment to the social work profession. Because she had had the rare opportunity of developing practice skills in group work in her work in psychiatric settings, and had a developing interest in sociology and theory development, I invited her to concentrate on group work.

When she applied for a senior lectureship in 1977, she provided the qualifications committee with a full and clear account of her work for the School of Social Work and in the wider community. Within the School she had been active in curriculum development, particularly in the teaching of social group work and interpersonal skills training within a holistic model of social-work practice. I stated to the qualifications committee that it was obvious from her impressive record that no-one had made a greater contribution to the foundation years of the school than Claire Bunday. Some of the important functions she had performed so well would normally not have been asked of someone at a lecturer level. This was particularly the case with her acting as head of school, when I was away on sabbatical leave from mid-June 1974 to mid-February 1975.

She is strongly imbued with professional and academic values and has a high level of intellectual curiosity and competence. I have no doubt that if she had had the academic opportunities now available in social work education early in her own professional life, she would by now have been appointed to a very senior university academic position.

Mrs Bunday has built up a national reputation as a teacher of social group work, an usual situation for someone still at a lecturer level, and is widely consulted on a range of professional matters.²⁸

28 Letter, Professor R. J. Lawrence to Professor A. H. Willis, 21/2/77.

Her 1975 AASW national conference paper described changes in social group work over the previous decade. From a situation of a shortage and restricted range of teaching materials and interventive techniques, the group-work educator now had problems of how to select teaching materials from a wide and ever-increasing range, and 'how to help the student integrate acquired knowledge with analytical, discriminative and interactive skills'.²⁹

Claire Bunday retired from the UNSW School of Social Work at a senior lectureship level in February 1978,³⁰ but continued to teach part-time at UNSW, and other educational institutions, including the University of Sydney. In private practice, she was used extensively by a range of welfare organisations to develop and provide training courses in group work, supervision of staff, leadership and interpersonal skills. She was awarded an honorary doctorate by Charles Sturt University in 1995, after working as a consultant in their establishment of the first social work course by distance education.

Throughout her professional life, Claire was an active and commitment member of the AASW, serving at various times as member of the committee of management, treasurer, vice-president and president at branch level, and vice-president and international delegate at federal level. In 1984, the AASW awarded her an honorary life membership, and she received an AM in 1992.

Her interests included skiing and photography. She visited China more than 20 times, learnt to speak Mandarin and once spent three months teaching at the University of Peking. Trish and I counted her amongst our friends. A truly memorable occasion was held in May 2013 at UNSW, to celebrate her life. Many of us testified to their admiration and love for her and the impact she had made to improve countless lives.³¹

An Important Research Proposal

Max Wryell and I knew each other from ACOSS conferences, and as mentioned, I had had significant contact with him and Bruce Hamilton at their Department's senior social workers conference in 1968. When Bruce Hamilton sent me the delayed proceedings of that conference in August 1969, he said, 'Your contribution to the success of this Conference is still remembered and greatly appreciated'.³² These good relationships with senior staff of the Commonwealth Department of Social Services (Social Security, from 1973 onwards) were to bear long-term fruit for the School and UNSW – in a research proposal for a pioneering study of public attitudes to the Department, in a national family research project in the school, and finally with the eventual establishment in 1980 at UNSW of the national Social Welfare (Social Policy, from 1990) research centre.

29 Claire Bunday, 'Developments in social group work, 1965–1975', in *Social Work in Australia: Responses to a Changing Context*, P. J. Boas & J. Crawley eds, Australia International Press, Melbourne, p. 152. The paper provided a very substantial bibliography.

30 Like Mary McLelland she retired at 55, when superannuation payments became available – a very rare discrimination in favour of women.

31 See her obituary by her close friend and colleague Sheila Truswell-Newman – 'Claire Bunday 1923–2013: Social worker's huge influence still felt', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13/3/13, p. 51.

32 Letter, L. B. Hamilton to R. J. Lawrence, 27/8/69.

In mid-June 1969, on their invitation I had a discussion in Canberra with Bruce Hamilton, the director-general of the Commonwealth Department of Social Services and Max Wryell, the assistant director-general (policy), about a research project for which the school would be responsible. The focus would be upon various aspects of the relationship of the public with the Department. The data could be collected mainly in New South Wales, computer and other resources of the Department would be freely available to the researcher, and there would be no limitation on the publication of the findings. Once the director-general had a definite proposal, he did not anticipate difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds. To my knowledge this would be an Australian first for a department to invite careful outside scrutiny of its work, to be willing to pay for it, and also be willing for the results to be published. Although the proposed project would be very modest in size (only about \$5,000 would be involved), it promised to be a fairly major breakthrough if we handled it well. The Departmental officers and I decided it was very important to have the right person doing the job, and we would wait until such a person was located.

By chance, immediately after the meeting in Canberra, I received a letter from Professor Rosemary Sarri about Sue Hecht, one of her 'very bright' graduates in the administration sequence in the Michigan School of Social Work, who was interested in job prospects in Asia. She had done 'exceedingly well' working with Rosemary as a graduate assistant in all phases of an OEO research project, and might possibly be useful in a position in our school if we had one for a person with her qualifications. Her impressive curriculum vitae was attached. I raised with Bruce Hamilton the possibility of her appointment for the Departmental project. He shared my preference for an Australian researcher, 'although it is possible that a complete outsider would have some advantages in that he or she would be less likely to be influenced by the local environment, history etc.' 'A great deal depends on the qualifications, calibre and personality of the researcher selected.'³³ I told Rosemary Sarri about the anticipated research project and suggested Sue Hecht read Kewley's book if she was interested in the job. Rosemary thought she could handle the assignment with due consultation with others.³⁴ Sue Hecht was definitely interested and provided further information about her experience. I wrote to Bruce Hamilton:

I respect the research competence and judgement of Professor Sarri and her Michigan colleagues, and their experience in survey and research work in public welfare programs is very relevant for our purposes. Miss Hecht has shared in this experience. I consider it would be most unlikely to find in Australia, in the near future, anyone who could match Miss Hecht's qualifications for the research project we had in mind. This being the case, it would be a wise investment to pay her fare to enable her to undertake the job.

As I have indicated, Miss Hecht would be working under my general supervision. This, together with her own professional training and experience, should be sufficient safeguard against mistakes arising from a misunderstanding of the local culture.

33 Letter, L.B. Hamilton to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 24/7/69.

34 Letter, Rosemary C. Sarri to R. John Lawrence, 5/8/69.

I was willing to propose that Miss Hecht be appointed as a research fellow in the school for 12 months from January 1970, suggested an over-all budget of \$6,000 would be required. Once I heard that the minister Mr Wentworth had approved the project, I would make a definite proposal to Miss Hecht. I added:

I have kept Mr Cox (the NSW director of the Department) informed about our discussions on the project and he is very favourably disposed towards it. Generally, the idea of a careful analysis of the way the department interacts with the public has aroused keen interest and support amongst colleagues. In the mere sponsoring of a self study, the Department would gain widespread respect for a progressive and imaginative action.³⁵

On 2 October, Bruce Hamilton wrote that he had discussed the proposed study with the minister, who had given it his general endorsement, including his suggestion that they assign an officer of the department to work with Miss Hecht on the study. The officer he had in mind was Miss M. T. Gibson, a social worker grade 11 from the Adelaide headquarters, and he asked my view on her suitability for the task after I had looked at background notes on her and had a meeting in Sydney with her. The rest of his letter set down 'a few thoughts' on how the planning for the study might proceed, to be discussed with Max Wryell in the following week when he would be in Sydney. It was envisaged that the researchers would work in close consultation with departmental officers in the Sydney headquarters of the department, and also have some contact with central administration officers in Canberra especially in the planning stage of the study.³⁶ Getting the project underway looked very promising until Sue Hecht wrote on 23 October declining our offer.³⁷

Bruce Hamilton was disappointed that we could not start the project in January 1970, but felt it was most desirable to wait until we had the right person to undertake the task. He approved of my draft advertisement to be placed in the federal newsletter of the AASW. It stated that if desired the work could lead to a higher degree.³⁸ In March 1970, Margaret Gibson enrolled at UNSW in an MSW (by research) degree, with a proposed title for her thesis, 'Public reactions and attitudes to a welfare bureaucracy', with me as her supervisor.

Margaret Lewis (née Gibson)

In April 1970, after a telephone conversation with Max Wryell, I wrote to Bruce Hamilton to seek the cooperation of the central office of his department and of the department's director in Sydney in Miss Margaret Gibson's research project. He was sure her project would be a most valuable and profitable exercise. I had been impressed by Miss Gibson and considered she would do a sound, conscientious job.

35 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to L. B. Hamilton, 17/9/69.

36 Letter, L. B. Hamilton to R. J. Lawrence, 2/10/69. By this stage, we were on first name terms.

37 Letter, Suann Hecht to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 23/10/69. She greatly appreciated our offer and our efforts on her behalf, but she had decided on a position with CARE in New York, with a consequent position overseas.

38 Letter, L. B. Hamilton to R. J. Lawrence, 17/11/69.

Margaret Gibson completed her junior public exam in Queensland in 1953. She worked as a stenographer at the Brisbane chest clinic until January 1959, in three medical settings in New Zealand until August 1960, and was the secretary in the social work department of the Royal Brisbane Hospital before completing her bachelor of social studies (hons), February 1962 – February 1966, at the University of Queensland, having gained adult matriculation by correspondence in November 1961. A Commonwealth cadetship to undertake the social work course bonded her to the Commonwealth until February 1970. She joined the Social Services Department in Adelaide in February 1968, after two years with the Repatriation Department in Adelaide. In 1969, she had a month on temporary transfer in central office as assistant director (social work and welfare). Since graduation she had been an active member of the AASW and the Newman Association of Catholic Graduates. She was accepted for admission to the master of science (in social work) at Columbia University in New York, and had planned to commence there in September 1970, but decided to stay in view of her proposed involvement in the above research project on the department's relationship to the public. This decision shaped her future, both professional and personal.

In a work-in-progress confidential report to Mr L. B. Hamilton, director-general of social services, in January 1971, Margaret Lewis stated that her MSW research had to be confined to the development of suitable methodology for the measurement of clients' attitudes and reactions to CDSS. The general objective was to lay the ground-work for a full-scale national study. Undertaking the full-scale study itself would require extensive resources, despite the amount of work involved in this preliminary study. The development of the research instruments had to occur in the light of departmental and political goals for the services administered, and the service delivery procedures to which the clients were subjected. The goals analysis would require access to central office policy files, and this was planned to be undertaken in the near future. Observation of service delivery had already occurred in the pensions and benefits sections of the Sydney headquarters and Bankstown regional office. She anticipated a considerable discrepancy would be found between formulation of service goals and service delivery goals, and the actual process of delivery of the service at the respective public contact points – counter, telephone discussions, personal interviews, correspondence.

During her period of observation at Sydney HQ when case action was traced to areas beyond public contact, many facets of organisational theory sprang to life. She observed various organisational factors that affected service delivery. It was apparent that further deeper organisational analysis was warranted together with attempts at organisational change, but the existing data had provided all that was required for her present study of consumer attitudes. Her findings so far were provided for interest only and should not be divulged or used in any way. It could prejudice the future of her project or any other project which might in future carry the director-general's sanction. By March 1971, the thesis title had become 'The interests of the consumer in the philosophy and administration of the Australian income security program'. That year a major change in her circumstances occurred with her marriage to

David Lewis, a lecturer in the Graduate School of Business Administration in the Faculty of Commerce. David was a widower with 5 children. Trish and I went to the wedding. In 1972, Margaret was appointed by CDSS as the director of social work in the Sydney office, with her MSW enrolment changed to part-time. Their daughter Anne, born in September 1972, added to Margaret's domestic responsibilities. Their expanding home in Maroubra at least was not too distant from UNSW.

In early 1973, Margaret Lewis finally submitted her thesis. I was appointed the internal examiner and the external examiner was Tom Kewley, the social security expert in the Department of Government at the University of Sydney. We both agreed she had produced a major study, which in fact was not far short of what was required for a PhD. This was particularly remarkable in view of the heavy domestic responsibilities she had assumed in the course of her research. I saw the thesis as particularly valuable as an assessment of Australia's income security program immediately prior to the new national government in December 1972. It was a useful, and as yet in Australia, a unique contribution, to each of the author's main concerns – trying to make sense of Australia's pattern of income security measures; viewing income security planning as only part of Australian social policy and planning; examining how the income security program was actually administered in a state headquarters and a regional office of the Social Services Department; and, finally making constructive suggestions on what changes, from the consumers' and citizens' viewpoints, appeared to be warranted at both policy and administrative levels.

I chaired a steering committee for an ASSW research project for the Poverty Commission in 1973. Its topic was 'An analysis of explicit and implicit principles, philosophies, and values in federal social security legislation', and Margaret Lewis was the research worker. Again, she demonstrated her very sound personal and research qualities. She worked hard, thought systematically, and organised her work well. When Spencer Colliver left the school for the senior position in central office of the Department of Social Security in Canberra, Margaret Lewis joined the School as a lecturer, taking over Spencer's teaching in administration and in the social welfare subjects. In her letter of resignation to the director-general of the Department of Social Security in October 1974,³⁹ she gave two reasons. Her present position gave her flexibility in meeting her family commitments, and she was aware that there were very few other people in Australia at present involved in teaching social welfare administration. 'I hope that by continuing in this academic area I will be able to make a contribution to training suitable manpower for the social welfare field rather than being involved in direct service in that area'.

At the 1975 national AASW conference, she presented a paper which related contemporary theory of organisational behaviour to a number of major problems within social welfare organisations: goal clarity, diffusion and distortion; lack of effective communication; role confusion and drift; centralisation of decision-making; bureaucratisation of organisations; fragmentation of the task; dysfunctional operations; and program planning that fails to provide

39 She had been on extended leave from the department.

for implementation. Application of a modern systems approach should be of tremendous benefit to Australian welfare organisations in their current task of rationalising services and making them more efficient and effective. It was, however, unrealistic to expect that modern administrative methods would be implemented without the development of formal training programs, especially for middle – and upper-level management.⁴⁰

Margaret Lewis had a strong commitment to the profession which was not always appreciated by students and some staff who did not share this enthusiasm. She could also be demanding of the secretarial staff. She was appointed senior lecturer in 1981, but resigned at the end of 1982, after her return from her second special study leave. The final year subject 'The social work profession' for which she had been responsible had been discontinued. I thought this curriculum change was a mistake, irrespective of the personalities involved. After leaving the school Margaret was a member of the Repatriation Review Tribunal for a couple of years, before becoming a member, then senior member, of the federal Administrative Appeals Tribunal in New South Wales. We did not stay touch but after attending her funeral in June 2010, I received a note from her daughter Anne thanking me for my letter to her father and added, 'Mum was always very fond of you and valued your friendship'.

Frank Pavlin

In August 1966, Frank Pavlin contacted Norma Parker, on the suggestion of Len Tierney at the University of Melbourne, about possible employment as a senior tutor in her department at UNSW. Nothing came of the enquiry and in fact he and his wife went to Brisbane for Frank to take up his appointment there as a senior tutor in the University of Queensland. I met and enjoyed interacting with Frank and Helen Pavlin at national AASW conferences. They were able and interesting people and I wondered where they were heading professionally. Frank had a particularly varied and interesting personal background.⁴¹

Born into a well-off family in Ljubljana in Yugoslavia in 1923, his education from the Jesuits was disrupted by the Second World War. He put up his age so that he could fight in the resistance, was captured, and was interned in a concentration camp. At the end of the war he was freed. Working for UNRRA and IRO as an interpreter and eligibility officer, he accompanied groups of displaced people being resettled in various European countries as well as in the USA, Canada and Australia. In 1949, on one of these escort trips, he came to Australia and stayed, at first living in the Bonegilla migrant camp. He worked as a labourer and interpreter with men building the railway from Adelaide to Alice Springs. As a personnel officer, he unsuccessfully applied for admission to Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney Universities. He temporarily became a restaurant owner in Adelaide, obtaining a licence to sell wine, and hiring a French

40 Margaret T. Lewis, 'Contemporary Theory of Organisational Behaviour: Its Implications for Social Welfare Administration', in Phillip J. Boas & Jim Crawley (eds), *Social Work in Australia: Responses to a Changing Context*, Australian International Press, Melbourne, 1976, pp. 98–108.

41 Much of what follows is based on a memorable obituary, Sandra Sewell, 'Frank Pavlin 25.2.23 – 24.6.88', *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 41, No. 3, September 1988, pp. 37–9.

chef. The enterprise failed but Frank learnt a lot about gourmet French cuisine. Moving to Melbourne, he worked with the State Electricity Commission as a personnel officer, and later went to Sydney. In 1956, after 'one last try to get a university to accept him', he moved to Canada as an immigration selection officer. He became interested in court work and psychiatric work and was accepted into a training course for probation officers. His probation work involved extensive travelling in North America. 'During this time, he took many courses, including one with Erik Erikson, partly because he was still determined to obtain proper qualifications, but mostly because he wanted more than ever to understand and have a part to play in caring and healing processes'.

Frank Pavlin returned to Australia in 1961, working as a probation and parole officer while enrolled in arts and social studies at the University of Melbourne. It was unmanageable so Frank became a full-time student and part-time taxi driver. His subsequent work in 1965–66 in the Alexandra Parade Clinic of the mental hygiene branch of the Victorian Department of Health, was described as 'of exceptionally high standard', by the senior psychiatric social worker. He had a great deal of skill in practice which was based on a sophisticated theoretical background.⁴² In 1966, he married Helen Friday, a fellow social work student at the University of Melbourne, who had studied French, and German and English at an honours level in her arts degree. With a diploma of social studies and a BA with a double major in psychology, Frank became a senior tutor in the Department of Social Work at the University of Queensland in 1967. Helen was also appointed a senior tutor – in social work at the Department of Child Health at the university.

In May 1969, near the final stages of his MSW study of professional identification of social work students during their course, Frank visited our school to interview a number of our final year students. He was very interested in the possibility of joining us, and sent me material on his current teaching and ideas on what he would like to teach and how he saw the casework content of the course developing.⁴³ In early July 1969, I sent him a copy of an advertisement which was intended to attract a variety of applicants who would be contenders for a number of positions – how many was not yet certain. After reading his material, I considered it was possible that he would fit into the plans for the school. 'Part of what is required is more playful, sequential learning in the Social Work Practice courses and the Human Behaviour courses, and obviously you have been working towards this end within the Queensland school'. I send him a document on our plans for the future – yet to be endorsed by the governing bodies of the university, but I was 'quietly optimistic at present'. I also suggested he look at a copy of our 'School of Social Work Policies and Procedures' which I had sent to Hazel Smith head of his department.⁴⁴

Frank was selected for a lectureship in our school, but the appointment was not made until early December 1970 because of a general delay on university

42 Nancy Hillas, 'To whom it may concern', 18/8/66.

43 Frank Pavlin to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 17/6/69.

44 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Frank Pavlin, 1/7/69. Nancy Hillas, 'To whom it may concern', 18/8/66. Frank Pavlin to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 17/6/69. Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Frank Pavlin, 1/7/69.

appointments for the following year. In the meantime, I discussed with Ken Bromham the master of Kensington colleges, the possibility of the Pavlins living in one of the colleges and providing tutorial assistance to students. Both could offer tutoring in areas additional to social work. Frank and Helen moved to Phillip Baxter College in February 1970 when Frank started at our school, with Frank a resident senior tutor at the college (the following year he served as acting warden). Helen was employed as a social worker in the children's department of the Prince of Wales hospital. Building on her experience in Queensland, we appointed her the instructor of a new student unit at the Prince of Wales hospital.⁴⁵

In June 1971, Frank was awarded the MSW degree at the University of Queensland. In May 1972, I wrote in support of his appointment being converted to a tenured position. 'His lively mind, his rich life experience, his knowledge of research methodology, and of behavioural science, and his enthusiasm for coming to grips with fundamentals in teaching social casework, have made him a most useful staff member.' He had served as subject coordinator for both human behaviour I (in 2nd year), and human behaviour II (in 3rd year), and the method teaching coordinator for casework in 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years – a demanding load. He was an active member of the New South Wales branch of the AASW, serving on its management, industrial and professional education committees. In 1971, he was also on the NSW branch committee of the Australian Psychological Society (Clinical Division). Frank was a colourful, interesting and sometimes controversial character. Those close to him appreciated his value; others who did not know him so well were less certain.

In January 1973, the Pavlin family (Natasha had arrived in 1971) moved to Perth where Frank was senior lecturer and deputy head of the Department of Social Work at the University of Western Australia. I described Frank and Helen as a rare package deal when I wrote to them thanking them for their respective contributions to building a solid foundation for the School, both in their teaching in the classroom and the field, and also through their influence on other staff members. 1973–76, Frank was president of the Association of Social Work Teachers in Australia.

After two years in Perth, the Pavlins (Louis had been added in 1973) returned to Queensland in 1975. Frank held various senior positions, reader, dean of the Faculty, and associate professor in the Department of Social Work at the University of Queensland until his retirement in 1985. In December 1977, I received a letter from Frank in Austria. He was on sabbatical but had had to restrict his comparative work on European social security systems because of poor health and difficulty of getting access to material without having government introductions. Helen and the children would be spending Christmas with him 'at home in Yugoslavia'. In August 1980, Frank sent me his up-to-date curriculum vitae and asked me for a reference. He was applying for a head of school position in Perth to assess how he stood in the market and what the particular school had to offer. His present and increasing frustrating problem was that he held positions with considerable responsibility but no

45 Letter, Helen Pavlin to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 5/2/70.

authority to act, which in the long run meant he felt powerless to the trends in the school. 'As I am older I am somewhat less fiery, but still full of ideas, more able to reach a compromise, but want to maintain my standards'.⁴⁶

In 1983, I agreed to act as one of the three required to nominate his name to the search committee for the position of the secretary-general of the IASSW. I wrote to Richard Splane, chairman of the committee:

Frank Pavlin would bring to the job extensive teaching and administrative experience in social work education gained in at least three Australian states; a research interest in comparative social work education in Europe, and, to some extent, in the Asian area; a firm commitment to the social work profession; a keen mind; an appreciation of cultural diversity; and fluency in a number of languages. It will be necessary to check on his current and projected health, especially in view of the extensive travelling involved. He was not at all well a while ago, but I understand he has returned to full functioning again. Earlier he was not always notable for his diplomacy, but I would anticipate his more recent senior responsibilities have developed his capacities in this direction. Edna (Chamberlain) should be able to give a helpful current assessment on this and other aspects of his suitability for this most important position. ...⁴⁷

I wrote to Helen from New York when we heard of Frank's death in 1988. She replied, 'I enjoyed the detail that your letter contained, including your sharing in the delight of Natasha's birth, as well as Frank's own attributes which you appreciated'.⁴⁸ Enclosed was the order of service for Frank's memorial service.⁴⁹ She mentioned 'the lovely obituary' which had just come out in the latest *Australian Social Work*.

Malcolm McCouat

When Frank Pavlin joined the school in February 1970, Malcolm McCouat held a lecturer appointment mainly to teach social casework. In 1965, he had opened at Townsville the first regional probation office in Queensland. Although his MSocStud thesis at the University of Queensland was on the relative merits of group as opposed to individual supervision of probationers, he was primarily a caseworker. He, his wife Christine, and their daughter returned to Queensland in February 1971 when Mal was appointed to a lectureship in the Department of Social Work at the University of Queensland.

Max Cornwell

Another University of Queensland social work graduate joined us to teach social casework in March 1971, and remained with the school until resigning at the end of Tony Vinson's first year as head of school in 1983.

In mid-1969, I kept Bruce Hamilton informed of my discussions with

46 Letter, Frank Pavlin to Professor J. Lawrence, 14/8/80.

47 Letter, John Lawrence to Richard Splane, 4/4/80.

48 Letter, Helen Pavlin to John and Trish Lawrence, 2/10/88.

49 It included an image of the church where Frank was an altar boy in his early years, and an image of a chef preparing a gourmet meal, with the caption – 'F.P. as remembered by family and friends'.

senior officials of his department (Ella Webb and Max Wryell in Canberra, and Mr Cox the NSW director) about the possibility of establishing at some future date a Student Unit in the Sydney office of CDSS.⁵⁰ This was established in 1970 with Max Cornwell as the student unit instructor. Max was a research assistant then tutor in the Department of Social Work at the University of Queensland 1965–67. Working as a social worker in the CDSS in Brisbane 1968–69, he was active in the local AASW branch and was branch federal delegate on its federal council in 1969. From 1969–71, he was associate editor of the *Australian Journal of Social Work*. Moving to Sydney at the end of 1969, he worked at Gladesville hospital, before rejoining CDSS in March 1970.

Max Cornwell was appointed a lecturer in the School from March 1971. He enrolled for a part-time MSW (by research) degree at UNSW in the first session of 1970 intending to undertake a thesis that would complement Margaret Gibson's thesis.⁵¹ In his case, he wanted to examine the attitudes and reactions of professional groups to CDSS, but in the event this was not pursued, and he did not re-enrol for the degree, deciding to give priority to other responsibilities. These included being responsible, with Lyn Reilly from the University of Queensland, for the crucially important AASW working party report in February 1973. This confirmed the existing membership criteria of the AASW and recommended that it should become a national, rather than a federal body, giving attention to social action, professional development and industrial activity.⁵²

Max Cornwell was one of the six members of the UNSW School who contributed papers to the 1975 national AASW conference. His paper tackled the 'Developments in Social Casework since 1965', a period which had covered his own professional life. It was well-written and captured much of the theoretical and practical turmoil of the period. He referred to major developments in social casework: choice of a wider range of underpinning theories of human behaviour, both psychological and sociological, including communication theory, interactionist and labelling theory; general systems theory; short-term modalities, including planned short-term service, crisis intervention and task-centred casework; assertive strategies and use of authority; more sophisticated and complete review of worker behaviour *vis-à-vis* the agency, including advocacy and mediation; the beginning conceptualisation of teamwork; developmental and socialisation-oriented perspectives; numerous modalities for working with families, including conjoint family therapy, network therapy and multiple impact therapy; transactional analysis and games theory; behaviourism, including assertive training and relaxation techniques; the impact of humanistic psychology, the encounter movement and liberation movements of various persuasion; and the effectiveness debate and its *sequelae*. Two innovations were specially mentioned – structured learning programs, and audio-visual laboratories. Both had contributed enormously to reappraisal and refinement of ways of acquiring interpersonal skills.

50 Letter, John Lawrence to Bruce Hamilton, 7/7/69.

51 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Bruce Hamilton, 3/4/70.

52 See p. 49.

Various counsellor roles had emerged in recent years, as well as courses for welfare officers. In-service courses prepared other occupational groups for direct service functions. There was immense confusion as to objectives, task definition, industrial relations, collaborative working relations and relevant educational preparation. All of this activity might be in the interests of the Australian people but it was yet to be demonstrated.

Provided people are getting the quality services they require, it seems to me of little relevance who supplies them. The question for social workers is whether they demonstrate collectively that they have something to offer in the realm of individualised service.

Max Cornwell observed that one response to the fragmentation of social work had been the search for a unifying, integrating model that simultaneously preserved the insights of earlier more specific frameworks. Although there had been some promising explorations of what he called process-oriented global frameworks, the quest might be premature, given the extent of looseness in underpinning human behaviour theory, the scarcity of empirically tested practice knowledge and the essentially idiosyncratic and *ad hoc* initiatives of many practitioners.

It is a fallacy to refer to social work as monolithic and Unitarian; the same may be said of social casework.

He acknowledged the loose relationship between the collectivity and the individual practitioner. The question was how much diversity was social work willing to tolerate and even foster, and at what point did it become dysfunctional because of structural ambiguity?

Finally, he noted that it seemed increasingly difficult to find a competent practitioner to whom to refer an individual or family. The emergence of private practice in recent years in part reflected this scarcity. Casework practitioners were being 'funnelled holus bolus into macro-interventive roles. Individuals and families would continue to seek help from experts in problems of living and the appropriate level of intervention in many instances would demand an individualised focus.⁵³

On study leave, Max Cornwell was staff associate at the Family Institute in Cardiff during part of 1977–78. After leaving the School of Social Work in 1983, he built up a private practice in family therapy. He had obviously made a notable contribution to the school's teaching in social casework. His later years in the school, however, were not particularly happy ones, partly because of disagreements with others engaged in practice teaching.

COMMUNITY WORK TEACHERS

When she was briefing me initially about the social work staff at UNSW,

53 Max Cornwell, 'Developments in social casework since 1965', in Phillip J. Boas & Jim Crawley (eds), *Social Work in Australia: Responses to a Changing Context*, Australian International Press, Melbourne, 1976, pp. 125–34.

Norma Parker told me of the imaginative community work teaching of Tony Vinson, but she was uncertain about his commitment to the organised profession. I did not doubt his commitment to social work, but had wondered about his commitment to the organised profession after his being caught up in Morven Brown's initial mess at UNSW and being on the receiving end of hostility from social workers in the AASW. I had hoped Tony Vinson would stay with us and head up the community work teaching in the revised curriculum, giving the school strength in a social work method that was desperately short of qualified practitioners and teachers. However, in the third term of 1969, he moved to the senior lectureship in social administration which I had vacated at the University of Sydney. His sociological academic environment at UNSW had stimulated the developing breadth of his social concerns and extended his research capacities.⁵⁴

Our revised curriculum required effective teaching of each of the main social work methods of casework, group work, community work, and administration, as well as an over-arching view of social work practice. Despite the historical legacy of an overwhelming concentration on casework, and the absence as yet of well-qualified teachers and practitioners in the other areas, I was determined that the relevance and importance of each of these areas to the objectives of the profession should be recognised and developed. But how could this be achieved without at least one key appointment in each of the key method areas and someone able to tackle the challenging task of providing a general or generic social work framework, within which each of the methods could be seen to have their place? With the early key appointments of Spencer Colliver for administration, Claire Bunday for group work and generic teaching, and Frank Pavlin for casework, we seemed to be doing reasonably well, but with Tony Vinson's almost immediate departure, the school's community work teaching was left with a gap which in fact could only be filled in the following years with a series of short-term teachers, until finally Martin Mowbray's appointment in 1979.

Murray Geddes

At the AASW national conference in Hobart in May 1969, Spencer Colliver and I discussed with Murray Geddes the possibility of him doing project work in the UNSW School. With a BA and DipSocStud from the University of Melbourne,⁵⁵ he had worked in 1965–67 as administrative assistant to Spencer when he was director of the Presbyterian Department of Social Services in Victoria. VCOSS had then appointed him as social worker for local services and student field work supervisor for the university. This provided wide-ranging experience acting as consultant for the development of welfare programs at local and regional levels, in urban and rural areas in Victoria, and also in New South Wales and parts of Queensland. His experience had included occasional lecturing in social work at the University of Melbourne, and designing,

54 In 1972, he was awarded a PhD in sociology from UNSW.

55 Murray Geddes was initially engaged in medical studies for 3 years before switching to social work.

administering, and teaching in volunteer welfare workers' training programs. A very active member of the AASW, he had been secretary of the Victorian branch, had been involved in various branch committees, and was federal treasurer 1966–69 and AASW representative on ACOSS in which he was an executive member. Altogether it was remarkably diverse experience for someone in the early stages of his professional social work career.

In July 1969, I sent to Murray Geddes a general-purpose advertisement for new lecturing staff, together with our planning document for the revised curriculum, and the policies and procedures handbook. I told him if there proved to be no suitably qualified applicant to fill a lectureship at least partly in the community work area, we would consider offering a position to a promising prospect in the senior tutor or instructor range, doing the project work we had talked to him about. Murray was interested, saying he could do master's qualifying work at the same time. With no suitable applicant at a lecturer level, and at least a tutor-level position eventually being approved by the university in December, a year-long tutorship was offered to Murray Geddes from mid-February 1970. He and his wife Sylvia came to Sydney and lived in Kingsford, near the university. Sylvia worked in the O and M section of the Commonwealth Department of Civil Aviation. We knew that it was asking a lot of Murray to carry the main community work responsibility in the school, but he rose to the challenge admirably despite having to cope with poor eyesight.

In November 1970, Les Halliwell, acting head of the University of Queensland Department of Social Work, asked for my agreement for him to approach Murray Geddes to offer him a temporary lectureship to teach community work in their program for second term in 1971 when Les would be away on study leave. They would like to have Murray permanently.⁵⁶ Murray did not leave us. One memorable venture in which he played a significant role was helping residents of the East Rocks area at the south end of the Sydney Harbour Bridge when they were faced with notices to quit without rehousing alternatives being provided by the landlord, the Sydney Cove Redevelopment Authority. Most of the present residents would be displaced from their long-term residence of the area under plans made by the SCRA. In September 1971, The Rocks Tenants Group organised a petition to the state parliament, and resident action groups influenced the local government election. In May 1972, the coalition of resident action groups arranged for a widely-representative conference on 'Reforming local government'. Murray Geddes represented 'The Tenants Rights Campaign' at this conference. With my permission, in this period Murray convened the meetings of this campaign in hut 34 of the UNSW School of Social Work.

Murray Geddes was promoted to senior tutor from February 1972 and was offered a 3-year tenurable lecturer appointment from mid-February 1973. When he applied for the lectureship, he anticipated submitting his MSW thesis early in 1973. He had taught community work for 3 years in the second, third and fourth years of our BSW program. A substantial majority of this had been by lecturing despite his tutor-level appointment. He had also made

⁵⁶ Letter, Les Halliwell to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 23/11/70.

contributions on community theory and social psychological theories in the human behaviour subjects in second and third year, and in the development and tutoring in the social welfare subjects in third and fourth year. He had made a start on collecting relevant Australian teaching material.

In his application he stated:

Community work method involves working with groups and organisations to improve social conditions and provided social services. The focus of the worker is the creation of new policies, attitudes and services or the modification of existing ones. Such practice is increasingly important in professional social work, and there is a rapidly growing demand for workers with such a focus, knowledge and skills. This trend will grow steadily. The range of settings in which such workers are employed is increasingly diverse – in local government, in government social service agencies as they develop more preventative orientations and diversify their working relationships, in non-government agencies, with the growing number of citizen associations (such as consumer, resident and self-help groups), in the widening range of planning, promotional and co-ordinating bodies. The demand exceeds the supply.

Such teaching is an essential and growing part of professional social work method courses in the BSW course at the University of New South Wales (as elsewhere) and in the proposed MSW (by course work).

At present I am the only full-time social work teacher in this method in Australia.

He explained his involvement in the school's field education program in these terms:

In a professional social work course, it is critical that campus or classroom and laboratory teaching be thoroughly integrated with field education. During the last three years, I have been instrumental, in co-operation with two successive staff members directing the Field Education program ... in developing focussed field work placements for community work in social agencies in Sydney, in other New South Wales centres and in A.C.T. This has involved consultation with the agencies' administration as well as the selection, training and support of a group of graduate field education instructors, who are employed within those agencies.

A field work assessment outline and clear, reliable criteria are being further developed in co-operation with the current Director of Field Education and field instructors.⁵⁷

In response to the offer of a lectureship, Murray Geddes was interested in the possibility of staying with us to consolidate and expand the functions he had performed over the previous three years. However, he had been offered a number of positions in two states and in Canberra, all of which had attractive functions and salaries considerably in excess of the UNSW offer, the cost of living elsewhere was considerably less than in Sydney, and there was security of tenure. Rightly, Murray believed he had been relatively underpaid for the level of functions he had performed in the School.

⁵⁷ Murray Geddes, 'Application for Appointment as Lecturer in School of Social Work', 24/11/72.

These have involved substantial lecturing and course development work. This is part of the stage of our course's development and also of the profession in which there is no graduate with an Australian PhD in social work, and only a few with Australian Masters.⁵⁸

As with Spencer Colliver, the School lost him, early in 1973, to the Commonwealth public service in Canberra, where he worked in the new Whitlam government Department of Urban and Regional Development.

Despite advertising and considerable scouting around, our school was unable to establish a key full-time appointment to teach community social work until mid-1975. During this period we had to settle for just make-shift arrangements.

Robert Myers

We were, however, fortunate to gain the part-time services of Robert (Bob) Myers throughout 1974, and for the first session of 1975, in teaching the final year community work elective, and this included some field teaching as well as helping to organise field learning opportunities for the students. He was an experienced Canadian community work practitioner appointed a lecturer in the Department of Social Work at the University of Sydney in 1973. Soon after his arrival in Australia he was asked by the Australian government Social Welfare Commission to organise a 3-week training course for beginning social planners who would be involved in the introduction of the Australian Assistance Plan (AAP), and he was the evaluator of the first stage of the AAP in New South Wales. When I provided a reference for him in February 1976, I wrote:

As a teacher, his material is well organised, and he draws fruitfully from his own practice experience. ... Both staff and students have found him very easy to work with, partly because of his relaxed, frank manner. He has the courage of his convictions and has impressed me as a person of moral integrity.⁵⁹

Alan Connor

In February 1974, I wrote to Alan Connor, a community work teacher in the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan, after he expressed interest in the community work position we had been advertising.

We see this as a crucially important appointment, and one difficult if not impossible to fill adequately at present from Australian candidates. As you will see from our curricula, both undergraduate and postgraduate, the school is actively concerned in preparing social workers for intervention at the various levels of social organisation, not just the traditional interpersonal levels, though we continue to consider these as important. As you may know, there is a sudden surge of government (especially national government) interest in social workers being employed in the broader aspects of social work, particularly in community work and social policy

58 Letter, M. J. Geddes to T. J. Daly, bursar, UNSW, 5/2/73.

59 R. J. Lawrence, 3/2/76. This was an open reference .

roles. Our educational programs have to some extent anticipated these recent developments, but the community generally is still very short of competent social work educators in the broader aspects of social work.

I had mentioned Al's interest in the job to his Michigan colleague Paul Glasser, who said he would be happy to write to Al about our school.⁶⁰ Paul assessed Al as an above-average staff member, who had not reached his potential as a scholar. The lectureship was eventually offered to Al Connor in May and he accepted it in June, with planned commencement in February 1975. Belatedly in early October, he re-read the conditions of employment and discovered he and his family would have to pay their own fares back to the US after the 3-year appointment. They could not afford this as well as coping with having three children at college or university in the US. This and other family factors led him to withdraw his acceptance. Al was 'truly sorry'; he had very much wanted to come to Australia and the job.

I knew John when he was here and had a great deal of respect and affection for him and Tricia. Polly did also. Paul spoke very highly of all the faculty.⁶¹

Claire Bunday, as acting head of school, had had extensive correspondence with Al about the job, fares for the family, the starting date and the education of Stephen his son, and said the School was 'quite devastated' to learn he would not now be coming.⁶²

Because there was so much student and community interest in community work, just before leaving for sabbatical leave in mid-1974 I organised an advertisement for an additional appointment to teach primarily in this area of our program. It was at the lecturer/senior lecturer level

Ted Tarail

The only response of interest was from Ted Tarail, an older very experienced community social worker who was currently the executive director of the Golden Gate chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) in California. He was keen to spend another year in Australia after spending 1970 as visiting lecturer in community work at the University of Sydney. Ted had worked well with Tony Vinson and generally had left an excellent impression.

After considerable correspondence, Ted accepted a visiting fellowship at the top of the senior lecturer salary range, for 12 months from July 1975. In the meantime, Bob Myers had agreed again to help us for the first session of 1975. Near the completion of his time with us, at his request I provided a reference for a number of social work teaching positions back in the United States. It expressed great gratitude for his contribution to the school:

... In the relatively brief time he has been with us, Ted Tarail has played a vital role

60 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Alan Connor, 18/2/74.

61 Letter, Alan Connor to Claire Bunday, 6/10/74.

62 Letter, Claire Bunday to Alan Connor, 4/11/74.

in the development of community work teaching in the School. He has had central teaching responsibility for this teaching in the third and fourth years of our BSW curriculum, and in the postgraduate MSW (by course work) degree. In addition, he has been heavily involved in the field work placements of the community work students.

Mr Tarail has brought to these tasks a rich and varied practice experience which he uses skilfully in teaching situations, a great sensitivity to students, a deep professional commitment, and strongly positive, co-operative, and optimistic attitudes. I have valued his presence in the School as a senior colleague, and have on numerous occasions in these past months appreciated being able to discuss with him a wide range of concerns.

Ted Tarail's professional enthusiasm and persistent curiosity, and too his physical fitness, are ... particularly noteworthy for a person of his age.⁶³

Both he and I were gratified when UNSW agreed to reimburse him for the cost of shipping his books and other materials from and to Berkeley, in recognition of his work with us. It was a small but unusual financial gesture which Al Willis agreed we should make.

In February 1977, Ted reported that he and his wife Pearl were well settled back in their US environment. Ted was very productively employed, taking an increasing interest in the field of ageing. Pearl was re-established in her previous position as a school guidance consultant.⁶⁴ In my response, I said I thought the school had done reasonably well financially in a fairly tight general university situation. I told him of Ron Baker's appointment at a senior level and also that Bob Doyle, a Canadian appointed at a senior lectureship level, had settled into the activities of the school and with people in the community very well. With Bob, John Toohey and now a full-time tutor appointment (Mark Schlosser), the community work teaching in the school was in a much stronger position than it was, and we had been able to build on the work he had done with us.⁶⁵

I also reported that the social welfare research centre, funded by Commonwealth funds, was proceeding slowly but soundly.

I have been particularly gratified by the attitudes of other senior members of the university to the development of the Centre. It all looks promising, but there still has not been made a final decision on the actual level of resources that will be available, and there lies the crunch.⁶⁶

Towards the end of 1977, Ted Tarail wondered if it would be helpful if he came for another year in the school. He had heard that Bob Doyle was returning to Canada at the end of the year, and John Toohey was taking his MSW at a Canadian university.⁶⁷ In mid-December, I told him of Martin Mowbray's appointment to a lectureship in community work.

In December 1977, Ted and Pearl definitely wanted to pay a return visit,

63 He was born in 1913.

64 Letter, Ted Tarail to John Lawrence, 7/2/77.

65 Letter, John Lawrence to Ted Tarail, 9/2/77.

66 Letter, John Lawrence to T. T. Tarail, 9/2/77.

67 Letters, Ted Tarail to John Lawrence, 6/10/77, 7/11/77.

in 1979 if possible.⁶⁸ I undertook to let them know if there was any possibility of this occurring in the school. In June 1978, I sent Ted as requested a packet of material on ageing in Australia. He wanted to include Australia in a comparative course he was teaching. 'I think constantly about Australia and miss seeing and being with our good friends there'.⁶⁹ In July, he was thinking about a year or two teaching and working in Papua New Guinea. I could tell him that Dr Maev O'Collins at the University of Papua New Guinea was an able and enthusiastic person, and had apparently built up an education and training program reasonably well adapted to the local conditions. I also told him to whom he should write at a number of Australian universities he was interested in. I was, of course, happy to act as a referee if asked by any of the people he approached about a position.

John Toohey

We employed John Toohey as a tutor for the first 6 months of 1976, and then temporary lecturer for 12 months. His wife was a residential medical officer in the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital. After his honours degree in social work at the University of Queensland with community work his special method,⁷⁰ he had worked in 1974 in the university's Department of Social Work as a research assistant for Les Halliwell on evaluation of the AAP pilot programs in Queensland and as a tutor in community work. In 1975, he had been a municipal social worker in the Department of Community Social Work of the Townsville City Council. It was, of course, unusual for someone with such relatively brief experience to have a lecturing appointment, even if temporary. He was, however, a very pleasant reliable colleague and clearly a person of promise. We were fortunate he chose to be with us until he left in August 1977 to undertake a shortened master of social administration and policy at Carleton university in Ottawa in Canada.⁷¹

At Carleton, John extended his theoretical knowledge especially in the area of economics of social policy, and achieved very good grades. We kept in touch and in January 1979 he explored the possibility of teaching in the school for the second session in 1979, although he realised I had 'always been anxious to recruit staff on as continuing basis as possible'. His thesis was in the area of industrial social work (widely defined)⁷² and his field placement was at the Canadian Labour Congress, working on the development of three national social welfare programs for organised labour across Canada.⁷³ I told John that his developing areas of interest should be able to be put to very good effect back in Australia, but our staffing situation precluded any appointment with

68 Letter, Ted Tarail to John Lawrence, 6/12/77.

69 Letter, Ted Tarail to John Lawrence, 6/6/78.

70 His honours thesis, 'People, Plans and Power – New Demands for Social Work', focused on community functioning in relation to power structures in physical planning (high rise, housing estates, new towns, freeway construction).

71 His wife's work prevented her from leaving Australia with him.

72 The topic was 'The political economy of employee assistance programs with particular reference to alcohol and drug programs in industry'.

73 Letter, John Toohey to John Lawrence, 23/1/79.

us and that dealing with his application for a project officer position for the new Social Welfare Research Centre (for which I was providing a reference), would be somewhat delayed. Tony Vinson would not now be the director, but confidentially, there was another good and immediate possibility.⁷⁴

On his return to Australia, John Toohey was at first employed as senior training officer at the Clyde Cameron College, developing social welfare courses and course material for the Australian Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA). His subsequent career included directing occupational health and safety programs, senior positions in management education at UNSW, a doctorate from Macquarie University, and appointment in 2004 as inaugural head of the Graduate School of Business at RMIT University in Melbourne.⁷⁵

Robert Doyle

We considered an application for a senior lectureship (community work) from Robert (Bob) Doyle, a Canadian, in June 1976. Ted Tarail was on the selection committee shortly before his return to the USA. So too was a UNSW town planner professor, John Shaw. Bob Doyle was a divorced 37 year-old with a variety of experience in voluntary organisations, government service and teaching. He had travelled recently to Mexico and the Caribbean and believed he could contribute to community work development and social work, while combining an interest in travel and personal learning in other parts of the world. He was currently executive director of the program development division of the Department of Social Services of the Government of New Brunswick. His social work doctoral study at the University of Toronto was on citizen participation in community development. With positive references from Reuben Baetz, Albert Rose and Frank Turner (all of whom I respected), Bob came to us in early August 1976 on a 3-year tenurable contract. Appointed almost at the top of the senior lecturer range, his salary was still considerably less than he had been receiving. He quickly built up his professional and community network throughout Australia, and was a co-recipient of university research funds for the development of Australian community work literature.

The University of Sydney employed him part-time to teach 'community organising and social planning', one of the two electives for social work practice in the final year of their social work course, and also to assist with the development of field practice in community work. This seemed reasonable after the community work assistance we had received from Bob Myers when he was a lecturer at the University of Sydney. However, a problem arose when Bob Doyle chose to act as spokesperson for the striking University of Sydney staff in a television 'This Day Tonight' program in late July 1977. Al Willis rang me the next day asking why Doyle was described as a member of the University of Sydney staff. I discovered that Bob Doyle had not sought the vice-chancellor's permission to engage in paid outside work. I made sure this 'oversight' was quickly rectified, but I still questioned his judgement getting

74 Letter, John Lawrence to John Toohey, 21/2/79.

75 See 'Professor John Toohey -RMIT University' on the internet.

involved in this way in the dispute in the other Sydney social work school. On 5 October 1977, Bob Doyle wrote to Professor Tom Brennan withdrawing his services from the University of Sydney department. The present atmosphere in the department made it impossible for him to continue teaching. It was paradoxical that he was not recognised as having any legitimacy to speak as a representative of striking staff, yet he was responsible for a major course in social work practice in the final year of the program.⁷⁶

By the end of November 1977, for family reasons, Bob Doyle had returned to Canada to a position at the associate professor level in the University of Manitoba. In February 1978, he said he would like to return again when his family situation had become more settled. He had just spent a few hours with Don Bellamy in Toronto.⁷⁷ In April 1979, he moved to what he anticipated would be 'a fascinating job' with the city of Toronto. He was to be 'coordinator of neighbourhood services', reporting directly to the city council.⁷⁸

Martin Mowbray

As already mentioned, I could tell Ted Tarail in mid-December 1977 of Martin Mowbray's appointment to teach in the community work area. From February 1978, he commenced as a lecturer on a 3-year convertible contract. Martin was an early UNSW graduate, who had concentrated on community work. His work for an MSocStud at the University of Sydney resulted in a book published by the University's press in 1977, *Radical Criticisms of Social Work: Their Implications for Social Policy Analysis and Social Action*. His most recent experience was in the United Kingdom working in a local government social service department. With his appointment, we had finally achieved some stability in a crucial part of our program. Martin stayed with the school until the early 1990s. By 1985, he was promoted to senior lecturer. From 1986–88, he was a member of the University Council at UNSW and completed his UNSW doctorate.

Martin Mowbray was seen to bring to his teaching and writing a 'radical' perspective, which I appreciated when it questioned traditional assumptions and focused on power and values. However, I was not impressed by a so-called radical perspective that was crudely Marxist, or by ideological posturing that paid little regard to empirical reality. Early in his time with us, both Ron Baker and I thought that Martin should employ more non-conflict strategies in his interventive repertoire. There was no question about his commitment to trying to redress inequality and injustice. His critiques of the political use of 'community' in the Australian context, and of the rationale for a restructuring of the NSW Child Welfare Department were typical of his early writing. Martin and his long-term partner Lois Bryson generously invited me and Trish to a restaurant dinner to mark my retirement from the School in 1991. He appreciated the support I had given him when I was head of school, despite

76 Letter, Robert U. Doyle to Professor Tom Brennan, 5/10/77. Copies to vice-chancellor, chairman of the Board of Studies, and students.

77 Letter, Bob Doyle to John Lawrence, 1/2/78. Don had spent time with the Lawrence family when we were on sabbatical for 6 months in 1974 at the University of York in the UK.

78 Letter, Bob Doyle to John Lawrence, 28/3/78.

any academic differences we might have had. I can recall we shared an interest in Sheffield Shield cricket.

Martin Mowbray joined RMIT as a professor of social work in 1994, where the social work course had developed from the course at the Preston Institute of Technology in the 1970s, headed by Frances Donovan. His article in *Australian Social Work* in June 1996 provided a brief historical review and sad commentary on the narrow contemporary scope of Australian community work. One of his findings was that community work was largely performed by personnel without community work qualifications of any kind, let alone advanced or postgraduate credentials. His list of desirable components in the education of community workers included community studies and urban theory, and debates and research on urban infrastructure and finance.⁷⁹ He urged the better integration of the relevant disciplines (such as community work and social work, sociology, local government and town planning) within educational institutions.⁸⁰ In 1998, he was founding head of the new School of Social Science and Planning at RMIT – a merger of the Department of Social Sciences and the School of Social Work with the environment and planning programs.⁸¹ In 2002 RMIT made him an emeritus professor (constructed environment).

RESEARCH TEACHERS

An important aim in the development of the school in the 1970s was to make sure that social work graduates had sufficient understanding of research methods to be critical users of research, to contribute to research processes, and to undertake their own research. Brian English and Erkan Ongel played central roles in helping the school to achieve this aim.

Brian English⁸²

After a Catholic school in a small country town, Brian English spent a year doing odd jobs including helping an apiarist to move bees throughout the south-eastern part of New South Wales. At 18 he joined a monastery as a novice, living a very simple secluded life of prayer and reading. After two years he was still unsure about what he wanted to do and declined to take vows. He was vaguely aware of a wish to work 'with people', but back in the 'world'. After a second brief stint of teaching in a Catholic school, he decided to see a psychologist to do a series of intelligence and aptitude tests. He was told that he was most likely to find what he wanted in social work. It was the first time Brian had heard of social workers. The psychologist emphasised the

79 In 1984, his paper on national urban planning and development was awarded the ANU Peter Harrison memorial prize.

80 Martin Mowbray, 'A case for the renovation of community work education', *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 49, No. 2, June 1996, pp. 3–10.

81 See on the internet: Natalie Bevilacqua and Phoebe Hyams, '30 Years of Social Work Education at RMIT University'.

82 See: 'Brian English', *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, UNSW School of Social Work, 1978, pp. 40–6. Most of what follows is based on his own account of his life and career to that point.

interpersonal helping rather than the community or social administration side of social work, but he did give a fairly accurate account of what many social workers did, and he made it sound attractive.

Brian was one of four parole trainees with the New South Wales Department of Prisons who enrolled in the BSW degree at UNSW in 1968. They were employed full-time by the parole service, with study leave to attend lectures and payment while they were on field work done as part of the course. The fact that only two of them survived before graduating five years later, was due to a great deal of short cutting of both work and study and the good-will and interest of Keith McClelland, the principal parole officer.

Going to the university and being taught some skills, given some solid basis of knowledge about man and society and in particular the organisation of welfare, being socialised into a profession which has some clear values about justice and equality; these things filled me with enthusiasm for what might be achieved in working as a social worker. They also made me increasingly conscious of the tremendous gaps in our existing knowledge base, the limited repertoire of skills available to us as a profession, the anomalies in our social welfare arrangements and extent of the injustice and inequity in our society.

In his second year at the university he discovered and then developed a passion for enquiry or research as a means of discovery, through a course on research methods taught by Pauline Young, a semi-retired visiting US professor in the School of Sociology, and author of *Scientific Social Surveys and Research*. His honours project in his fourth year was a review of social work research during the previous decade. In his fifth year he reviewed what was happening in the prisons and parole service, and examined his own place in the system. By the end of that year, the majority of the social workers in the Department had resigned, partly because the Prisons Department was moving away from the values and objectives of social work and also because the in-service-trained officers of the probation service and the social workers in the parole service were welded into the one service.

With disappointing prospects for continuing to work as a social worker in the prison system, and more conscious than ever of the lack of knowledge and skills in the profession, but particularly within himself, with which to deal with social injustice and problems of equity and access to adequate resources by the different groups in society, he was considering undertaking a full-time postgraduate degree. He then learned about the family research project in the School of Social Work and encouraged by Spencer Colliver, applied for a research officer position on the project. The prisons and parole system granted him leave without pay to work on the project and to study for his PhD part-time. In his own words:

I was a member of a very small team with quite extensive resources and a very open charter to study families and their welfare in Australia with special reference

to one-parent families.⁸³

The research grant came from a National Liberal Government but by the time the research staff had been employed, the Whitlam Government was in office. During the Whitlam years the community, and social workers in particular, became enthused by the potential value of research. Many, probably the majority, felt that documenting injustice or the inequities of social distribution must inevitably lead to greater justice and the removal of discrimination. I was caught up in this enthusiasm and with my colleagues set about designing a 'textbook' study of the family and its interaction with other major social institutions.⁸⁴ Our research plan called for a study of the full range of family types in the community, rather than concentrating on those already identified as families with problems or families in trouble, for example, those already receiving pensions and benefits. Thus we argued for a nationally representative sample and designed a survey touching on most of the topics usually dealt with in the literature on families plus a number of new topics. To our surprise and our delight the Australian Bureau of Statistics (then the Bureau of Census and Statistics) agreed to cooperate with us and in 1975 the Bureau carried out the field work for the National Family Survey. By that time I had taken the senior position in the unit.

After two years on leave, Brian English resigned from the probation and parole service and was appointed a lecturer in the School, while retaining his position as supervisor of the Family Research Unit. His main teaching responsibilities were in the areas of research methods and social theory relevant to social welfare in industrial society. The major work of the Family Research Unit turned out to be planning and participating in the design of the national family survey and the general social survey carried out by the Bureau of Statistics in 1975.⁸⁵ Its brief was impossibly large.⁸⁶ The Unit never had more than three full-time staff, and usually only two with some part-time assistance, and the project had to be extended way beyond the three years which had been originally planned. Its work, however, did lay some foundation for the Australian Institute of Family Studies established by the federal government in 1980. Also the project was a major reason for the establishment of the Social Welfare Research Centre at UNSW, rather than in some other Australian university or in a government department.

83 The terms of reference were 'to undertake research directed towards understanding and documenting families at risk, family disruption and family breakdown in Australia', including attention to family patterns and community services available to families.

84 See Brian A. English, 'Social Policy and Family Policy in Australia', *The Australian Family*, Research Bulletin, No. 2, 1975. This used my social policy framework of common social goals to be studied in relation to service delivery systems for the population at large and for special population categories such as the family. To my list of maintenance of income, education, health, housing, recreation and leisure, and civil and political rights, were added mobility and life change/developmental tasks added by Spencer Colliver. The development and work of the family research unit were described in four research bulletins (1973, 1975, 1976, and 1978), and in journal articles.

85 See: Brian A. English, Raymond King, and Sali Smith, *Families in Australia: A Profile*, 1978, and Brian A. English and Raymond King, *Families in Australia*, 1983 – both published by the Family Research Unit, UNSW, Sydney.

86 See footnote 83 above.

In 1977, Brian English testified:

I enjoy teaching, but mainly when it involves working with students on discovering the answers to the apparently very simple but also very profound questions about why certain things happen in our society, why social welfare is characterised by certain attitudes and practices, why certain groups in our society are and continue to be disadvantaged and how welfare services or other social arrangements operate to maintain or to remove these disadvantages. ... Research alone does not bring about change, but allied to the other skills that now exist and which will be developed within social work, a capacity for sound research within the individual social worker or at least within sections of the profession can lead to greater justice and equity in society and to the alleviation of particular problems or deficiencies in individuals and groups. ... There must be a greater emphasis on training for research in the professional degree, there must be opportunities for postgraduate research and there must be courses in research methods for practising social workers.

Throughout the 1980s Brian English continued to provide invaluable research and other teaching in the School. Towards the end of the period he completed his own PhD at UNSW and was promoted to a senior lectureship. In 1990, the University of Newcastle appointed him as professor of social work and head of its new Department of Social Work. He later was dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and president of the Academic Senate. When he was appointed deputy vice-chancellor in 1997, he was described by the vice-chancellor as having an excellent background in his academic field and in senior administration. 'He has the ability to both lead and communicate with diverse groups'.⁸⁷ In 2003, just before his retirement, I rang Brian to express my support when he was caught up in a widely-publicised episode of plagiarism by foreign students at the University of Newcastle. The handling of the case by the senior administration had been referred to ICAC. Brian was cleared of any corruption but was reprimanded for misconduct in not following particular procedures. It seemed unfair for this to happen in the final stage of what had been a very notable career. He and his wife Jenny⁸⁸ were planning to travel overseas.

Erkan Ongel

I discovered Erkan Ongel's interest in working in Australia from a bulletin of the professional section of the Commonwealth Employment Service. Although it looked like a long shot, he had a Turkish qualification in social work, an MSW and a doctorate in education from the University of Pittsburgh, and had experience in teaching statistics and research methods. Teaching research methods had tended to be an educationally troublesome part of both our undergraduate and postgraduate curricula. Erkan Ongel was appointed to a tenurable lectureship from mid-1976. Pam Thomas, the lecturer responsible

⁸⁷ Media release, The University of Newcastle, October 31, 1997.

⁸⁸ Jenny Wilson was a long-term member of the teaching staff at UNSW. She was Brian's second wife.

for the undergraduate teaching of research methods was going on leave for two semesters and Erkan, with tutorial assistance from Jane Fishburn, began teaching almost immediately after his arrival. I can recall his enthusiasm after his first teaching experience with the students. 'They don't have guns!' He told me that his wife Gul would be joining him in at the beginning of September. He had taken leave for 14 months from his present university position in Ankara, to give him the opportunity to decide whether he wished to stay in Australia long-term. Gul and he certainly hoped they might stay.

By June 1977, they had decided they would like to stay much longer than 3 years; it was better living in Australia. They were getting to know Turkish families here and Erkan was providing some leadership in the Turkish community. Trish and I had a memorable Turkish meal prepared by Gul in their flat at Coogee. It was obviously an important occasion for them both which we greatly appreciated. Additional to his teaching, Erkan put his research skills to good local use heading a small task force which reported on students' evaluation of the second year of their course in December 1977.

At the review of his appointment in August 1978, I testified that he had provided the school with clear expertise in statistical procedures and more generally in research methods. He had had teaching and administrative responsibility for research methods I and II, for research methods in the MSW (by course work) degree, and for qualifying work for a number of potential Master's students. In addition, he had acted as a consultant on research matters for staff undertaking higher degrees, and for students and social workers undertaking a variety of field studies. In all of these responsibilities he had established a fine reputation for real expertise in his specialised areas of knowledge, for being a highly committed teacher, and for being extremely generous with his time, especially with students who were having difficulties in his subjects. He was particularly keen in the longer term to build up relationships between himself and others in the university and elsewhere, who were responsible for teaching research methods. Brian English and he were working to produce an appropriate reference book for the research methods subjects in the BSW. Together with Elspeth Browne, they had prepared for the Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission a research assessment of a survey report on natural planning services and methods.

Erkan Ongel was granted tenure from mid-September 1978. He was 'very pleased and proud', but before settling in Australia in the long term, he needed to return to Turkey 'for important personal reasons', on leave without pay from the end of November to mid-July 1979. Erkan wrote to me on 23 December from Ankara. On their way there, he had informally visited schools of social work in Manila and Bangkok to get 'a loose idea' about social work practice in countries less economically developed than Turkey. Erkan was engaged in very suitable teaching and he and Gul were very happy to be with their families and friends. 'We gladly observed that we were much more missed than we missed (them)'. However, Turkey had become an even more difficult country to live in. People were tense and scared to go out. Contrary to his predictions, political unrest had accelerated under the new government which was honest, hardworking and very conscious of the needs of the masses but greatly

inexperienced.⁸⁹ 'I think it is not hard to draw a right policy for the country but not so easy to have the administrative staff to implement the programs.' Ankara had an extra problem, air pollution. 'I bet it has become the worst in the world'.⁹⁰

After teaching in our school in the second session of 1979, Erkan again had to return to Ankara. His mother was desperately ill. A week after she died on 1 December, he wrote to me a long, sad, apologetic letter. He and Gul were exhausted from looking after his mother, but she had died peacefully thankful for the way they had looked after her. Erkan had had to pretend to be very strong and give psychological support to every member of the family. He was now feeling himself at a psychological breaking-point, unable to continue coping with his job in our school.

I do not wish to exaggerate the difficulties staff members have to face in a school, although I would think the tension was a bit too high for more effective teaching at our school, especially in the last year. ... I have no energy, patience and flexibility to cope with even the typical difficulties a lecturer encounters in teaching at schools of social work with a large young student population. In my case the language is an additional source of difficulty which prevents ... a fuller participation in all aspects of school affairs.

I cannot find words how to apologise for my resignation. I do owe you so much. I cannot pay this debt except to try to be a good administrator, like yourself; if administrative work is unavoidable for me in the future. ... I will always remember you as a kind and helpful person and as a most respectful (sic) school administrator.⁹¹

In view of the valued and conscientious service he had given to the School and on compassionate grounds, the university administration accepted my recommendation that the prescribed period of notice be waived in his case. Erkan briefly visited the school in February 1980 to have discussions with Brian English about his thesis and to tie up various loose ends. As head of his family he expected to remain in Turkey. In December 1979, he had written: 'Australia is so peaceful, and I pray will stay so forever, as compared to today's Turkey'. Over the many years since Erkan and Gul left us, they have continued to send Christmas greetings to Trish and myself, and we have reciprocated.

In 1984, when Brian English and Jennifer Wilson were visiting them, he wrote to me that they wished so much that we might visit them one day. Just about to visit Anzac cove with them, he again expressed his deep gratitude for my invaluable support in all the difficulties we encountered in the school, and my understanding regarding the family problems he had at the time. Visiting the cemeteries reminded him how important was leadership in human affairs. He remembered 'my great leadership at the school of social work and learned so much which I will apply in my future career'.⁹² Brian and Jenny would have told them that at the end of 1982, I discontinued being head of school after 14

89 There had been 1000 political murders during the 10 months of the new government.

90 Letter, Erkan Ongel to John Lawrence, 23/12/78.

91 Letter, Erkan Ongel to John Lawrence, 11/12/79.

92 Letter, Erkan Ongel to John Lawrence, 6/8/84.

years in this capacity. I thanked Erkan for his comments about my leadership. 'It is not the easiest of jobs in the sort of world we live in'. Trish and I hoped to be in his part of the world within the next few years and looked forward to visiting them.⁹³

THE FIELD EDUCATION STAFF

In the student evaluation of the second year of the BSW led by Erkan Ongel in 1977, one gratifying result was that 46% had rated their field placement experience as 'very satisfactory, 31% as 'satisfactory', and a further 14% as 'moderately satisfied'. Erkan Ongel suggested that such a high degree of satisfaction was perhaps due to a number of factors, the first of which was the 'careful and thoughtful management of the placement by the field work staff of the school'.⁹⁴ This was an especially notable result, given the early difficulties experienced when the social work program at UNSW was in its early stages. A key to the apparent success, at least in terms of students' satisfaction, was school academic appointments which specifically concentrated on the development of the school's field education program.

Jennifer Caldwell

Claire Bunday played a central role in the organisation of the field work program at UNSW from 1966 to when she appointed a lecturer in February 1970. Jenny Caldwell was then appointed as field work coordinator. As has been indicated, I had taken a particular interest in the developing careers of Jenny and her friend Diane Wright. I had taught both of them at the University of Sydney and they had visited us in Ann Arbor in 1967. Jenny made a point of writing to me when she heard of my appointment at UNSW.⁹⁵ Although it was obviously premature to give her the field education responsibilities, she welcomed the opportunity and managed to work very effectively despite her relative inexperience.

On her return from the USA in October 1969, she had worked in the social work department at the Royal Hospital for Women before her appointment with the School. Her MSW degree at Smith had included research on stress in ageing, and a thesis on the post-discharge adjustment of long-term geriatric patients. One of her achievements with us was helping to establish a student unit at Lidcombe Hospital which specialised in older patients. She returned to the USA in early 1971 to a position at Bellevue Hospital in New York, setting up a youth counselling service. I heard from Gayle Murray in October 1971

93 Letter, John Lawrence to Erkan Ongel, undated. Unfortunately when we subsequently did have the opportunity, we were advised that the unstable political situation in Turkey made it dangerous to travel.

94 Erkan Ongel, 'A Brief Research Report on STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF SECOND YEAR', UNSW School of Social Work, December 1977, p. 10.

95 See pp. 35–6.

that Jenny seemed to be enjoying the challenge – and New York life, again.⁹⁶

Bethia Stevenson

With the departure of Jenny Caldwell from the school, a new director of field education position was established at a lecturer level in mid-1971 and Beth Stevenson was appointed. My initial interest in her was raised by an impressive presentation she made at a national rehabilitation conference.⁹⁷ In her own words, Beth Stevenson had spent 'years in the wilderness of commerce then journalism before coming to social work in 1966'. She had worked at three psychiatric centres in Victoria and was senior social worker at Larundel Hospital before applying for our position. Her active membership of the AASW, at both the state and federal levels, included being on the state professional education committee and being an associate editor of the professional journal. An arts and social work graduate of the University of Melbourne, she had begun post-graduate studies at that university before enrolling in an MSW (by research) at UNSW. Her thesis topic was 'The place of the student unit in education for social work'.

Beth Stevenson's 1975 national AASW conference paper was the only one which concentrated on field education, and like other papers she was asked to review the experience of the previous ten years. She had spent just over 4 years as director of field education in the UNSW School of Social Work, and during this period had been responsible for over 1,000 student placements.

When I first came to my present job, I was new to the State and the School. ... The field education system was still predominantly based on long-standing personal contacts. ... The major symbols of Sydney social work education were two people, Norma Parker and Kate Ogilvie, ... and their students were the majority of Sydney's leading social workers.

More formalised arrangements were required.

The transition from the 'new' to the 'other' school has come and gone, and is now replaced by a healthy competition of 'separate but equal' and a short-lived attempt at shared planning.

In February 1974, at a residential seminar on social work education, field education staff of most Australian schools held an informal meeting, but the development of a national network had been slow. Beth suggested various research tasks that could be stimulated by such a network.⁹⁸

96 The Murrays had recently spent a weekend with Diane and Asad Zulfacar in Cincinnati, and they were joined there by Jenny Caldwell who flew from New York, to make it quite an Australian reunion. Gayle and Ian Murray were University of Sydney social work graduates applying for admission to the University of Michigan School of Social Work MSW course. Letter, Gayle Murray to Professor J. Lawrence, 30/10/71. A year later, I heard from Ian Murray that Jenny Caldwell was getting married to a Cincinnati psychiatrist in January 1973.

97 I can recall a comment at the time from Lorna Nolan, a former colleague from the University of Sydney. 'She will be the next Mary McLelland!'

98 Bethia Stevenson, 'A 10–10 Vision of Field Education in Australian Social Work', in *Social Work in Australia: Responses to a Changing Context*, P. J. Boas & J. Crawley eds, Australia International Press, Melbourne, pp. 227–34. The paper provided a substantial bibliography on field education in social work.

In April 1975, I asked our administrative officer Patsy McPaul to send to Paul Glasser at the University of Michigan a copy of an advertisement for the director of field education position to see if he knew of people who might be interested to apply. Patsy wrote to Paul:

Beth (Stevenson) has finally decided to return to Melbourne – it was always her long-term intention, and she had now decided upon June 1975 as the definite date to leave Sydney. It probably will not be easy to replace her – especially her attitude of concern and dedication to the job.⁹⁹

Fortunately Colin Marshall, one of our existing lecturing staff, was interested in succeeding Beth as director of field education. It was a safe appointment and ensured that this part of the school continued to be well-organised and reasonably stable. In 1975, Jenny Wilson joined the school's field education staff at a senior tutor level and was promoted to the lecturer level from 1978. She was joined by Elizabeth Fernandez from 1979, a social work graduate from Madras. Elizabeth and her husband Carl who worked for ICI, migrated from India to Australia with their two children. Elizabeth has remained with the school and over the years has progressed academically. Recently she was made a full professor. The well-being of children supposedly looked after by the state has been one of her major research interests. For many years, Elizabeth and her family kept in touch with Trish and me. Elizabeth has been grateful for the employment opportunity the UNSW school has provided for her.

Colin Marshall

Colin was in his mid-30s when we appointed him as director of field education. Like Beth Stevenson, he entered social work practice in 1966 and was active in AASW affairs, at a branch and federal level. In Colin's case he was in the parole service of the NSW Department of Corrective Services. In 1969, he added a diploma of criminology to his BA, DipSocWk at the University of Sydney, and was a part-time tutor in the final year group work elective in the Sydney University social work course. He left the parole service in 1972 to become a social research officer of the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, and for two years lectured in the diploma of criminology course at the Law School of the University of Sydney. We appointed him to a lectureship in 1974 to teach social work practice and the social philosophy and policy subject. In his role as director of field education from 1976, he ran seminars and courses on field instruction and other matters related to field education. In addition, he discussed social work practice and legal issues for seminars and courses for the NSW Institute of Psychiatry, the University of Sydney and the NSW Institute of Administration. He well earned his promotion to a senior lectureship in 1983, but soon after he left the school for a public service position as education and liaison officer for the Queensland Legal Aid office.

Originally I had hoped that the school might be able to establish the director of field education position as one of its most important senior appointments

⁹⁹ Letter, Patsy McPaul to Paul Glasser, 17/4/75.

because so much of our curriculum was given to field education. We had moved in that direction while I was head of school, but what we managed to achieve fell well short of what I had had in mind.

A Second Chair

With Spencer Colliver's departure, the school badly needed another senior appointment, preferable at a professorial level. I was fortunate that Claire Bunday was able and willing to act as head of school in the second half of 1974. The growth of the school – in its student and staff numbers, and in its educational programs – warranted a second chair. Also, I made a point of attending the monthly meetings of the professorial board, taking part in board and other university committees, and in the affairs of our own faculty and its committees. I saw all of this as an essential part of my professorial appointment and important for the awareness of the school within the university, as well as within our faculty. I knew, however, that both for my own and the school's sakes, I needed to share these responsibilities with another senior colleague. It was obviously a challenge trying to pursue one's own academic interests and expertise amidst all of these various levels of responsibility, and in a professional school which entailed active community involvements, this could become overwhelming.

I can recall a general discussion with Rupert Myers about whether I was interested in having a role in senior university administration. Al Willis who had acted as dean of the Faculty of Professional Studies was retiring, and our faculty needed a dean from within its ranks. I told Rupert there was still so much to do in the development of my subject areas of social work and social policy. I would not feel fulfilled if I was distracted from these at that stage. In the event Professor Ray Golding, another pro-vice-chancellor, served briefly as the dean of our faculty, until finally he was replaced from 1980 by Professor Austin Hukins from the School of Education.

When I was appointed as head of school, no period was specified. This hang-over of the 'god professor' days was later removed by UNSW to a very short period of only two years, with people of lower academic ranking being able to serve as head of school. I saw this as a retrograde change, without proper regard to a school's need for academic leadership within an essentially collegial organisation, and within academic politics at an institutional level.

By the mid-1970s, the university's finances were tight. A number of chairs were approved when the finances were available, and social work was amongst these. I recollect that when I heard that a meeting of VCAC¹⁰⁰ was about to consider which of these chairs could be acted on, I decided on an unusual course of action. I knew Rupert Myers always came in very early on VCAC days, so without appointment I went very early to his office in the chancellery and argued why our chair should be included amongst those chosen. Rupert listened and said you make a very persuasive case. I replied, 'Yes, but are *you* persuaded'. He laughed. A second chair for the school of social work was allowed to be advertised.

¹⁰⁰ The vice-chancellor's advisory committee was chaired by the vice-chancellor. It consisted of the bursar, the registrar and the deans of the faculties. Although advisory, it was seen to be the most important decision-making body in the university. Patrick O'Farrell, op. cit., pp. 177–78.

It was obvious that we needed a professor who would give leadership in the development of the social work practice subjects in our curriculum and in the profession generally – someone who would complement my own special interests in social policy and social administration. Matching the general social unrest which included challenges to all of the professions and not just the traditional powerful ones, it was a period of ferment and activity in social work practice. New schools were being created, new services were being planned and social workers were in demand yet the efficacy of their work was being challenged. How could you give coherence to an occupation that was now being expected to operate at all of the main levels of social organisation – interpersonal, local, community, national, and international? With increasing numbers of other occupations, professional and otherwise, becoming engaged variously at these different levels, should social work be in competition with them or be working cooperatively with them in pursuit of common purposes? What had social work to contribute to the well-being of society, if its numbers remained relatively low, many did not stay in the occupation, and they themselves were uncertain of the worth of their contribution? Within social work itself, tensions and sometimes outright conflict, was weakening the profession's collective existence.

At least in our new 4-year curriculum we had space to help students get a beginning understanding of their responsibilities as professional social work practitioners in this emerging restless environment. However, I was aware that no matter how effective their learning in different parts of the curriculum, without a grounding in general practice theory their basic education and their subsequent practice would be fragmented and difficult to justify in a broader societal analysis of social intervention. Declaration and espousal of broad social welfare objectives did not in itself justify their recognition as an occupation organised on professional lines. They needed integrating theory which would incorporate the way social work values, knowledge and skills were used in social work practice. Practice theorists were tackling these kinds of issues overseas and I was keen to find someone to occupy our second chair who would provide leadership in the development of teaching and research in social work practice. Academic criteria (appropriate for a professional school) had to prevail, but hopefully the successful candidate would be an Australian with overseas experience, and be female to provide gender balance at the senior level and a professional role model for so many of our students.

In the event, we short-listed four of the applicants – a 40-year old from Canada, with substantial US experience, a 43-year old from the UK, an Australian 35-year old with a doctorate from the university of Michigan, and a 44-year old British social worker who was currently teaching in Australia. All were male. While each applicant had much to offer, the last one, Ron Baker, had relevant education, practice and teaching experience, both in England and Australia – and was engaged in developing a unitary or general/generic approach to social work theory and practice at a new School of Social Work at Monash University in Melbourne. Although he did not have a doctorate, he was clearly the most promising candidate.

Ron Baker

Ron was one of the people invited to take part in the 1977 series on people's careers in social work.¹⁰¹ He had a remarkable story to tell:

I was born in 1932, in Berlin, Germany. My father was a milliner and I had a brother who was five years older than myself. When the Nazis came to power our family was split up. My father was deported to Poland. In 1940 he joined the French underground resistance movement, was caught in 1941, and sent to Auschwitz concentration camp. My mother remained in Berlin but my brother and I were sent to Holland to be fostered by different families. When the Nazis were at the point of overwhelming Holland, I, along with several other children, were herded into a boys' camp. Just prior to the Germans taking over this camp some of the children were spirited away, and I was fortunate enough to be one of them. We were escorted through the firing line in Amsterdam docks to an old Chinese cargo ship, and I found out years later that this was one of the last boats to get away from Europe in 1940. After a week on the high seas I found myself as a refugee in Liverpool, England. My brother was less fortunate. He was sent to Auschwitz where he and my father met their end in the gas ovens.

... I was fostered with the Bakers, had all my primary and secondary schooling in Salford, which is the sister town to Manchester in the north of England. I managed to gain a scholarship to Salford Technical College, hated it and left at 15.

My only real interest at school was sport, and I became skilled enough to play cricket and soccer for the school and table tennis for England's junior and senior teams. From 15 to 22 my activities ranged across a number of different pursuits. I became an apprentice mattress maker in the small family business owned by the Bakers, I played table tennis for Manchester United, Lancashire and England for almost 7 days a week, and developed an interest in philosophy.

Sam, father of one of Ron's peer group, became a major figure in his adolescence. Completely self-taught, Sam 'had a keen mind and an endless capacity for discussion'. They became close friends and Ron attended with him for three years an evening philosophy course provided by the Manchester University extra mural department. Most of the time Ron did not understand the topics and issues under discussion, but it sowed a seed. 'Increasingly I was asking questions about myself, about the world, about the nature of the experiences I had had, and what I wanted to do with my life'. The appeal of being a front-line sportsman had lost its gloss and he was not attracted to becoming a comfortable businessman if he 'played his cards right'. He chose to become a student nurse living in a mental hospital for six challenging years and completed both the mental and general nursing certificates.

He came to realise that 'systematic and disciplined caring could help people', and that 'hard work and discipline required to achieve success in sport were equally applicable to learning'. Increasingly, however, he realised that nursing was too confined for him; he wanted to focus on the social context of his own

101 'Ron Baker', *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, UNSW School of Social Work, 1978, pp. 47–57. Most of what follows about his life and career up to 1977 is drawn from this source.

and other people's lives. He read widely, undertook correspondence courses, and gained entry at 29 years of age to the two-year diploma of social studies at the University of Leicester. This was followed by the one-year certificate of psychiatric social work at the University of Manchester. His first social work job was in the Shropshire Education Department's school psychological service, 1963/4.

Ron and Karin began their life-long love-affair at Leicester and were married in 1964, 'perhaps the most significant thing of my life'. (Karin also had an original German family background, and was brought up in England after the war.) In 1977, Ron testified:

So much that was missing in my earlier years by way of safe, consistent and mutually satisfying relationships has become a reality over these years. Karin has been, and is, a mainstay of my personal life.

In 1964, they were 'young, footloose, loved travelling and camping, and the assisted passage scheme for Poms ... was very attractive'. They went to Perth, because they loved sunshine. From October 1964 until July 1968, Ron worked as a senior psychiatric social worker in the W.A. mental health services, located at a child guidance clinic – 'a most professionally satisfying and enriching experience'. At the clinic, the team was relatively stable, experience was consolidated, and 'genuine respect between the various disciplines could develop'. 'Clients received a systematic, disciplined and expert service'. In addition, Ron was involved in a variety of other professional initiatives. At the personal level, both their children (Ruth and David) were born, they bought their first home, made a range of personal friends, and Ron returned to playing table tennis.¹⁰² He had never worked or played harder in his life.

Encouraged to take on increasing professional responsibilities, he was getting involved in aspects of practice, research, administration and teaching for which he had little training. With a commitment to the development of competent practice and practice education, he was not interested in a master's or PhD by research only, or for its own sake. What he was looking for was a course in advanced casework and groupwork, in practice research and assessment, in development of administrative skills, and in education for social work practice. He found it in the MA in applied social studies at Bradford University back in England. Reluctantly they sold up in Perth, but Ron's job was kept open in the W.A. mental health service for they intended to return after the completion of the degree.

The contrast between the grey drabness of the Bradford/Leeds area in Yorkshire and sunny Perth was stark, but the course was exactly what he wanted and needed. Ron was working as a senior social worker in the family guidance centre of the Leeds Education Department while undertaking the course. The teachers in the course included a group of experienced and committed practice educators. A group of nine students, all at about the same stage of experience and professional development, became a very close support system and they

102 He was captain-coach of the Western Australian table-tennis squad 1965–68, and was ranked fifth after a successful national championship in Melbourne in 1966.

decided to continue their close association. Ron was the only one to leave the country but still kept in touch with them as they moved into senior social work positions in the United Kingdom. They were a close supportive friendship system, as well as providing valuable professional linkages.

At the end of his MA course, although Ron could have returned to his job in the mental health services in Perth, and Wally Tauss had written to him about a lectureship in the Social Work Department at the University of Western Australia, Ron and Karin decided to stay in the UK for the time being. Both their children were now settled in primary school, and Ron received an offer 'too good to refuse' for he was now sure he wanted to be a social work practice educator. He was invited to apply for a lectureship in applied social studies in the Bradford school.

1970 in the UK was a time of massive change and exciting developments in the social welfare field. The Seebom recommendations had been accepted and the new Social Service Departments were being set up around the country. There were lucrative positions available for aspiring social workers as Directors of Social Service Departments, as well as senior jobs within these departments as researchers, educators and advanced direct service practitioners. Most of my contemporaries moved into these roles. By comparison, the educator role on a professional social work course was not very popular. The pay was relatively poor and the degree of exposure demanded by the job meant that teaching positions did not attract many applicants. Nevertheless, for me the opportunity and challenge it presented was very exciting. I would be assisted and eased into a new role in a department which I was also at home with.

Noel Timms was appointed to the chair and head of school at about the same time as Ron was appointed lecturer.

For Ron, the lectureship proved a 'sound decision' for his professional development and he received great support from his colleagues, but it took him 'over three years to feel right in the job'. Two things he had not bargained for – the loss of feelings for clients and being located in an agency, and the nature of the teaching role itself.

It's a job I would not recommend to anyone unless they have total commitment and are prepared to be constantly challenged, both constructively and negatively. It also demands a form of mental discipline which I have not found in any other job. The lecturer's role is part teaching, part research and part administration. Throw in the tension that develops between the diverse pulls of being committed to disadvantaged and distressed people and to expectations of scholarship and rationality, and you have the potential for intolerable stress.

Ron was teaching and coordinating the 3-year human development sequence and teaching casework at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. The need, however, was to prepare multi-role practitioners in the new, sometimes very large, social service departments. Ron found 'a fragmented profession with little sense of unity, common theoretical base or generally agreed purpose', so he set about identifying and amplifying what is the core of social work practice at its most basic – its primary values, purposes, knowledge bases, roles and

tasks. He discovered a small group of people were engaged on the same quest of developing a unitary social work frame of reference which could be used in social work curricula, in practice and in agency organisation.

After extended discussion with Peter Boss the professor designate for a new Social Work Department at Monash University in Melbourne, Ron was offered a senior lectureship to develop and coordinate the theory and practice of the social work program at the undergraduate level and to formulate and coordinate the MSW course. In August 1974, the Bakers arrived in Melbourne. Ron, Marie Campbell, Peter Boss and Cliff Picton, 'began the massive task of setting up a new department and establishing credibility on the Victorian social work scene'.

It was a high risk venture. My framework and curriculum design had not been tried before and here we were, four Poms developing a new school in another country.

One school (at the University of Melbourne) had had a monopoly for 34 years. By the end of 1975 there were three schools and another in the offing. Monash restricted its intake to 40, all applicants were interviewed, an individual tutorial system was built into the program, and along with the BSW course parallel courses for field instructors were run for field instructors. The staff worked incredibly hard but were rewarded by the enthusiasm and motivation which the new program produced in both students and practitioners.

This briefly, then, was Ron Baker's history when he applied for our second chair at UNSW. To Ron, the job seemed exactly what he had been doing at Monash – the promotion and development of social work theory, practice and research. This would be the first chair in social work practice in Australia and he knew of no similar chair in Britain, and it would be in a school that was 'highly esteemed in Sydney and Australia'. The decision to apply, however, came only after lengthy family discussion about whether they should return to the UK.

In April 1976, I had acted as a referee for an ARGC grant for a research study, 'Consumer, Agency and Policy: perspectives on the services provided by the Family Welfare Division of the Victorian Welfare Department'.

This is an original and timely project. There is currently in Australia much expressed concern but little data about the way consumers view social welfare services, and about consumers' influence on policy and services compared with the influence of the service providers. In addition, because the new national government is prescribing a strengthened social welfare role of the states, the setting of the proposed study is the more significant. We badly need carefully researched reality instead of rhetoric not only to understand these aspects of our society better but to make well-informed changes in our social welfare arrangements.

An attractive feature of the project is its proposed extension into other divisions of the Social Welfare Department and other types of agencies. Its comparative possibilities are exciting. A series of such studies could make a most significant contribution to a number of fields of study including not only social work and social welfare, but others such as public administration, organisation theory, and social stratification.

Ron Baker was one of the three instructors for the proposed study and I

testified that I held him in high personal and professional regard. To assist me in my assessment of the proposal, Ron had sent me the curriculum vitae of each of them. I had met him at the 1975 AASW conference, but this was the first time I had detailed knowledge of his professional background and began to think about him as prospect for our school. The Baker family stayed with the Lawrence family for a long week-end in July, 1976.

Professor Peter Boss at Monash University thought Ron was ready and worthy of a chair. He was particularly strong in the development of theory where his future contribution was likely. He had a capacity to inspire his students. They had a real respect for him as a teacher. As a colleague, he was warm and generous, with a bubbling wit which was infectious. Professor Edna Chamberlain at the university of Queensland said we were fortunate to have someone of his calibre working in Australia and able to test out theory against practice in our community. She hoped that any move he made from his present position would not take him out of the country. Lack of a doctorate was a disadvantage, but given the relatively small pool of experienced and qualified social work academics from which applications could be expected she believed Ron Baker's application should be seriously considered. His interests complemented mine. In combination we would be 'likely to enhance the standing of an already excellent school of social work'.

Professor Noel Timms also thought Ron Baker was worthy of serious consideration. The major characteristic of his teaching and writing was that he remained firmly rooted in and loyal to the demands of practice and the problems people presented to social workers. He was a good and thorough teacher, an able administrator, and someone with research ideas and a growing body of publications. He had been 'somewhat surprised' by the way his published work had blossomed. If he had been asked about Ron Baker 3 or 4 years ago, he would not have written as he now did. He thought he had developed considerably.

Because of brief uncertainty about the financial situation, UNSW did not inform Ron about the success of his application until 20 December. While they waited for the decision, they had driven to Perth, to discover more of Australia, to renew old friendships, and to say goodbye to Teddy Stockbridge¹⁰³ who was close to death. After giving Monash the required 6-month notice, he joined us at UNSW in early July 1977.¹⁰⁴ A news release from the university in May, announced his appointment, and provided a brief statement about him which I had checked with Ron. It stated: 'His major interest is the development of a general theory of social work practice and its application in Australian condition'. His table tennis prowess was mentioned.

With the proceeds of the sale of their house in Melbourne, Ron and Karin bought a terrace house in Paddington. Karin was an excellent teacher of

103 Teddie Stockbridge was the social worker in the child guidance clinic in Perth, where Ron had worked during his time in Perth. In 1965, she left to found the Department of Social Work in the University of W.A.. She was originally from England.

104 His induction included meetings with in turn, Al Willis (pro-vice-chancellor and acting dean of the Faculty of Professional Studies), Rupert Myers (vice-chancellor and principal), Rex Vowels (pro-vice-chancellor), Keith Jennings (registrar), and Tom Daly (bursar).

modern languages (French and German), and was soon appointed to a well-known private girls school. Their children went to Sydney Girls' and Sydney Boys' High Schools, academically selective schools.

After just 14 weeks into his job, Ron gave his first impressions.¹⁰⁵ His new colleagues were friendly, 'though look tired and overworked'. 'The much larger student body than I am used to mitigates against knowing every student personally, which I regret, and which I believe is unsound educationally in a social work course'. 'There is no shortage of paper within the university, or Australia, judging by the mass of it that floods over my desk each week'.¹⁰⁶ He had so far met with nearly 100 practitioners and, as in Melbourne, 'the state of social work practice and teaching leaves much to be desired'. He then listed a number of needed changes –

- More social workers needed to be working with the dependent aged, the skid-row homeless, the poverty-stricken, disadvantaged ethnic minorities, aborigines, adolescents, self-help groups and those dependent on alcohol and drugs, and not be primarily located in traditional medically-oriented 'treatment' facilities.
- Social workers needed to be more visible and assertive in the media on behalf of their clients.
- Social workers needed to use their creative imagination to reach out to people and offer services wherever people congregate, e.g. in pubs, industry, post offices, shopping complexes, markets, libraries, football and race meetings, surf carnival, etc.
- Social workers need to see themselves as part of the same profession and be able to state simply, clearly and with conviction what they do, how they do it, and why they do it in a particular way.
- Social work educators need to be as committed to becoming good educators as they are to the particular subject that they research or teach.
- Social workers need to have three or four years in a multi-service agency, consolidating their knowledge and skill assisted by a senior social worker, before becoming a specialist worker.

In September 1977, after extensive informal discussion with staff and students, and between ourselves, Ron and I produced a joint statement of some proposals for 1978 – for preliminary discussion at a staff meeting, and for more extended discussion at the staff conference in November. We identified 16 concerns and made proposals to deal with them.¹⁰⁷ Ron and I worked well together and I welcomed having another senior person to share discussion of the overall direction of the school. I had been head of school for nine years and was looking forward to Ron being able to take over in the not-too-distant future. I thought his article 'Social Work: Some Myths and Realities', *Careers NSW First Term 1978*, p. 7, was excellent – informative, clear, realistic and

¹⁰⁵ See p. 177, footnote 101.

¹⁰⁶ Peter Boss had mentioned that he had 'not hitherto been tested in the myriad minutiae of departmental administration', although he had shown high competence in the organisation of courses, classes and field work.

¹⁰⁷ Ron Baker and John Lawrence, 'Some Proposals for 1978', UNSW School of Social Work, 23/9/77.

positive, reflecting the various dimensions of modern social work practice. It tackled five myths –

- 'Anyone with a wish to help people, with time available, with some life experience and sensitivity, can be a social worker'.
- 'Social work is only concerned with helping people who have personal or family problems'.
- 'Social workers only work in a collaborative way with others'.
- 'A social work course is like any other in the university'.
- 'There are always jobs for social workers'.

The article was reproduced in a broad-sheet and was widely distributed.

Ron Baker's presence and input provided stimulus for various changes in 1978 in the practice subjects and in the running of the school. It was, however, a difficult process trying to get people to share his enthusiasm for a unitary model of social work practice both amongst his teaching colleagues in the school and in the agencies, and amongst social work administrators. Inevitably he encountered resistance. When it was open and argued he could tackle it head-on, but not when it was passive and hostile. We held a well-attended general conference at which Ron explained and defended the changes being made in the practice subjects, but clearly he and those who agreed with him had a lot of work ahead of them.

Just before starting his study leave in mid-1979, Ron and I had a full and frank discussion based on a memo he had prepared for me on his experience of the school, his present and future role, and his impressions of social work practice in Sydney.

He had spent about 55–65 hours a week on matters directly connected with teaching, program development and planning, staff support and school organisation, but had not time to undertake important administrative roles, for example, on the professorial board and the higher degree committee. He had given 7 papers and published 5 articles but had insufficient time for personal research. By serving as subject coordinator of social work practice IA (SWP IA), and SWP IIA, and supporting and advising new staff taking on these roles, the structure on which to build had been laid. However, how these courses related to SWP IIIA, the electives, left a great deal to be desired, and the content and the way the electives were taught was a major concern. Ron was frustrated by the lack of genuine teamwork amongst some of the staff. The size of the student body, personalities of staff, the lack of sufficient senior and experienced educators, and the nature of social work, might all be part of this, but Ron experienced it as a lack of academic collegiality, genuine warmth between colleagues, and 'a sense of excitement and commitment about what we are doing together'. Most of the staff functioned in highly individualistic ways often engaged in outside commitments. They needed to record and share with others what they were doing. Ron knew that I was usually 'flat out', but had the impression I was not visible enough in the school or obviously involved with local policy and practice issues. More joint research activities within the school would rapidly improve morale.

Ron had experienced our relationship as supportive with open communication.

'Your careful, if at times pedantic analysis of situations, is a good antidote to my more immediate, sometime intuitive response'. Ron regretted that we rarely got down to serious discussion about important matters. 'I know that you are probably even busier than I am but if we don't make time for such discussion we are inevitably forced into a reactive rather than proactive position'.

I was distressed when Ron said that, with the exception of me, he had experienced little manifest goodwill, acceptance of support of his role, or acknowledgement of his efforts. The mass of material he had freely circulated to practitioners and staff was rarely mentioned let alone discussed.

After 9 years of teaching at the undergraduate level, Ron increasingly questioned its value. Generally the students were 'too young to benefit properly from what we teach them and very few are ready to deal with the demands of the job for several years'. Ideally, the undergraduate intake should be drastically reduced, and up to 75% should be maturer (older) students admitted on criteria wider than just HSC results.

Ron believed his future involvement at the undergraduate level should be as a consultant for SWPIA and SWPIIA. SWPIIIA needed a senior person as subject coordinator, but vested interests of elective coordinators was so strong and consolidated that he questioned whether he should take this on in 1980. A task force should examine the content and organisation of the electives in SWPIIIA. Ron himself would like to be teaching the casework elective. It was appropriate for Ron to be the coordinator of the MSW (by coursework), teaching mainly in advanced social work practice – general, and in the inter-personal and social work education options.

The role of the professor of social work practice (PSWP) had been experienced by him and many of his colleagues as ambiguous and equivocal. According to Ron, it seemed obvious that the school needed some written policies on the rights, responsibilities and accountability of the PSWP in the various relationships and involvements he might be expected to have: with the subject coordinators of the practice subjects; the elective coordinators in the final year; the content of these subjects; their curriculum design; the director of field education; the staff of the field education unit; students in placement; the content in field instructors' reports; the practitioners, field instructors, and senior social workers involved in the different aspects of the practice program; and the subject coordinators not directly involved in teaching practice. Finally, is the PSWP acting head of school when the head of school is away, and what are the powers of the PSWP when acting in this capacity?

Ron had located the various areas which he might be expected to influence as a new and first professor of social work practice in the school. However, he was new to the Sydney scene, was coming into an established educational program, not founding one as he had done at Monash, and was proposing a significant change in the teaching of practice. I had hoped and anticipated that he would develop appropriate constructive relationships in all of the areas he mentioned but not surprised when he encountered initial resistance. I did not think it was a good idea to try to put in writing, and as matter of formal authority, what form these various relationships ought to take. This needed to evolve amongst the various interested parties paying due respect to their

respective roles and responsibilities in an academic setting.

Ron's impressions of social work practice in Sydney reflected dismay and frustration. There were a handful of professionally committed, articulate social workers.

Sadly some of these develop prima donna characteristics and go into private practice. Some openly state that they do not call themselves social workers because it would be detrimental to their credibility and job and others move out of the main stream of social work thus depriving colleagues and clients of their knowledge and skills which are desperately needed.

Generally he found practitioners unable to articulate their knowledge and/or skill base. There was almost a conspiracy of silence about competence and standards of practice. 'Whatever the reasons¹⁰⁸ it is my view that our discipline is in a parlous state in New South Wales'. Ron doubted whether the majority of practitioners, and educators for that matter, really wanted him around.

My way of challenging people to face reality and contradictions in their practice, to be in touch with practice theory, to be accountable, to document what they do, to be proud to be a social worker, to question everything, to be committed beyond talk and act, to enter into constructive conflict, more often than not goes down like a lead balloon!

On his return from study leave, he saw himself as needing to be much more visible in agencies and actively involved in research, educational and consultancy roles with social workers 'on the job'.

Ron was fully aware that he had focused on the obstacles and barriers that were frustrating him, and that he may have overstated and misinterpreted aspects of the situation. 'No doubt you will tell me'. There had been the excitement and challenges that the school presented, and it had been a pleasure to meet new people and make real friendships with some of them, although at the social level things had been very slow.

In conclusion, Ron said he had freely communicated his thoughts and feelings about social work and social workers whenever he believed this would stir people to develop insights, competence, and collective practice. Perhaps he had done this too freely. He welcomed my comments on whether his strategies and style had helped or hindered the process. He had no objection to his comments being shared with school colleagues if this could lead to something constructive.

I had an extended productive discussion on his memo with Ron Baker on 11 June. In fact, I shared many of his concerns but not always his interpretations and we did not think it would be constructive to share his memo with colleagues in the school.

From 15 June, 1979 to 4 January, 1980, Ron was on a special studies program studying innovatory curriculum designs for teaching social work practice in USA and Europe, and studying simulation materials and methods used to teach practice skills assessing their relevance for the Australian context.

108 He suggested various reasons, including attracting the wrong people into social work (too young, too middle class, overwhelmingly female, too naively religious).

He reported that it was ‘enormously valuable and professionally stimulating’. Wherever he went he experienced active and lively debate on major social work issues and became aware of a range of relevant research in progress that had not been reported elsewhere. He found it reassuring that many of the issues we faced in Australia were the same or similar in California.¹⁰⁹ In the UK, he was based at the National Institute for Social Work (NISW) in London and linked with colleagues at the Universities of Bradford, Leeds, Newcastle, and in the Derbyshire Social Service Department. For three weeks in September, he visited the secretariat of the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) in Vienna. On his return to London, he spent three challenging and satisfying months at the Institute which had developed ‘an enviable reputation for social work practice research’, as well as offering a range of post basic educational programs to qualified social workers and educators. The latter programs were of special interest because Ron had developed and coordinated the Summer Studies Program at our school in February 1979. Ron was invited by the NISW to give two 3-day workshops and to give seminars in various other places. This was Ron’s first sabbatical after 10 years of university teaching. He felt stimulated and enriched; he had made important international contacts that would be of benefit to the School, the University, Australian social work, and himself.¹¹⁰

Ron wrote from London in August 1979, giving me details of their very successful time in the United States, and now in England.

England is beautiful as ever despite the intermittent rain and a planned £4000 million cutback on educational and social services being perpetrated by Thatcher.¹¹¹

In a long letter to him in October, with enclosures, I told him about various ‘things on the go’ back home.¹¹² First enclosure was the document the acting dean of our faculty, Ray Golding, had asked heads of schools to prepare.¹¹³

Please let me know urgently if you have any major reservation or disagreement so that I can feed this into the discussion with the dean and the other heads of schools. I would, of course, have much preferred to have been able to discuss the report with you before submitting it, but time and distance made this impossible. I have tried to reflect much of our previous joint discussion together. As I sense it, we are going to be hard put to hold on to what we have, yet we must try to achieve some improvement in at least the areas designated.

Ron Baker wrote a long letter in response to my letter which, as mentioned, had included the above report as an attachment.

Thank you for your welcome and informative letter. As always you seem to fill

109 He visited Berkeley and San Francisco state universities, the University of Southern California, and the University College of Los Angeles. In his subsequent visit to Columbia University in New York, he collected course materials but hardly any staff or students were there because of the summer vacation.

110 ‘Report of Special Studies Program Undertaken by Professor Ron Baker – School of Social Work’, to the secretary of council, UNSW, 1980.

111 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 1/8/79.

112 Letter, John Lawrence to Ron Baker, 5/10/79.

113 See pp. 109–14.

every waking moment on professional matters. I was particularly impressed with the first document and the clarity with which it presented an up-to-date profile of the school and our projected needs over the next 5 years. Well done! It's a pity more people are not aware of the asset you are to Australian social work in general, and the school in particular.

It's good to hear that the school progresses without too many hassles at present. Have there been any pressures or movements to mount a series of ongoing public debates on unitary practice this session as some were pushing before I went away?

Ron went on to respond to various staffing matters I had raised with him and to discuss his teaching preferences for 1980. He was pleased to hear that both June Huntington and Margaret Lewis were applying for senior lecture-ship positions. Both had strong cases. If both were promoted it would go a long way to provide balance in terms of senior people within our teaching team.¹¹⁴ In the rest of my letter to Ron on 5 October, I mentioned that Austin Hukins had become our dean, and added other items of news:

The various meetings in Melbourne in August went reasonably well – the meeting of the Standing Committee of Heads of Schools of Social Work which generally endorsed Enclosure 2; the IFSW(A) and ARASWE Seminar at which I presented Enclosure 3; the ICSW Regional Conference; and a special national seminar on the Social Security Appeals system, which I have followed up with Enclosure 4, at the invitation of the seminar's chairman, Mr Justice Kirby. One very successful venture was the School having Dr Armaity Desai from India, outgoing President of ARASWE, and Miss Cora de Leon, Regional Director, Department of Social Services and Development in the Phillipines, as Visiting Fellows for 3 weeks. The first two weeks were spent in attending the international regional meetings in Melbourne, and the third week was spent in the School, each giving a staff seminar, a lecture to final year BSW students, talking with individual staff, and jointly talking at a special meeting of the AASW. With Ray Golding's approval, I used money from the School's Special Research Funds for these appointments, and I believe it proved money very well spent.

The Scarba Review Committee of the Benevolent Society, which you will recall I am chairing, which includes Mary McLelland and Bert Sucgang, has been working hard and well, and we have almost reached the stage of making firm decisions on recommendations to the Board.

In two weeks' time, I am involved in the Selection Committee for the staff of the Social Welfare Research Centre, and the first meeting of the Centre's Advisory Committee is at the end of October. There has been an overwhelming response to advertisement for staff.

There is much else to talk about, but hopefully what I have said above helps to keep you in the picture here. Generally, things are going reasonably well in the school and I can't think of any major hassles. I am even putting myself at considerable risk on Saturday night by participating in the School Review!¹¹⁵

114 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 12/10/79.

115 Letter, John Lawrence to Ron Baker, 5/10/79.

Ron was in very good spirits on his return to the school, but to my disappointment he did not wish for the foreseeable future to become head of school. He had obviously benefited greatly from his study leave, and had increased confidence to function internationally. A new activity for him back in Sydney was being a founding member and convenor of a new Amnesty International group. In July 1980, he and I both went to the IASSW and ICSW meetings in Hong Kong, and stayed in the same hotel. He was excellent company and we enjoyed discussing our experiences of the meetings. Later in 1980, he informed me that he wished to return to Britain. After living there when Ron was on study leave, Karin and his daughter Ruth were keen to return. In his letter of resignation to Rupert Myers, he stated 'for family and educational reasons my wife, children, and I have decided to return to Britain'. Working at UNSW had been a stimulating experience and he felt privileged to have been associated with the development of one of the leading professional social work schools in Australia.¹¹⁶

In a letter to *The Bulletin* in April 1981, Ron Baker targeted an article 'Warfare Over Social Welfare' by Tony Abbott:

The author draws fallacious conclusions from several incorrect facts and uses the opinions of three people to make generalisations about social work practice and education in Australia which are mostly invalid. ...

The whole tenor of Abbott's paper is a frontal attack on social work practice and education in its context of welfare programs that require large scale public expenditure. Social workers are sanctioned by society to deal in sensitive and relevant ways with people who are deprived, disadvantaged, disturbed and stigmatised. In many respects social work does society's 'dirty work' as it attempts to prevent or deal with the effects of poverty, unemployment, domestic violence, child abuse, racism, sexism and other violations of human rights. Such work is demanding and frustrating. It requires highly developed capacities of self-discipline and the ability to utilise knowledge and skills in humane ways. Such attributes can be taught systematically and are learnt usually over a number of years in well-constructed social work programs in universities.

It would be a regressive step if Abbott's mischievous article were taken to be more than the petty polemic it is.¹¹⁷

At a forum on social work practice at the University of Sydney just before he left for England, Ron Baker declared:

I decided over 22 years ago that I wanted to do social work. The reasons were many, and the conscious ones most people here would no doubt share,

1. It was concerned with assisting powerless, disadvantaged, and disturbed people.
2. Its rhetoric spelled out a belief in the uniqueness of people, the right of every person to exist, to have their basic needs met, and the right to be heard irrespective of their class, colour, sex, religion or socio-economic status.

116 Letter, Professor Ron Baker to Professor Rupert Myers, vice-chancellor, UNSW, 3/11/80.

117 Letter, Ron Baker to the Editor, *The Bulletin*, 7/4/81.

3. It was an advocate for human rights and ideologically at least challenged social injustice and inequities of all kinds.
4. It had to do with change: preventing it occurring or promoting it in and between people, and the social systems which affect us all.

In my 10 years as a practitioner and 12 years as a practice teacher I guess these values and statements of intent have remained fundamentally important to me, and are the reasons why I am still in social work today.

I see myself not as a past practitioner who is now an academic teaching social work practice, but as a social worker who happens to be located in a university.

I have seen social work described as an occupation, a profession, and a discipline. My commitment to it is primarily as a discipline of practice which views the human condition and society in particular ways and has an identifiable body of knowledge, values, and skills, which can be systematically taught and learned over many years. ...

What one rapidly learns through what I call 'practice shock' is that our splendid philosophical and ideological commitments are one thing, to achieve them is another! In the 80+ years that social work has been developing as a discipline it has a relatively poor track record in demonstrating its effectiveness.

Ron had reached a number of tentative beliefs about social work which he offered for discussion:

- Social work practice is a vehicle for social welfare policy but not totally dominated by it.
- Social work practice seems inextricably connected to one or a number of ideological positions adopted by a practitioner, however, what the connection actually is between an ideology, a practice act, and an outcome is poorly understood and so far has not been thoroughly researched.
- Social work practice needs to be understood in terms of the functions it may play in a capitalistic state. This includes having a real understanding of the place of class and power and the way these influence assumptions underlying social welfare programs and social work practice. By itself however such understanding is not enough.
- Social workers need to be aware of the ways in which social control can be used to benefit as well as enslave the people we are supposed to serve.¹¹⁸

Ron, Karin, Ruth and David Baker left us for England in mid-June.

In response to Ron's letter of appreciation for the farewell we had given them, I wrote to Ron in August that we were anxiously waiting to hear where they would be settling and how the future looked. Before they left Sydney, they very successfully sold their Paddington terrace-house to Ita Buttrose, and this gave them a financial buffer while they were looking for jobs, housing and schooling in the UK. In the interim they were living in a camper-van. Because of Thatcher government cut-backs, the job situation was frustrating and depressing. I wrote a very positive reference for him when he did find

118 Ron Baker, 'Notes for forum at Sydney University in social work practice', 9/6/81. Ron sent me these for my 'interest and information'. Each of his tentative beliefs had some elaboration in the Notes.

something that looked a possibility, and attempted to adapt my comments to the advertised position, but it was to no avail. For example, for a senior lectureship at the University of East Anglia, I wrote:

... He has taken a special interest in the development of more adequate practice theory and he is very much alive to the many issues involved in trying to make more educationally effective the 'practical' or 'field education' component of a social work course.

I think he would enjoy working in a program of your size. He came to us from the Monash University Department of Social Work which was much smaller and more manageable than ours. It has taken him some time to come to terms with the size of our program and of the university (the largest in Australia), and I believe he still has a firm preference for working in a smaller, more manageable environment.

Ron Baker has been a particularly congenial senior colleague and I am going to miss his humour, reliability, support, and hard work.

I cannot imagine a better qualified applicant for the advertised position in your program.¹¹⁹

In March 1982, I received a request for a reference when Ron Baker was short-listed for the post of principal of the National Institute for Social Work. (I knew David Jones, the current principal, who was retiring in July.) The listed responsibilities of the post and the personal attributes considered to be of prime importance were formidable. Ron realised it was a long-shot, but was delighted to have been short-listed. In my comments on his suitability for the position, I repeated that I thought he still had a firm preference for working in a smaller, manageable environment. Clearly the National Institute had a wide variety of activities and challenges, which would involve the principal in large, complicated and rather uncertain environments. Ron had not as yet had direct large-scale administrative responsibility. Further, despite his work on unitary practice models, he was less well read and experienced in policy development and broad organisational matters than in more 'micro' aspects of social work and social welfare.

I have no question about Ron Baker's whole-hearted commitment to social work or to both basic and continuing education. In my understanding he has a sound knowledge of the so-called 'personal social services' in Britain, but I am not sure how imaginatively he might be able to give leadership on how these might articulate more effectively with the other social service systems operating in Britain, and what role an organisation like the National Institute could play in reviewing and influencing these matters.

It would obviously be desirable for the Principal to be highly qualified academically and to be seen to be so, both within and outside the National Institute.

119 I wrote this reference in March. The position was subsequently 'frozen', and then readvertised as a 3-year contract, with interviews delayed to at the end of July. The person appointed was not an experienced university teacher or specifically committed to social work. 'Having been a university lecturer for 12 years it seems doesn't count for much when you have the ear of the DHSS and can command research funds.' Ron was told informally that 'this was a major political factor which of course the universities are having to take into account in the current bleak economic climate'. Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 23/8/81.

Ron Baker has not experienced the sustained scholarship required by a doctoral study, but his own writing program has to a substantial extent provided a substitute. His special interests in the development of generic social work theory and in conceptualising and learning professional skills obviously would contribute to the work of the National Institute. So too would his recent and developing interests in work with refugees.

... I consider Ron Baker would have a great deal to contribute to the position, but have suggested some aspects of his application which the Selection Panel might pursue with him. Clearly the Principal's job is a crucial one for our profession in the United Kingdom, and to some extent more generally. It will be a rare person indeed, who can fill all the specifications for the position.

After 3½ unsettled months of living in a motor caravan and 'grotty rented accommodation', the Bakers bought a semi-detached Victorian house in Guilford, 'an old town nicely situated in superb walking country, and 29 miles from London'. The children settled well into a large, comprehensive school, but at first were shaken by the somewhat higher academic standards expected of them than they experienced at Sydney Boys and Sydney Girls High schools. At the end of December, Ron wrote a very enthusiastic letter about the first-ever family get-together – in their home amidst wonderful snow for Christmas, 'a marvellous opportunity for the younger members of the family to get to know each other'. Against stiff competition and massive teacher unemployment, Karin had been appointed as head of German at the Henrietta Barnet school, established by the Barnet family of Toynbee Hall and COS fame. The school had a fine academic tradition but was a long way from Guilford. From 6 January 1982, every day Karin would be travelling 3-hours by train, tube and bus to get there. Ron was 'endlessly busy, but not in (full-time) paid employment'. His activities included: an invited submission to the current national inquiry into roles and tasks of social workers; running workshops at the NISW on burnout in social work practice; an invited consultancy to Refugee Action (formerly connected to Save the Children Fund) to develop training programs for interpreters. He had been invited to prepare a paper for the genocide and holocaust conference in Israel in June, 1982. His paper on 'Generic Social Work – Obstacles to its Development in Practice and Education' had been accepted for the IASSW conference in Brighton in August, 1982. Ron hoped that I would be attending the conference and would stay with them.¹²⁰

Ron reported that they were all thriving and he was enormously busy when he wrote in February 1982. Work of all kinds was coming in which was enjoyable and very stimulating. This included a 2-day a week consultancy with the Ockenden Venture, one of the main refugee organisations in the UK.¹²¹ He had just completed examining for us an MSW thesis by Beth Stevenson, who had been the director of field education in the school. In May, I thanked him for his excellent report on behalf of Richard Roberts to the committee reviewing his appointment in the school. Ron's paper 'The refugee experience:

120 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 29/12/81.

121 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 25/2/82.

communication and stress – past impressions of a survivor’, on ethical grounds (the middle east war), was not given to the Israel conference in June 1982. He did, however, present it at the British Refugee Council and at an IASSW research seminar in Brighton.

When I stayed with the Bakers before the international meetings in Brighton, Ron told me about his research job with the British Refugee Council, which combined well with his Ockenden Venture work. To get me over my jet lag, they took me on a memorable long very wet walk on the Pilgrim’s Way. Guilford and its surrounding countryside was certainly a most attractive location for them.

In a letter in May 1985, Ron Baker wrote that the last four years had been very professionally and personally satisfying, and he sent me a package of what he had written for my interest and to show he had not been idle. As well as his refugee work, he been teaching part-time at LSE, had had a great deal of consultancy/tutoring work in the National Institute and in statutory and voluntary agencies up and down the country, had given invited papers in Germany, and had conducted 76 workshops and study days on stress in social work. It was just what he needed to re-establish himself in the UK. After commuting for three years, they were selling their home in Guilford. Karin was now very well established in the school at Hampstead Garden Suburb in London; her pupils in ‘O’ level German had achieved exceptional results. They would like to live nearby if they could afford it.¹²²

In September 1985, Ron was appointed head of the Richmond Fellowship College in West London and assistant director of the Fellowship, ‘a rapidly growing national and international organisation doing important mental health community care work’. He was responsible for some teaching and all the training and staff development programs. In January 1986 he reported that he felt privileged to be associated with the Fellowship, and that he was enjoying it immensely. In December 1985, they had moved into ‘a delightful cottage’ in Hampstead Garden Suburb. Created by Henrietta Barnett, the suburb was a conservation area on the edge of Hampstead Heath. They had easy access to art galleries, theatres and concerts, and planned to eat in every curry house in London. We were urged to come and stay with them and enjoy some time together.¹²³ This, however, did not eventuate until the late 1990s when both Ron and I were formally retired. Christmas greetings and news have kept us in touch. Ron and Karin have spent their time in retirement doing a great deal of travelling and walking, and enjoying their grandchildren. Their children completed masters degrees – Ruth in clinical psychology at Exeter university and David in developmental economics at Manchester university. They flourished in their subsequent careers in England, although both had hankerings after Australia, and Karin has told us that Ruth may even live in Sydney again when her own children were older. Sadly we did not see Ron again; he was diagnosed

122 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 22/5/85. Ron was devastated to hear of Mel Weinstock’s sudden death. Mel was the head of the UNSW School of Librarianship when Ron was with us. He and his wife Ruth were friends of the Bakers.

123 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 5/1/86.

with terminal cancer, managing to survive long enough to enjoy the London 2012 Olympics. A couple of long, international telephone conversations near the end were my last contacts with Ron.

Another Professorial Appointment in the School

I wrote to Ron Baker in mid-August 1981, with the news of the appointment of Tony Vinson to the chair of social work vacated by Ron.

The selection committee was in fact the last one chaired by Rupert Myers, and we were in fact very lucky he agreed to do so, otherwise there could have been a considerable delay which might have jeopardised our making the appointment that we did. In the event, the appointment was seen as quite clear-cut, and there was considerable support for it both in the School and outside. After extensive discussion with Tony, I am confident that it should work out well. Certainly I will be doing all I can to make it a success, and he has given every indication he will be doing likewise.¹²⁴

... The general climate in the School is good at present, and long may it last. ... We seem to be making slow but steady head-way in the Social Work Practice Subjects Committee.¹²⁵

Ron wrote in response to my news:

... It was very pleasing to hear of Tony Vinson's appointment, particularly for your sake. Hopefully he will be able to take over in the not too distant future and give you a well-earned and much deserved break from the rigours of the head of school. I hope he will be able to offer the kind of social work practice leadership that we all agree is very much needed in New South Wales. Anyway, give him my sincerest congratulations on landing the job. I wish you both well. If the resolve and goodwill is there I have no doubt you will forge a really good working relationship together.

It was also good to hear of the steady progress of the Social Work Practice Committee, and the generally good atmosphere in the School. It just goes to show what can be achieved by the resignation of some staff!¹²⁶

Tony Vinson

On Tony Vinson's eventual retirement from the school in 1997, I recalled that in our discussion prior to his appointment in 1981, he and I had agreed not to allow others to play us off against each other, and to maintain an open, collaborative relationship, both for the sake of the school and our own peaces of mind.¹²⁷ In fact he and I became not only close colleagues, but also very good friends, which I understood from Tony was a rarity. I anticipated that we would, and would want to, continue to keep in touch during our respective 'retirements'. We have done so and have mutually enjoyed our numerous long

124 Letter, John Lawrence to Ron Baker, 14/8/81.

125 Letter, John Lawrence to Ron Baker, 14/8/81.

126 Letter, Ron Baker to John Lawrence, 23/8/81,

127 Letter, John Lawrence to Tony Vinson, 16/3/97. His actual farewell was on 23/4/97 when we would be overseas.

conversations about a variety of topics – the political scene, his current ventures and writing, religion, the Catholic church, my writing, life. Periodically we enjoy social occasions shared with our wives, Diana and Trish, and respective friends.

I never doubted Tony's commitment to social work, but had wondered about his commitment to the organised profession after his being caught up in Morven Brown's initial mess at UNSW and being on the receiving end of hostility from social workers in the AASW. When she was briefing me initially about the social work staff at UNSW, Norma Parker told me of his imaginative community work teaching, but she herself was unsure about his commitment to the organised profession. I had hoped Tony Vinson would stay with us and head up the community work teaching in the revised curriculum, giving the school strength in a social work method that was desperately short of qualified practitioners and teachers. However, in the third term of 1969, he moved to the senior lectureship in social administration which I had vacated at the University of Sydney. His sociological academic environment at UNSW had stimulated the developing breadth of his social concerns and extended his research capacities.¹²⁸

In a moving tribute at the funeral of Frank Hayes, Tony Vinson spoke of a fateful practical work placement he had with Frank Hayes in 1956, as a social work student in the parole service of the NSW Department of Prisons.

He showed me a vitality and openness to professional innovation, and a desire to contribute to the professional literature which I had not seen in any of my other practical work attachments ... I hadn't anticipated a career in corrections but after a few weeks observing Frank, no other career seemed possible.

Tony Vinson described Hayes as

a great Australian, one whose distaste for hypocrisy and pretensions was forged in the youthful experience of war in the Pacific and nurtured thereafter by sustained contact with the 'battlers' of this world – those who often have reason to suspect that law and authority come less as friends and protectors and more as hasslers and prodders in the life of the poor.

Frank Hayes built up the parole service and associated community activities. 'Prisoners and their problems do not fall from the sky. They come from families; they live in neighbourhoods, they belong to our communities'.

Tony Vinson worked with Hayes for five years as a parole officer in the NSW Department of Prisons (1957–62). His first links with UNSW were the diploma of sociology provided by Morven Brown's pioneering sociology department, a tutorship in that department, then the lectureship in community work in the new social work degree program at UNSW. As mentioned above, he left to occupy my former position of teaching social administration at the University of Sydney, in the third term of 1969.

In 1971, Tony returned to a prime focus on criminology and corrections, becoming the foundation director of the Bureau of Crime Statistics and

¹²⁸ See p. 157. In 1972, he was awarded a PhD in sociology from UNSW.

Research in the NSW Department of the Attorney-general and Justice. The bureau's reports were distributed widely in the judicial and parliamentary systems, to other researchers and to the general public, providing stimulus for informed social change. Similar units were later established in other Australian states. Vinson began to be recognised as a sound researcher and an effective communicator in the media.

Professor David Maddison recruited Tony Vinson in 1976 to be the foundation professor of behavioural science in medicine in the University of Newcastle's new medical course which used a problem-solving approach in its curriculum design. He successfully developed and implemented an acceptable admission system which went significantly beyond just recognition of applicants' academic marks. After taking up the chair of social work at UNSW in 1981, in 1983 a 'problem-solving' approach to teaching an introductory practice course was introduced. This was carefully evaluated by Vinson and three of our colleagues in an *Australian Social Work* article in 1986. It was typical of his approach to change – collaborative, research-based, balanced and evaluated.

In 1979, Tony Vinson accepted appointment as foundation director of the Social Welfare Research Centre at UNSW, a national centre directly funded by the Commonwealth government. However, premier Neville Wran persuaded him instead to accept appointment as chairman of the NSW Corrective Services Commission, and UNSW released him. The 1978 Nagle royal commission had recommended 252 reforms needed in the NSW prison system, and the government required a respected, research-based, knowledgeable outsider to effect the reforms. Often against intense opposition, most of the reforms were achieved, but by 1981 prison reform had lost its political momentum, and Tony Vinson resigned. His subsequent book, *Wilful Obstruction*, written with the help of a journalist, recorded the experience. During the reform period he had extensive media exposure, and ever since then until fairly recently has continued to be consulted by the media on issues related to the prison system. More recently 'social inclusion' has been the focus, in connection with his continuing research on geographic location of social disadvantage. He served as a member of the social inclusion committee set up by the Gillard government.

Professor Vinson's international activities included attending UN congresses on prevention of crime and treatment of offenders. Twice – in 1985 and 1988 – he was visiting professor at the University of Stockholm and the Dutch Ministry of Justice in The Hague, undertaking evaluations of the Swedish and Dutch prison systems. Researching the Swedish social welfare system became a continuing interest. In 1991, he joined the editorial board of the *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare*.

In 1999, he produced a report on the distribution of social disadvantage in Victoria and New South Wales, as part of the research program of Jesuit Social Services. He was building on pioneering area deprivation studies in the 1970s, including research by Vinson and Homel in Newcastle. The report identified current instances of severe community disadvantage, and what could be done, in partnership with residents of the area, to improve their life opportunities and those of their children. Tony's concern for social justice derived from his working-class roots and Christian values learned at school under the Marist

Brothers. For a period after his retirement from UNSW, he worked for Uniya Jesuit social justice centre headed by Father Frank Brennan, who rang me for a reference. Both Frank and Tony were high-profile public figures and tended to go their own independent ways, so the arrangement did not last.

Twice Tony Vinson chaired public inquiries. In 1984, he was commissioned by the Department of Territories of the Commonwealth government to inquire into the welfare services of the Australian Capital Territory. When Max Wryell, a long-time resident of Canberra as well as a senior public servant, wrote to me in March 1985, he was not at all impressed by the resultant report.

The Vinson report on welfare services in the ACT is, in my view, very disappointing. It seems to knock, or damn with faint praise, everything that is being done here and, as a solution, seems to provide a shopping list of anything and everything that all and sundry have ever dreamed up. In particular it gives no order of priorities and seems as if it might have been relevant in 1973 when the Labor Party thought that money grew on trees. It is thus very easy for Treasury types to knock as unrealistic and I will be surprised if any action stems from it – this is unfortunate.¹²⁹

In 2004, he chaired the first inquiry into public education in New South Wales for 40 years. It was commissioned not by the NSW government but by two other major interested parties – the Federations of Teachers and of Parents and Citizens. The Vinson report found Australia, and especially New South Wales, lagged the developed world in preschooling, with long-term effects on educational disadvantage.

Tony Vinson was appointed an emeritus professor by UNSW in 1997 after his retirement from the School of Social Work. In his 'retirement', he and I shared a room in the school, but only occasionally did our paths cross, because I did not regularly go to the school and Tony was increasingly involved in projects away from the university. At one stage he was keen that we should have regular discussions on matters of common concern and interest, but this did not eventuate. In recent years, Tony Vinson has held a senior visiting position in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Sydney. In 2005, the university awarded him a DLitt in Social Work. Tony invited Trish and me, and Bill Jegorow, to join with his family afterwards in celebration of the occasion.

After Tony Vinson took over from me as head of the Social Work School at UNSW in January 1983, he gave needed impetus to the research undertaken by both academic staff and post-graduate students. Tony quickly answered any doubts there were about his identification with the social work profession by serving as president of the NSW branch of the AASW 1983–84.

From 1988 to 1993, he was an energetic, resourceful and successful dean of the Faculty of Professional Studies.¹³⁰ During this time, the faculty doubled its staff and students, former programs at the St George Institute of Education were successfully amalgamated into the faculty, the teacher education program was revitalised, faculty staff research was strengthened, and a network

129 Letter, Max Wryell to John Lawrence, 2/3/85.

130 At the time it consisted of the Schools of Social work, Education, Health Administration, and Information, Library and Archive Studies.

of educational and professional contacts was established in Asian countries. Education was becoming a major export industry for Australia and deans were under great pressure to play that game for the economic returns. As far as I could see, educational and other social considerations were not paramount. I can remember saying to Tony, universities were in danger of selling their academic souls.

The UNSW academic community was generally opposed to the Dawkins proposed amalgamations with other tertiary institutions. The relatively smooth, successful development of the St George campus of the Faculty of Professional Studies was a measure of Tony Vinson's effectiveness as an academic entrepreneur in difficult circumstances. He was bitterly disappointed and felt betrayed when vice-chancellor John Niland discontinued UNSW support for the St George development despite the academic achievements of staff located there. In 1996–97, Tony Vinson again served as head of the School of Social Work.

In the course of preparing my wide-ranging book on professionalism and ethics, I sought Tony Vinson's help as a willing, critical, social science reader. His serious, long-term interests in value questions, social structures and processes, and gaining empirical evidence, together with our shared responsibilities for a profession's education, made him an ideal sounding board. He was generous with his time and constructive comments and always enjoyed talking over academic and policy concerns.

I wrote the following in December 2006, when supporting Tony Vinson's nomination for an Order of Australia award:

Since graduating from Sydney University 50 years ago, with an Arts degree and a social work qualification, Tony Vinson has pursued a remarkable career of service to Australian society. A restless inquiring spirit, prodigious work capacity and a fierce but disciplined commitment to social justice have led him to, and guided him in, a wide range of activities of benefit to Australian society. ... He is an obvious nomination for ... an award.

Richard Roberts

In December 1987, I wrote from New York to the academic staff office at UNSW in strong support of the promotion of Richard Roberts to a senior lectureship. Richard, in fact, had played an important part in the school when Ron Baker was with us, and subsequently. In 1990, at the end of a long process which began in 1978 when he became closely associated with Ron Baker, he produced a notable book¹³¹ developed from his PhD thesis submitted in February 1987.¹³² It was described on its cover in these terms:

In these times of financial stringency and conservatism in the public sector, social work, with its diversity and differentiation, is criticized for its lack of efficiency and cost effectiveness. As the first major text of its kind, *Lessons from the Past*

131 Richard Roberts, *Lessons from the Past: Issues for Social Work Theory*, London, Tavistock/Routledge, 1990.

132 His examiners were Professors Rolf Olsen, Edna Chamberlain and Herb Bisno. Professor Olsen at the University of Birmingham assisted in the conversion into book form and wrote a foreword for the book.

demonstrates the need for a more refined theory and practice ...

Richard Roberts criticizes and evaluates a significant body of social work writings from the 1970s in its search for a 'grand', all-encompassing theory. Various descriptions as 'generic', 'integrated', or 'unitary', these theories attempted to construct propositions that would accommodate social work's broad domain, regardless of setting, method of intervention, or socio-political context.

Crisp and innovative, *Lessons from the Past* will prove invaluable to professionals and students of social work, social policy and the social sciences.

In my 1987 reference for Richard Roberts I wrote:

Since 1978, there has been an almost continuous process of assessment and review of the Social Work Practice subjects in the School's BSW curriculum, and Richard Roberts has been centrally involved in this process. He has continued to be the main designer of and chief lecturer in, the Social Work Practice subject taught in the second year of the BSW. At first, as Social Work Practice 1A, this subject was the students' introduction to practice theory; later it was revised, as Social Work Practice 2, to build on a new problem-solving introduction, Social Work Practice 1, now located in the first year of the BSW. Dr Roberts has not always enthusiastically endorsed the various curriculum changes, but he has always conscientiously continued to revise and re-design his teaching materials in response to over-all curriculum changes and the ongoing debate in the School on how best to teach social work practice.¹³³

... Soon after joining the School, Richard Roberts enrolled in a research MSW degree under Professor Ron Baker's supervision. His interest was in the curriculum design implications of recent attempts at 'unitary' or 'integrated' social work theory. His research interests shifted, especially after Professor Baker left the School, to undertaking a critical analysis of these various attempts at 'integrated' theory, and such was the quality of his work that he successfully converted to study at the doctoral level.

As a co-supervisor in the latter stages of his PhD thesis, I had the opportunity to appreciate the scope and importance of his study. ... I am delighted ... a reputable London publisher is going to publish a book based on it. I anticipate that this will make a significant contribution to better theory building in social work and will establish a firm international reputation for its author.

... I know that Dr Roberts made a very favourable impression with Professor Howard Goldstein, a very experienced and highly regarded social work educator and practice theorist, when he visited Case Western Reserve University in 1983. I was present at the presentation he made at the University and believed he compared very favourably in interaction with senior colleagues. They in fact assumed that he was at a much more senior level than lecturer in our system.

Richard Roberts was very much aware of the normative aspects of social work.

133 With his colleague Diane Zulfacar, in 1986, he gave an account in *Australian Social Work* of dynamics which influenced the design of the social work practice curriculum 1978 to 1982. Richard J. Roberts and Diane M. Zulfacar, 'Developing Complementarity between Generic and Methods Approaches to Social Work Practice: An Exploration of Some Problems in Curriculum Design', *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 39, No. 4, December, 1986, pp. 27-34.

Social work intervenes in the lives of people. Thus it is a moral activity, and as such needs to consider the purposes and consequences of its actions. It is a normative activity which is open to empirical observation, but a description of current observations can in no way be used as a justification for what *ought* to be the case. ... In addition to the need to clearly articulate 'ends' and 'means' in social work, a further question relates to what constitutes justificatory criteria for both ends and means. It has been argued by Lawrence (1983) that justification criteria must be of a moral kind since social work deals with interactions between *people*. He argues for a central place for moral philosophy within social work. (Lawrence 1983) (see also Siporin 1982). It will not be debated here what the precise nature of justificatory criteria is or ought to be. It is important to establish, however, that justification (of any variety) is crucial in providing a rationale as well as a direction for a social worker's actions.

Although Richard's analytic and critical work was impressive as far as it went, those last two sentences reveal why I thought it was still inadequate. He fully recognised the crucial need for justificatory criteria for intervention, yet apparently he thought he could avoid having to make explicit what these were and ought to be. The aim of the social philosophy subject (later two half-year subjects) in our curriculum was precisely to develop students' capacity for moral reasoning as an essential and basic part of their professional social work roles.

Richard Roberts came to the School with a BA in arts and diploma of education from the University of New England, and a BSocStud from the University of Sydney. He had had a period in social work practice (in family and psychiatric work), teaching and administrative experience at the technical college level, and active involvement in social welfare bodies and in the professional association, including being the immediate past president of the Northern Territory Branch of the AASW. Additional to his general teaching of social work practice at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, he taught in the school's Summer Studies Program. His course on human sexuality and social work practice, an elective in the final year of the BSW, provided leadership for other social work schools in Australia and abroad. Richard remained devoted to his daughter Rebecca after he discovered he himself was homosexual and separated from his wife. He was devastated when many of his friends had AIDs.

When Richard visited Cleveland on sabbatical in 1983, he stayed with us. Our daughter Ruth was with us at the time and we all enjoyed his company. I recall him showing Trish and me with both personal and professional pride the life-style in the gay community in San Francisco. He was an efficient, reliable and helpful staff member. His regular involvement in various AASW and AASWE activities was of value to the school. These included being on the editorial committee of the professional journal. His programs at the Sydney Fear of Flying Clinic were very successful and in demand. I welcomed his appointment as a senior lecturer, and at his staff development review in 1990, I considered him ready for being responsible for the over-all design and administration of a social work curriculum. He was seconded from UNSW 1991-2 to develop the new social work course at Sturt University, but did not proceed

with his application when the university advertised for a chair, because inadequate resources were being made available for the course. For four years after his retirement, he was a private consultant to the Department of Defence.

June Huntington

In September 1972, I received a letter and biographical attachment from June Huntington, a lecturer in sociology at Bedford College, University of London.¹³⁴ She had recently married an Australian (John Huntington) and they would be leaving to live in Sydney in October. Through a colleague at LSE she had met Jean Hamilton-Smith and had spent an evening with Jean and Elery Hamilton-Smith discussing the structure of social work in Australia, and had read my *Professional Social Work in Australia*. She was 'particularly anxious to learn whether, as a sociologist, without a professional qualification in social work, (she) could be attached to a School of Social Work rather than a Department of Sociology'. Until the end of the year she would be heavily occupied with writing up a research project, but Elery and Jean recommended that she write to me and introduce herself so that perhaps she could spend some time in our school after she arrived to begin making professional contacts and to learn where 'the major centres of information and activity' were. Her research project was a study of interprofessional perceptions, attitudes and behaviour among medical general practitioners, social workers and health visitors, and it inevitably explored the possibility of greater general practice–social work cooperation. The Seebohm legislation in Britain had hardly helped the already rather prickly relationship between medicine and social work. June would therefore be interested in continuing her research in this field in Australia.¹³⁵

I read June Huntington's biographical statement with considerable interest and thought she could be a great asset to the school. Here was a sociologist interested in occupational sociology with particular concern for interprofessional relationships involving social workers, a good understanding of the structural features of social work, a person with interpersonal skills and an appreciation of the psychological as well as sociological dimensions of social work practice, evident humanitarian values, a teacher with experience of diverse types of students, research-minded and wanting to pursue comparative study – and at 34 years of age, she was still in the early stages of her career.

June Montgomery was born in Lancashire. In her words, she was 'a rather typical working class "early leaver" from the British Grammar School system, and became a short-hand typist at fifteen, proceeding from this to secretarial jobs'.

My two main secretarial posts served me well with data for the future: one with the local Medical Officer of Health, giving me a taste of professional/bureaucratic/lay relationships in the public service, and the other with the manager of the local works of the English Electric Company, giving me a taste of the quality of human

134 Letter, June Huntington to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 30/8/72.

135 She had seen a reference in my book to a 1961 pilot study of social work and medical practice by the NSW Faculty of the Australian College of General Practitioners.

relations in British industry. I took teaching diplomas in Shorthand and Typing at the local technical college and was teaching these subjects to evening classes by the time I was eighteen. When a thirst to return to more general education hit me at twenty and I registered for 'O' level history and economics in the evenings, I was fortunate enough to have a Head of Department who gave me a mild lecture on underutilization of capacity at just the right time in my personal development, and I left full-time secretarial work at twenty-two and took a nine-month crash 'A' and 'O' level course at the college, gaining entrance to an Honours Degree Course in Psychology at Bedford College, London, a year later.

I found academic psychology rat-ridden and imprisoned in a maze of its own making, but sociology – my subsidiary subject – was an endless joy, so much so that with the help of the professors concerned I changed my honours subject to sociology at the end of my first year. My long vacations at university were as educational as the courses themselves: the first I spent working my way white collar style across the United States, and the second on a Swedish Institute Scholarship at the University of Uppsala, attending a course on 'Modern Sweden: Individual in Organized Society', during which I met academics and senior people in the Swedish Public Service (predominantly education and welfare), management and trade union personnel. I graduated in 1965 ...¹³⁶

June's statement went on to describe her appointment as an assistant lecturer in sociology at Brunel University in west London. This included visiting various institutions such as firms, civil service departments, hospitals, special schools, and prisons, as a field tutor for students undertaking work placements. She worked closely with Elliot Jaques¹³⁷ as she was particularly interested in 'his intellectual focus on the interrelationship between the individual and social institutions'. In cooperation with the Central Training Council in Child Care, she designed and taught in-service training courses in organisation and management. 'This was 1966–67 and the beginning of the concern with administration in British social work'.

For four years from 1968, as a lecturer in sociology at Bedford College, she designed and taught at the undergraduate level an industrial sociology option, and a course on social structure in modern Britain. In addition was teaching organisation and management theory to postgraduate social work students. Within the industrial sociology course, she developed the specialism of occupational sociology and this led her 'to explore more deeply the possible applications of this field to social welfare'. In March 1972, she participated in the planning and execution of the first residential workshop for general practitioners, social workers, and health visitors, organised by the Royal College of General Practitioners, the National Institute for Social Work Training and Council for Education and Training of Health Visitors. She was now engaged in writing up and getting published the rich material from her evaluation of this workshop.

136 Her honours degree covered these subjects: sociological theory and method, comparative institutions, social psychology, social policy and administration, criminology, statistics, economics, social philosophy, and social structure of modern Britain.

137 Canadian founder of the school of social sciences at Brunel University in 1964.

Finally, June reflected on her experience over the past four years of teaching sociology in a part-time qualifying course for social workers who had been in the field for some time, but in an untrained capacity:

So many social work students in this country, particularly the older ones, have dreaded sociology because so often they have been taught by sociologists who are busy professionalising themselves and who are therefore hypersensitive to any contamination by association with social workers, that they bitterly resent having to teach social work students in their institutions. I find, in contrast, that I am happiest teaching and researching in the social welfare context and I wish to continue in this direction in Australia.

In February 1973, she joined the school as a lecturer. It proved to be an excellent appointment envied by other heads of Australian schools of social work.

In June 1974, I wrote to Sid Sax, the chairman of the National Hospitals and Health Services Commission interim committee, in strong support of a research project being proposed by June Huntington. In October 1974, the Australian Health and Hospitals Commission offered her funding for a two-year project to evaluate the impact of a full-time social worker on a private group medical practice in Sydney. The funds, administered by the NSW Health Commission, financed the salary of the social worker, a part-time secretary, car, office furniture and supplies and other routine expenses. The project would constitute a major part of the empirical research for a doctorate on the relationship between social work and medical practice. A special award for postgraduate study provided by the Whitlam government to strengthen the staffing of schools of social work, enabled her work full-time on her research and writing for her PhD. The school was reimbursed her salary for the duration of the award.

For the meeting of heads of schools in Melbourne in February 1976, she prepared a bibliography on interprofessional relationships. Her introduction was instructive:

Without knowing exactly what aspects of interprofessional relationships are of particular concern to the Meeting, it was difficult to compile a focussed bibliography. There is a great deal of work that describes and discusses interprofessional co-operation (or lack of it) in specific service delivery settings. In my own research field, that of social work-general practice relationships, there are well over thirty published studies. Much of the work makes no or very little attempt to develop concepts that would help explain, and/or predict situations of interprofessional conflict or co-operation.

In view of this, the first part of the bibliography is drawn from that part of the social scientific literature that has been concerned with conceptualization of occupational structure, culture, and process. Interestingly, not much of this literature has been specifically concerned with interprofessional relationships, but the content of all the work listed is relevant to the topic.

June Huntington had papers on her research published in the *Medical Journal of Australia* (May 1976), the first volume of *Community Health Studies*

(1977), and *Australian Family Physician* (1978). She returned to full-time teaching in the School of Social Work in March 1978. In 1980, she submitted to the School of Sociology at UNSW her thesis, 'Social work and general medical practice: towards a sociology of interoccupational relationships'.¹³⁸ She converted this into a book in 1981, *Social Work and General Medical Practice: Collaboration or Conflict* (London, George Allen and Unwin). Professor Margot Jeffreys had found June's thesis 'cogent, enlightening and exciting', and had urged the publishers to speed its production into a book. She was delighted to provide a foreword to what she saw as a 'contribution to scholarship and social policy'. She hoped the book would become 'a source of enlightenment for doctors, nurses and social workers who are training for family and community practice in a variety of settings in Europe, the Americas and the Antipodes.' Also the book could be 'profitably read by social scientists, social administrators, organisational theorists and management trainers'. Seeking solutions to health and social problems which involved bringing members of different professional groups together had an underlying assumption that the professional workers would collaborate with one another without conflict.

What June Huntington has been able to show by her own in-depth observations, by extensive interviews and by a critical reading and analysis of accounts by many doctors, social workers, nurses, administrators and other social analysts is that conflict is endemic and that its roots lie deep in the social fabric of our occupational world and are fed by the cultural taken-for-granted assumptions which we make about the world.¹³⁹

This was very significant endorsement from the person who was the first ever professor of medical sociology – at Bedford College, London University, in 1968.¹⁴⁰

In July 1980, June Huntington was promoted to senior lecturer in our school. She spent the second half of that year on a special studies program, based in London, using the resources of London University (Bedford College and LSE) and the Tavistock Centre. After completing the book manuscript for Allen and Unwin, she attended conferences and seminars, both to hear and give papers on interprofessional collaboration between social work and general medical practice, and on the relevance of attachment and loss concepts to migration, the subject of her next book. Her letters to the staff and to me personally indicated great professional stimulation and recognition. She was feeling 'utterly "at home"', living back in Hamstead village, 'getting enormous enjoyment as ever out of the Heath', and going to the theatre and opera available in London.

I was disappointed, but not surprised, when she resigned from the school, to take effect at the end of 1981. Her extended stay in the UK had affirmed her profound long-term attachment to certain people and to the place itself. Also,

138 Her supervisors were Bill Bottomley and Professor Colin Bell, who returned to England to a chair at the University of Aston in Birmingham soon after.

139 Margot Jeffreys, 'Foreword', in June Huntington, *Social Work and General Medical Practice*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1981, pp. ix-x.

140 See Meg Stacey, 'Obituary: Professor Margot Jeffreys', *The Independent*, 12/3/99 – available on the internet.

she wished to be able to follow up personally the implications of her book on social work and general practice collaboration where the issue was very much alive. The medical fee for service system in Australia, strongly supported by most doctors, made any real progress extremely difficult. In her evidence before the NSW commission of inquiry into doctors' fees, June Huntington illustrated the disastrous effects of Australia's fee for service payment system on interoccupational collaboration and referral, and focussed on the inappropriateness of GPs entering the counselling area without adequate preparation.

Typically, June explained both to the staff and her students her decision to leave us, before others told them. In the acknowledgements in her book, she thanked me 'for taking a punt in appointing a sociologist ... and for offering ... the opportunity to develop an interest in occupational sociology within the School'. Many people benefited from her appointment with us, but not apparently within the medical fraternity. In a 1986 book, described as 'a definitive account of general practice today in Australia',¹⁴¹ only one of the authors made any reference to Huntington's work, and acknowledged that 'general practitioners often fail to take full advantage of referral to non-medical resources particularly in respect of patients whose main problem is essentially non-medical'. Amongst the other 18 contributors there was only one other mention of social workers, and even that was superficial.

On her return to London, June Huntington worked very successfully as a fellow for The King's Fund¹⁴² for 10 years, and then as an independent consultant working with all levels of primary care from individual GPs and practices up to through health authorities and the Department of Health. She was made an honorary fellow of the RCGP and subsequently a visiting professor at the Health Services Management Centre in Birmingham. She retired at 67 to enjoy London's theatre and music, and English literature. Recently, she wrote:

... You may like to know I still tell people that my time at UNSW was the happiest in my working life, as the social work milieu suited my ever-interdisciplinary nature and I loved the undergraduate students I taught there.¹⁴³

Elsbeth Browne

Elsbeth was another staff member who benefited from a Whitlam government award for a higher degree in social work, resulting in a book *The Empty Cradle: Fertility Control in Australia* (UNSW Press, 1979).¹⁴⁴ Demographic analysis of the Australian population was an important part of the subject 'Australian social organisation', introduced into our BSW curriculum in 1972.¹⁴⁵ In 1975, as part of the requirements for an MSW (by research), she completed my subjects 'social policy analysis' and 'social planning' with distinctions. She was

141 Neville A. Anderson, Charles Bridges-Webb, & Alan H. B. Chancellor (eds), *General Practice in Australia*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1986.

142 The King Edward's Hospital Fund for London.

143 Letter, June Huntington to John Lawrence, 7/6/13.

144 Examiner of her MSW (by research) was Professor W. D. Borrie, who described it as 'a substantial contribution to our knowledge about the determinants of demographic behaviour'.

145 See p. 90.

able, very committed to her profession of social work, and spoke her mind fearlessly – at times rather too aggressively for constructive discussion. In the School as a tutor in 1972–74, senior tutor 1974–77, and tenured lecturer from 1977, she undertook a wide range of teaching responsibilities additional to ‘Australian social organisation’, during the period when I was head of school.

Elsbeth Browne was dux of PLC, Pymble. On a Commonwealth scholarship, 1952–56, she completed Arts/Social Work at the University of Sydney, with a concentration on medical social work. 1957–59, she worked in four hospitals – Royal North Shore Hospital, St Thomas’s in London, the London Hospital, and St George’s Hospital in Sydney. 1959–63, she was at the Women’s Hospital, Crown Street, being social worker in charge of its Social Work Department in 1963. At the University of Queensland, 1964–65, she was a senior tutor, Department of Child Health, Faculty of Medicine. The Department of Social Studies, University of Sydney, employed her as a part-time tutor, 1966–67, to develop field education in geriatric settings, and in 1968 as a field education instructor at the Royal North Shore Hospital. 1968–69, she directed an NCOSS survey of Commonwealth Sickness Benefit in NSW. Active in the AASW, she was secretary of the Queensland Branch, 1964–65, a member of the national professional education and accreditation committee (PEAC), 1971–79, and convenor of its eligibility sub-committee, 1971–77, and president of the NSW branch, 1979–82.

When Elspeth left the School in 1989, I spoke at her farewell and provided a ‘poem’ at her last staff meeting. In a subsequent letter, she thanked me and went on to say:

But most of all, John, thanks very much for the last seventeen years. They’ve certainly been interesting and whatever I may have said, I wouldn’t have missed them for anything. ... I have a lot of good memories of the School. One of the things that has been rather special out of the early days was the School’s capacity to have first-class disagreements, to agree to disagree and not to have those personal disagreements tainted with personal rancour. I really appreciated that.¹⁴⁶

Elsbeth was married to Lin Browne, a *Sydney Morning Herald* journalist, who for many years was responsible for the crossword in the SMH. He shared my love for the Australian game of football (more recently called AFL), and was a keen supporter of Hawthorn in Melbourne.

Rosemary Berreen

Coming from a background of nursing practice, administration, and teaching, Rosemary Berreen achieved a first-class honours degree in social work at UNSW in 1976. Subsequently she made an increasingly significant contribution to the School – as research assistant, tutor, lecturer (from 1980), and senior lecturer (1990), taking a special responsibility for teaching and development in the social welfare stream of subjects. I particularly valued her interest in and commitment to social welfare as a subject in its own right, and its central

¹⁴⁶ Letter, Elspeth Browne, 6/4/89.

importance in social work education. Her doctorate, awarded by UNSW in 1990, was in social welfare history.¹⁴⁷ A welcome aspect of her course outlines was a skilful use of humour. Her own rather dry whimsical humour was an asset in sustaining School morale, especially in difficult times. She shared my enthusiasm for AFL, having originated in Melbourne.

Damian Grace

In February 1981, the School appointed Damian Grace as a lecturer for three years on a tenurable contract basis. Professor Douglas McCallum, head of the School of Government, thought he might be the sort of person we were looking for. We were seeking someone with 'high academic qualifications in moral and political philosophy with special interest in justificatory arguments for social welfare policies and social welfare interventions generally'. Damian's PhD was on Thomas More's *Utopia*, published in 1513. Damian took over the responsibility for the BSW subjects, Social Philosophy I (an introduction to moral philosophy with particular emphasis on normative ethics), and Social Philosophy II (critical discussion of means and ends in a liberal democracy). As has been made evident, I had a particular concern that these subjects should be taught well and be integrated with the rest of the professional curriculum. It was a notable feature and aspiration of our school's curriculum. Neither I or other existing staff could, however, continue to take direct responsibility for teaching the social philosophy subjects. Damian's appointment was a great relief and he became tenured within the initial three years. In the ensuing years, Damian became a valued colleague in the school, with obvious developing expertise in ethics, and Trish and I enjoyed meeting with Damian and Bernadette socially.

Diane Zulfacar

One of my former Sydney University students, Diane Zulfacar (née Wright) spent almost 12 years in the USA, gaining an MSW at Smith College and experience in psychiatric social work and social work education. She joined the School in 1979, worked as a research officer, then senior tutor, and in 1981 was appointed a lecturer. She achieved tenure in mid-1983, and a senior lectureship in 1991. Her research and practice interests were clinical social work in Australia and resettlement of refugees. (Her UNSW PhD was on unaccompanied Vietnamese minors in Australia.) In 1991, the School appointed her as coordinator of its Postgraduate Research Program. I knew Diane well, and was very pleased to act as her reviewer in the Academic Staff Development review in 1990. I had followed her professional career with interest and admiration. The School was very fortunate to have had her continuing professional commitment to social work.

147 Her thesis title was: 'The disabilities of illegitimacy: a study of unmarried mothers and illegitimate children in early twentieth century Sydney'.

Michael Horsburgh

Another of my former Sydney University students in the final year social theory subject at the University of Sydney (in 1964) was 25-year old Michael Horsburgh, president of the social work students' association. After four years as a clerk in the Commonwealth public service, he had completed a BA degree and was finishing a social work diploma and theological training at the Methodist Theological College. My subject-area was his introduction to what was to become his long-term academic interest. On completion of his studies, he spent a year as a methodist minister at Newcastle in 1965, before being appointed 'vice-master'(!) at Wesley college, the University of Sydney. In 1968, I came to know him well, when he assisted me in some of the teaching and examining in my social theory subject. In 1969, I wrote him a positive reference for a position at the University of the South Pacific in Fiji, as dean of students and master of hall, in the light of his experience at Wesley and his personal qualities – 'a tolerant, balanced person of high integrity, has a good sense of humour, and clearly enjoys residential university life'. It was rare to find either a dean of students or master of hall with professional social work qualifications. Michael Horsburgh's academic ability was sound. His wife Beverley was a pleasant person who would be a decided asset in a university residential situation. Although I would be sorry to see him leave Sydney, he could well prove to be a most suitable appointment at this early stage of the university's development.¹⁴⁸

The Horsburghs stayed in Sydney. Michael was admitted in 1970 at UNSW to do qualifying work for an MSW by research – a research assignment and a 2-hour weekly seminar. Although he had to do further work in part of Psychology II to rectify a weakness in statistics, staff were impressed by his work, so I recommended his appointment as a tutor for 1971. His tutoring responsibilities were in the social policy/administration area – in the subjects social philosophy and policy, and social welfare systems 1 and 2. He was a member of my 2 – hour weekly MSW seminar on social planning, processes and issues, and in addition helped me collect data for my Australian social policy project, and served as the school's library liaison officer. Towards the end of 1971, I provided a positive but qualified reference for his appointment to a lectureship in social administration at the University of Sydney.¹⁴⁹

Mr Horsburgh has performed his various tasks admirably. He is conscientious and efficient and does not shirk responsibility. His continuing improved academic work indicates that he is a genuine 'late developer'. As yet, however, this has not borne fruit in any publications of note. Perhaps he still needs to produce an adequate MSW thesis to demonstrate clearly that he is of lectureship calibre academically. He has a developing and perceptive understanding of Social Administration as a subject area and has taken a particular interest in basic value questions underlying social policies. ...¹⁵⁰

148 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Hari Ram, 27/6/69.

149 This was, in fact, the teaching position I had held at the University of Sydney, now vacated by Tony Vinson, who had moved on to direct the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics.

150 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to R. B. Fisher, 2/9/71.

Michael was appointed by the university of Sydney as an assistant lecturer in 1972, then lecturer from 1973, and stayed with the University of Sydney Social Work Department for the rest of his academic career. I unsuccessfully encouraged him in September 1973, to apply for a UNSW lectureship primarily in the teaching of social policy/administration. From the late 1960s to 1978, Michael Horsburgh was actively engaged in professional social work and some broader social welfare activities. With the *Australian Journal of Social Work*, he was business manager (1968–72), committee member (1973–8), and acting editor (1977/78). With the AASW, he convened the national conference committee (1971), was NSW branch vice-president (1972) and president (1973–6), federal delegate (1973–6), member of professional education and accreditation committee (1976–7). He was a member of the NCOSS executive (1973–6), and on the Child Welfare Advisory Council of NSW (1974–8)

In May 1978, I gave 'firm support' to his application for promotion to senior lecturer at the University Sydney. I had acted as his supervisor in the final stages of his MSW research thesis and was one of his examiners. The thesis was titled: 'Government Subsidy of Voluntary Social Welfare Organisations: a Case Study: New South Wales – 1858–1910'. Currently I was his PhD supervisor for a thesis on the 19th century orphans schools of New South Wales. I could write in support of his promotion:

Already he has made a number of useful contributions to the social welfare history of New South Wales, and his active interest in these matters continues to grow and develop. He brings to his historical study the insights of a well-informed analyst of contemporary social policy. He works systematically and carefully, and does not allow himself to be swamped by detail. His conceptual framework for discussion of government subsidisation of non-government social welfare organisations is particularly helpful.

Mr Horsburgh is currently providing a lecture series on income security in the Third Year subject Social Welfare II in the BSW degree at the University of New South Wales. This teaching material is well organised and thoughtfully presented.¹⁵¹

In October, Michael Horsburgh wrote that the academic board had recommended his promotion to senior lecturer.

The support you gave me by way of a reference was only the latest of the many occasions when you have assisted my career, both in writing and by personal encouragement.

This note is to thank you once again and to express my deep appreciation for your support.¹⁵²

In January 1980, after receiving from London a tape on his work sent to me as his PhD supervisor, I responded:

I have listened to your tape with both interest and enjoyment. Your sleuthing for you thesis material is obviously bearing some valuable fruit: the checking on leads

151 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Kenneth Knight, 17/5/78.

152 Letter, Michael Horsburgh to John Lawrence, 18/10/78.

which prove to be negative is, of course, an inevitable part of the whole process. I look forward to hearing the next report. Clearly things are beginning to fall into place and you are gaining confidence in deciding what the thesis is about. I think that it is a good idea for you to produce a first draft of a paper on the influence of the Hill sisters and Cobb on boarding-out in Australia, and especially in NSW. As I know you are aware, there is no substitute for writing (or having to produce periodic reports for a supervisor!), to help you gauge where you have actually reached in your thesis preparation.

I don't feel any need at this stage to make detailed comment on your work. It seems to be going well. If you wish more detailed feed-back before your return, please indicate this to me.

Trish and I were especially pleased to hear how satisfactory are your general living circumstances. Town planning friends from Canada, to whom we sold our car when we left England in 1974, spent their sabbatical leave in a Victorian house in Wimbledon, so we can visualise your present housing and location. It is good that both Bev and Simon (their son) are well settled in their respective spheres. The Wimbledon Choral Society sounds a necessary anti-dote to the long, lonely haul of 19th century archival material.¹⁵³

In August 1983, from the USA I provided a final reference to the University of Sydney for Michael Horsburgh, now applicant for an associate professorship in social work (social policy), who would be expected to serve as head of department in due course. I reported that for a time Michael Horsburgh had been making good progress on his PhD, but this was temporarily interrupted by added teaching responsibilities after Professor Brennan's death and family responsibilities connected with the serious illness of his father. I understood, however, that he was now working consistently on his thesis, under Professor Vinson's supervision. He was now recognised as one of the few social policy historians in Australia because of his MSW thesis on statutory-voluntary relationships in the social welfare field in 19th century NSW, and a number of substantial 19th century historical articles. He had considerable expertise both in social policy in general and in Australian social welfare in particular. He brought an historical and comparative perspective to what was still a relatively new subject area. In addition, his social work qualifications and experience, especially his leadership role in the professional association, enabled him to understand and emphasise the interdependence of social policy and social work. I was confident he would be very well suited to carry out the academic responsibilities of the associate professorship. I could not, however, comment on his current teaching or administration. A completed PhD degree would, of course, be desirable for this level of appointment, but I was confident this would be forthcoming in the not-to-distant future.

Whether Mr Horsburgh would be an efficient Head of Department in due course, would greatly depend on the extent to which the unsettled past of the Department was put to rest and he was accepted on his current academic and personal merits. On my understanding of the Department's situation, because of his previous close

153 Letter, John Lawrence to Michael Horsburgh, 31/1/80.

association with Professor Brennan, he was rather isolated from at least some of the current members of the Department.¹⁵⁴

Michael Horsburgh was appointed associate professor in January 1985, and subsequently did head the Sydney University department. He had spent only one year on the staff at UNSW, in 1971, but clearly his story and our story at UNSW were at times significantly intertwined in the course of his career.

THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT POSITION

It was essential for the school, and in particular, the head of school, to be well served by an efficient administrative officer. In my time as head of school, this position was occupied by Julia Moore, Patsy McPaul and Audrey Ferguson. Each had social work qualifications, which was desirable for the job. Patsy also had worked in the registrar's department of the university, and Audrey had been employed for some years as a tutor in the School of Health Administration in our faculty.¹⁵⁵

Julia Moore

With an interesting background, including working in the Department of External Affairs, marriage to John Moore later judge of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, home duties (four children), the social work course at the University of Sydney, honorary parole work, and medical social work locums, she was appointed a part-time instructor at UNSW when the BSW was introduced in 1965. This was made full-time in 1968. The category of 'instructor' was retained, apparently for administrative convenience, although her position was in fact largely administrative.¹⁵⁶ After my arrival, it was evident that she was having difficulty juggling her administrative duties, her continuing home duties and her work to complete an honours degree. Especially with all the changes afoot, we needed a full-time efficient administrative officer. In November 1969, after a review of her position in the school and discussion with the university administration, I had to set down her duties in considerable detail. By mutual agreement Julia resigned in July 1971 'for personal and other reasons'.

Patsy McPaul

We were very fortunate in her replacement, Patsy McPaul, who was appointed in October 1971 and stayed until leaving for overseas in December 1975. She came to us as a 31-year old with very relevant professional and administrative experience for the position. After psychiatric social work at Callan Park Hospital, and then the Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association and Mental

154 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Keith Jennings, 10/8/83.

155 She knew our school and wanted to work with me, she said.

156 Letter, Norma Parker to E. H. Davis, bursar, 17/5/68. The school's handbook in March 1970 described her duties as 'Deals with course enquiries, enrolments, transfers and various administrative responsibilities'. It also provides data on her interesting background.

Health Association, she had worked in the admissions office at the UNSW for 4½ years, and for 12 months had been in charge of its higher degree section. She was familiar with the administrative structure of the university as whole, and the registrar's division in particular. Since May 1968, she had been working as a parole officer in the NSW Department of Corrective Services, had supervised students from both university schools of social work, and was now officer-in-charge of the Parramatta district office. Keith McClelland, the principal parole officer, said she had a sincere interest in people and had great respect for her ability. She had been involved in planning and executing short courses for parole trainees and in in-service courses for prison officers. In 1971, she was responsible for teaching the social casework section in the trainee district officers' course of the NSW Department of Youth and Community services. With university approval, she continued to do this in subsequent years. This made her 'consider levels of training appropriate to the performance of different functions and tasks required of welfare organisations'. In January 1974, she decided to remain in her administrative job although a senior tutorship in the school's field education staff was offered to her. My reference on her departure overseas described her considerable organising capacity and continuing professional growth.¹⁵⁷

Audrey Ferguson

In November 1975, I told Al Willis a very suitable person already employed by the university wished to apply for the administrative position. He agreed to a short period of internal advertising so that the position could be filled immediately, but in accordance with university custom, the position had to revert back to administrative assistant. Despite this, Mrs Audrey Ferguson came to us from the School of Health Administration where she had been a tutor for some years. That school was part of our faculty and Audrey wanted to work as my assistant, welcoming being back in a social work context. By 1980, she was promoted to administrative officer and remained with the School of Social Work for the rest of her working life well into the 1980s.

157 R.J. Lawrence, 'Valerie Patricia McPaul', 5/12/75. This was an open general reference.

Chapter 6

The Michigan Connection

When I wrote to Fedele Fauri, the dean of the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan in July 1968, I enclosed a general letter for my friends and colleagues in the School about my new appointment at UNSW and about our activities since we had been amongst them, and asked him to distribute it for me.¹

... This new position considerably extends my range for putting U of M ideas into practice – with all due respect, of course, to the local culture. One important aspect of the local culture is that our basic professional courses tend to be four year Bachelor of Social Work (or Social Studies) Degree courses. The course at the University of New South Wales is no exception. It is very recently established, so there isn't much to build on, or to have to get rid of! Student intake is a rising 100. This will have to be restricted because of limitations of field work facilities, and a small teaching staff of about 10 people. The sharing of field work supervisors and agencies with the much longer established Sydney University is causing tension and difficulties, partly because of inadequate administrative procedures. Tackling this will be one of my first tasks.

The University of New South Wales was founded in 1949 mainly to produce science and engineering graduates and has had ever since a strong technological emphasis. In 1958, it began to extend into the humanities and social sciences, at first to try to 'humanise' the technologists! Now this segment of the University exists in its own right and is rapidly expanding. Full student numbers are about 13,500. One attractive feature of the place from my point of view is that many of the schools in the University have a specialised interest in administration.

I will possibly take up the appointment in December. Not least of my plans, once I have settled, is to try to encourage international visitors (not third raters – I recall a certain luncheon conversation at the League with Bob [Vinter] et al!) to help as a matter of professional responsibility, this 'developing country' in which I am living. I understand the School of Hospital Administration at the University of New South Wales has special links with the University of Michigan. I would like to confirm personal ones already established and forge some new ones between the University of New South Wales School of Social Work and your School.

¹ See Vol. 2, p. 363.

... I apologise for this collective device to keep in touch. I wish I had time to write to you all at length personally. If you hadn't been so friendly and helpful to us, our mailing obligations would have been far more manageable. ...²

Syd Bernard

On 3 September 1968, Syd Bernard wrote congratulations. 'I always knew that behind that academic and philosophical façade was a ruthless and power-hungry Dean. However, I am writing just after Humphrey's nomination and don't want to be too truthful because I may want to approach you for a job in December.' 'Everyone here is too depressed to talk about it'.³ In a letter in May 1970, he wrote about an Israeli student interested in teaching group work in Australia, and went on:

We never got anywhere with the philosophy and ethics courses. No faculty ever hired.⁴ The University has had its share of student demonstrations and strikes. But, we have been spared the most severe violence (so far). Lines are tightening now. I only hope we can keep a little ahead of events. – Compromising before the lid blows off.

They were planning to visit Israel (if it's still there) for his sabbatical from November until August 1971. He would be working on a textbook on social welfare services. If we could pay the expenses they could return via Australia and he could give a colloquium. 'We miss you and your family'.⁵

In my reply, I told him we did not have a group work teaching vacancy but I would tell the other schools at a forthcoming meeting of the association of teachers. We did not have funds for him to visit us on the way home. University finance was very tight and extremely difficult for a developing school like ours. I told him about chairing the pre-conference working party in Manila of the XVth ICSW conference. 'The prospect is a rather forbidding one, but I suppose I'll survive'. I also commented:

I hope our suggested philosophy and ethics courses are not completely forgotten, even though in the short term seemingly more important matters have had to take precedence. I am still firmly of the view that social work is likely to be rootless and adrift (if I may mix my metaphors), responsive and vulnerable to passing whims, fancies and pressures, unless the social work schools produce people well educated in the handling of value questions.⁶

Gayle Murray, who had been in my social theory subject at the University of Sydney in 1965, wrote to me in October 1971 seeking my assistance to complete a form for admission to the University of Michigan. She and her husband Ian, also a University of Sydney social work graduate, had applied for

2 Letter, John Lawrence to Friends and Colleagues, University of Michigan School of Social Work, 23/7/68.

3 Letter, Syd Bernard to John Lawrence, 3/9/68.

4 See Volume 2, pp. 311-5.

5 Letter, Syd Bernard to John Lawrence, 4/5/70.

6 Letter, John Lawrence to Syd Bernard, 26/5/70.

admission to the Michigan school. Ian, interested in the social welfare policy option, was disappointed to find that the school had not carried through a development of the courses I had proposed while I was there.⁷ In November 1972, Ian sought my advice on how to get ‘my’ courses or emphases in courses back into the curriculum.

There are *no* courses offered on values and ethics, nor any with those as even a substantial minor emphasis. At best, its mentioned in passing (eg one lecture from John Tropman in Administration and Policy III). ... I soon discovered some *students* very interested, and in fact “Ethics and Values” is on an agenda for the November 22 student-faculty meeting in the A and P area. I gather the main reasons why this area is not taught are: 1) No-one feels competent to teach it, 2) Alleged lack of student interest, 3) Fear that university students (who seem to have everyone scared to death !) will interpret such content as “trying to ram WASP values down their throats.”

Judy Willard, the chief student proponent of a return to such content, now believes strategy should concentrate on getting more values etc content in existing or proposed courses, rather than trying for specifically value/ethics oriented courses as such. Your comments and suggestions would be very welcome – as much before November 22 as possible! When hearing of your influence in days past, Judy especially requested an up-to-date bibliography. Of course, if you care to contact faculty directly (mentioning my contact with you if you like), that would be even more helpful. (Judging by the way eyes light up around here when I occasionally mention your name, it seems your influence could still be considerable!).

His wife Gayle had quit social work and was now studying for a master of fine arts at Wayne State University.⁸

Unfortunately I was overseas in Bangkok when Ian Murray’s letter was sent. I wrote in March 1973 that I would be very interested to hear whether his initiatives taken with other students had led to firm action at long last on the teaching of ethics and values, and enclosed a few relevant references. I would be hearing up-to-date news of the Michigan school when Paul and Lois Glasser joined us in August.⁹

Paul Glasser¹⁰

I was disappointed when Paul Glasser wrote in September 1968 that he had not heard from me and had asked around among colleagues and none seemed to be in correspondence with me. ‘I am hopeful that this is because you have

7 Letter, Gayle Murray to Professor J. Lawrence, 30/10/72.

8 Letter, Ian Murray to Professor John Lawrence, 1/11/72.

9 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Ian G. Murray, 19/3/73.

10 Paul Glasser joined the faculty of the University of Michigan in 1958. Born in 1929, he graduated in psychology and sociology from the City College of New York in 1949, and with an MS in social work from the Columbia University School of Social Work in New York in 1951. His subsequent social work experience was mainly in psychiatric settings – in an army hospital in Arkansas, 1952–3, in an alcoholism clinic, a child guidance home, and a university medical school in Cincinnati in Ohio, and briefly, in a hospital in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. At the University of North Carolina, he was a research assistant in the Institute for Research in Social Science, and then an NIMH trainee, 1956–8. In 1961, his PhD in sociology was from the University of North Carolina.

returned to a full and productive work load at your home university, and nothing beyond this'. For some reason, my letter had not been distributed as I had requested.

When we were leaving Ann Arbor at the end of 1967, Paul had said he was interested in the possibility of a year in Australia in the not-too-distant future, and he wrote that he was still interested. A target date of January 1970 seemed feasible if I and my faculty were still interested. Paul hoped that I had made some progress on the volume on which I was working while in the USA. He had been asked to serve as senior editor, responsible for all the articles on practice, of the new *American Encyclopedia of Social Work*, expected sometime in 1971. His letter concluded with 'All your colleagues here at the University think about you often, and miss both your scholarship and your charm. Do write soon.'¹¹

I responded promptly enclosing a copy of my earlier letter which he and the others had not seen. I could tell him that my new appointment meant I was now in a position to act directly to try to arrange his coming to Australia, attached to the school I now headed. 'Social work colleagues here who know your writing are most enthusiastic about the prospect. ... you would make a lasting contribution in professional areas where we are still very much a 'developing country'. Since nominations for an Australian American Educational Foundation award were due 25 September, I had immediately nominated Paul Glasser for a specific name request to undertake a suggested project. I had suggested the school needed the services of an American specialist like Professor Glasser in three important aspects of its work:

1. His major task would be the development of the Group Work Section of the School's curriculum. Professor Glasser is an experienced group work educator, who has taken a keen interest in (a) the relationship between the social work methods of social casework and social group work, (b) using research skills to evaluate professional and agency performance, and (c) incorporating new material from the social sciences into social work education. ...
2. His second task would be to assist in the general curriculum design and development that is taking place in this relatively new school. ... as a Program Head (of group work) and member of the Curriculum Committee at the University of Michigan School of Social Work, Professor Glasser was closely involved in the extensive curriculum revision accomplished by that School, 1964-7.
3. The head of school is planning an Australian Social Welfare Encyclopedia (or Handbook). Professor Glasser would be an invaluable consultant in this project. ...

Sydney University's Department of Social Work strongly supported the nomination and schools in other states would certainly also be interested in

¹¹ Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 16/9/68.

at least a brief visit if there were sufficient time and funds available.¹²

Paul was encouraged by my prompt action and thought my application seemed excellent. 'We both know that the tasks a visitor tackles are highly dependent upon both his personal interests and the needs of the department at a particular period in time, and these change not only yearly but often monthly. However, as you imply, I do believe my interests are broad enough so that I could be useful to both faculty and students at The University of New South Wales'. Paul would proceed with making an application for a Fulbright-Hays award for 1970, but the Vietnam War had been responsible for major budget cuts in all of the Federal programs, and he had just heard the Fulbright-Hays program budget for the next fiscal year had more than halved. The competition would be extremely keen and the result might well mean your request is not financed.¹³ In the event, Paul Glasser's name was not included in the American Fulbright lecturer and research scholar program for 1970. Of the 11 nominations made by UNSW only 3 were included, and two of these were shared nominations with other universities. Without any alternative financing for the Glassers, a visit in 1970 no longer seemed possible, but I would re-apply for a Fulbright in the 1971 program. There would be some advantage waiting until then because the school would have had a chance to settle down and we would have had a year's experience with the new curriculum. If Paul did come in 1971 we would be able to use him rather differently.¹⁴

Because the budget cuts had been so substantial, Paul was not surprised or too disappointed when he heard he was not included in the 1970 program. In some ways it was better to postpone the visit for a year anyway. 'We have had our share of student protest at The University of Michigan, and in the School of Social Work in particular, and I found myself in the middle of it. This had delayed my publication efforts, which I am finally getting back to now. ... another year here would enable me to finish off some of my commitments. Lois and I still would very much like to spend the better part of a year with you'.¹⁵

In July 1969, I nominated Paul for the 1971 program of the Australian-American Educational Foundation in almost identical terms as previously.¹⁶ Paul thanked me and hoped it would be a real possibility in 1971. He had just written to all the local congressmen and senators, as well as the chairman of each of the committees considering the Fulbright – Hays program and a new United States International Education Act that were now before Congress, asking that they be funded liberally. 'Whether this will do any good I don't know, but at least I felt better about it.' Lois and he had completed a Book of Readings on The Family and he was now working on the new *Encyclopedia of Social Work* during his 'vacation'. 'There are just too many interesting things to

12 Letter, Professor R. J. Lawrence to D. C. Vallentine, Associate Registrar, UNSW, 23/9/68. Although I officially did not take up my duties until 28/11/68, this action was fully endorsed by Professor Willis, chairman of the Board of Vocational Studies, and Associate Professor Parker, the present head of school.

13 Letter, 16/10/68.

14 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Glasser, 18/2/69.

15 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 1/4/69.

16 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Glasser, 2/7/69.

do in this world.¹⁷ In December 1969, again I heard that my nomination for Professor Glasser as a restrictive name request was not included – this time in the 1971 program. 5 of 23 nominations submitted by UNSW were successful; the general competition in the health, education and welfare category appeared to have been particularly stiff. Professor Willis told me that it was quite out of the question for the university to fund Paul Glasser as a visiting professor. The university was just entering a triennium during which finances were going to be very tight and in fact there had already been some cutbacks. Our only chance of him coming would therefore be to obtain independent finance.

It occurred to me that Paul might be interested in spending 1971 with us undertaking for us the ground-breaking research project initiated by the Commonwealth Department of Social Services.¹⁸ I told him about the great potential importance of the project and that a Michigan graduate, first brought to our notice by Rosemary Sarri, had recently withdrawn. The departmental officers and I had decided it was right to have the right person doing the job, and we would wait until such a person was located.

You are, of course, an experienced researcher, you would be doing a thoroughly worthwhile task from the Department's and the School's points of view, you would quickly get to know a great deal about our national social security system and the way Australians view it, and there is a fair chance you would receive sufficient finance to cover fares of your family to Australia and live comfortably while you are here. I fully realise the topic may not be in an area of present central interest to you, and that you have not been working with the Vinter and Sarri team. With your experience, however, I am sure you could take advantage of what your Michigan colleagues had to offer and do a thoroughly competent job.

I have discussed your curriculum vitae with Max Wryell, who is very much in favour of my writing to you to sound you out. ... We will be very pleased to have you located with us in the School. ... Max Wryell considered the financial aspect would be very much open to negotiation.

There could be some part-time teaching for Lois and yourself in the School, if you wished it, but this would not be very lucrative, I'm afraid.

I suggested he read Kewley's book on social security in Australia, and also told him about Margaret Gibson's MSW work on a selected segment of the project¹⁹ which could give him a flying start in January 1971 if he decided to come.²⁰

Paul Glasser was initially interested in the possibility of the Commonwealth departmental project but on reflection thought it would not maximise the use of his skills in Australia; other priorities might be higher. Both he and Edna Chamberlain, who was on sabbatical leave at Michigan from the University of Queensland,²¹ thought his greatest value might be in helping the profession

17 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 11/7/69.

18 See pp.147–8.

19 See pp. 148–9.

20 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Paul H. Glasser, 16/12/69.

21 Edna Chamberlain was auditing two of Paul Glasser's classes and she had been to their home. 'We find her a delightful person'.

and the schools develop a more social and behavioural science approach to practice. In any case, they had had to reconsider the possibility of leaving the United States for an extended period because of the serious illness of his aged mother, and the ill health of Lois's parents. Paul suggested two alternative short-term proposals and was continuing to search for funding to pay part of the costs. He stressed that they still wanted to come to Australia.²²

When Paul Glasser wrote in June 1970, life there was 'just too hectic'. They had had a student strike, a number of the faculty had been active concerning the political situation, and as usual he was trying to catch up on manuscript writing and editing. They would be eligible for sabbatical in fall 1973. If they cannot find a way to get to Australia sooner, he was very hopeful they could make it then.

Truthfully, Lois and I have been very upset about the political situation here. The Indo-China War, the repression on dissent, the increasing prejudice against blacks, and now Jews as well, etc, has got us up tight. This is the reason for our increased political activity. We have thought seriously about the possibility of a permanent move. This is one of the important reasons for our strong interest in a visit to Australia. Our limited knowledge of other nations leads us to your country as a first preference. We want to see what it is like.²³

I met up with Paul and Lois in Manila at the ICSW conference in September 1970, and had a chance to talk with them about future possibilities in Australia. In March 1971, I reported no success in trying to persuade the university authorities to fund a visit from Paul Glasser. The economic climate, both within the university and now nationally, was most unfavourable. I wrote, however, because if he was still interested in the possibility of eventually settling in Australia, he might wish to apply for the headship of the School of Social Work at the University of Queensland which was about to be advertised at a professorial level.²⁴ 'Few other positions in the country would offer you the same challenge and level of remuneration'.²⁵

In the summer of 1971, Paul was in Italy with Lois and the children on another Fulbright grant as a consultant on evaluative research. He wrote in June that the dean's situation got very messy towards the end, with much taking of sides and disorganisation. Phil Fellin, the best of the inside candidates, was chosen, although Paul would have preferred Bob Vinter who withdrew. Some colleagues had approached Paul to be a candidate but he had refused partly because he was not sure he wanted to be a dean. He thanked me for thinking about him for the deanship in Australia, but he doubted that an American would be acceptable, or even very effective. (Doubts which I also shared.) The Encyclopedia work was done, Bob Vinter, Rosemary Sarri and he had almost completed the new group work volume, and he was starting on a text in practice. 'There is always too much to do'. Lois and he were still planning to spend a

22 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 21/2/70.

23 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 19/6/70.

24 Its founding head, Hazel Smith, had recently died.

25 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Glasser, 9/3/71.

sabbatical with us 1973–74. Funding for Fulbright grants would be back on a high level again, beginning the next academic year. He hoped to see me at The Hague ICSW conference in August.²⁶

For the third time, I made a submission to the Australian–American Educational Foundation. The field of study of my proposed project was ‘Social work – specialising in social and behavioural science approaches to social work practice’, and I suggested Professor Paul Glasser to undertake it:

Social work education has been established in Australian universities since the early 1940s. In the recent period the general pattern of such education has taken the form of 4-year degree courses and postgraduate research degrees. In these degrees, there is growing emphasis on new social and behavioural science approaches to social work practice, which is being conceived far more broadly than in the past. Australian development in these directions is still, however, in its relatively early stages and an overseas social work educator with relevant experience and interests could make a crucial contribution at this point in the country’s social development.

Dr Glasser would study the availability and possible use for social work practice, of overseas and Australian social and behavioural science material. He would be especially concerned with its scope, relevance and validity for professional social work education, in the classroom and in the field.

Like other modern industrial societies, Australia is being made increasingly aware of its social problems. To cope with these, it badly needs professional people able to use new material from the social and behavioural sciences. New theoretical approaches in such areas as social change, social policy formation, community and group structures and processes and modes of learning, are rapidly changing the nature of social work practice.

This project would be valuable to a number of schools of social work as well as to experienced social work practitioners working in a wide variety of social welfare agencies.

Although Dr Glasser’s main focus would be on the project as outlined, he could also undertake limited teaching responsibilities.²⁷

In March 1972, I heard my submission had been included in the Foundation’s program for the 1973–74 academic year. Paul and his family were delighted to receive the news. ‘The way you have written the grant should make it relatively easy to write my application. As one of the small group who took the initiative in developing social science foundations for social work at The University of Michigan, which led the way nationally, and as my publications in both social work and social science indicate, I should be in an excellent position to qualify for the appointment.’ Paul and Lois were very sorry we would not be able to get together in The Hague. ‘Considering the major contribution you made to the last International Conference, we were sure you would be present at this one. It’s too bad this other commitment conflicts, but I’m sure you will make

26 Letter Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 7/6/71.

27 Professor R. J. Lawrence, ‘Submission to Australian–American Educational Foundation 1973 Programme for American Senior Scholars and Post Doctoral Fellows’, 18/8/71.

an important contribution to the World Rehabilitation Congress as well.²⁸

Paul's subsequent application in May 1972 for a Fulbright-Hays grant made a powerful case for the award. It concluded with:

Professor Lawrence chose to serve his sabbatical year ... because of his interest in the distinctive integrated curriculum in social work and social science at this School. Since then he hoped that I might join him and his colleagues in Australia in furthering such efforts there. I am hopeful that this plan can be carried out with the aid of a Fulbright-Hays grant.

His application was very strongly supported by four impressive referees. Fedele Fauri, former dean of the University of Michigan School of Social Work and now vice-president of the University, recommended him highly. He had outstanding qualifications for the proposed project, and was a tireless worker dedicated to his professional responsibilities. Robert Vinter, who had also known him since 1958 and had recently served as acting dean of the school, described him as an esteemed colleague and also a friend. He had a reputation as a quality instructor, who demanded much from his students but gave much in return. He knew how to involve students in the material in a way that made it meaningful and useful for practice. He kept abreast of the latest research in those areas of greatest interest to him. He was a capable administrator, who combined efficiency with interpersonal tact. Edwin Thomas, another outstanding member of the Michigan school, had known Paul Glasser for 10 years. His background in teaching, research, consultation and scholarly work prepared him well for the assignment. Robert Morris from the Florence Heller graduate school at Brandeis University, described Paul Glasser as one of the outstanding social work educators who bridged the concepts of social science and the requirements of administration and practice in social welfare. All three of the Michigan referees commented very favourably on the applicant's wife, Lois Glasser, currently a lecturer in the School Public Health. Fauri described her as an outstanding student in the MSW at the University of Michigan. Vinter commented on the popularity of the graduate courses she had taught to employed practitioners through the university extension division and her reputation as an excellent lecturer and fine seminar leader in the School of Public Health.²⁹

On 15 June 1972, Len Tierney wrote to me saying he would like to look at the possibility of having a man of Paul Glasser's quality at the University of Melbourne for some time, but he understood his visit was basically my project. I sent him a copy of my submission and said we would be in touch with his and other schools about the visit when it had been confirmed.

In a letter on 23 June 1972, I enclosed material on the one-year course work Master's degree expected to commence in 1973. 'This new programme should be one in which your help and experience would be particularly valuable'. I told him about the various schools of social work in the country and that I

28 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 9/4/72.

29 When I was informed in November 1972 by the Australia-American Foundation that Professor Glasser had accepted the award, enclosed was a copy of the application and the referee reports.

would ask each of them to send him their handbooks at the beginning of 1973. I would also have sent to him detailed course materials of our school to assist in his orientation. Our student numbers in 1972 were: BSW full-time – 289 (101, 66, 66, and 56 in the four years), part-time – 22 (8, 8, and 6 in the first 3 stages of the new six year program); MSW (by research) part-time – 6; PhD full-time – 2, part-time – 1.

The school would be moving into more adequate accommodation at the end of session 1, 1973, just in time for his visit! I also enclosed a brochure on the international rehabilitation seminar for August. Jim Dumpson was coming from the USA as the main seminar principal speaker. He would be at The Hague and I hoped that we might hear news of them from him.

In September 1972, Paul told me about his experience at the international conferences of social work education and social welfare in The Hague. He found the former much more stimulating because the groups were smaller, there were less formal papers, and people could be more involved. Paul had looked at the faculty handbook I had sent him and was looking forward to the receiving other handbooks for comparative purposes. 'Some of the issues seem to be related to not the amount or type of content but the integration of content into social work method in the classroom and in the field. I've already begun to think of some methods to solve such problems, and tested a few ideas on Kevin.'³⁰ Paul was impressed by the both the currency and flexibility of the requirements for the new Master's program. With the proposed small beginning class it could be tested well. It seemed like an exciting new development.³¹

By December 1972, Paul had the Fulbright award and he and Lois were very happy about it. He thanked me for all my efforts. It would be easier for Lois to get university leave if she had some teaching and consultative work in Australia. He had to apply for sabbatical leave by 1 March, but the dean did not anticipate any problem. They had received many materials from the Australian commission and embassy as well as the university.³² In a letter in February 1973, I enclosed two letters inviting Lois Glasser to consult and teach with the Marriage Guidance Council of New South Wales and to do some part-time teaching in our school and these enabled her to obtain official leave from the university. I also suggested two possible commitments for Paul, additional to the expectation that he would help us generally in the development of both our undergraduate and postgraduate curricula, which might well include specific teaching assignments 'once you know better where we are, and I have a clear idea of your own priorities'. The first possible commitment was that he would teach in session 2, a 2-hour seminar course, practice applications of contemporary behavioural science, in the new MSW (by course work) degree. The small class of 6 would be swelled by interested staff. The other possible commitment was that Paul might help the school run a national residential

30 Kevin O'Flaherty was a doctoral student from Melbourne taking a seminar with Paul. His interest was curriculum revision to incorporate social science in social work and would be returning to Australia at about the same time as Paul's visit.

31 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 24/9/72.

32 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 10/12/72.

seminar in the January-February break in 1974.³³

In mid-March in the middle of a large snow storm, Paul wrote that Lois's university leave had been granted, and that he was happy with both the MSW seminar course and the idea of a national residential seminar but asked if Spencer Colliver could write to him about what kind of content we had in mind for both. Kevin O'Flaherty saw Spencer last month in Melbourne and had told Paul our school was thriving. Social welfare was on a major upswing in general. Nixon there had made drastic cuts in all human services. The mood there was very gloomy. 'It will be nice to be under a progressive government if even for only one year'. Paul had heard from UNSW about the housing situation and he did not expect this would be a major problem, since they would have a decent income, and having travelled quite a bit, were pretty adjustable.³⁴

In May 1973, I wrote to Paul Glasser that we had recently lost our promising young community work teacher to the new federal Department of Urban and Regional Development. We would shortly be advertising the position as widely as possible overseas, especially in North America. Unless we could make a good appointment to guide and develop this vital aspect of the school's work we would be in serious difficulty. I hoped the Nixon cutbacks might work in our favour, much as I deplored them. 'Until fairly recently, Americans seeking academic appointments in Australia were often not very good quality, but the situation does seem to be changing. I would be most grateful for help from you in this matter'. We had just made what I believed was a suitable appointment to the senior research position in the family research project.³⁵ I hoped Kevin O'Flaherty was not too disappointed, but he would not have been available for the appointment until the end of the year.

I thought it best to leave until after Paul arrived any discussion of the 'national occasion' and of work with other schools. I anticipated he would be receiving a request to speak at the annual general meeting of the Council of Social Service of New South Wales on 22 August. Full details about the council and its activities would be sent to him with the invitation. I commented: 'This is a fairly conventional community welfare council type body with inadequate resources, but is trying to re-think its role and would benefit from the sort of input which I am sure you would be able to give'. 'Rest assured that I will do all I can to make your stay with us happy and memorable.'³⁶

In mid-June, Paul had just finished an international workshop on family planning, for which he had had considerable responsibility, and was completing two manuscripts for publication before he left. He had quickly checked with John Erlich about our community work position, for he knew John was in the market for a job, but unfortunately he had just taken another position.³⁷ He had been tied up with the workshop but would pursue other possibilities. Michigan, however, was now likely to retain most of its faculty on university

33 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Glasser, 20/2/73.

34 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 18/3/73.

35 Dr Adrian De Winter joined the school as senior research fellow, family research project, June 1973. He resigned in August 1974 and tragically died early the following year.

36 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Glasser, 29/5/73.

37 I knew John Erlich and he would have been an excellent appointment for us!

funds despite losses in federal funding, but this was not true of a number of other schools. The Glassers would be arriving in Sydney from Fiji on 7 August. Paul thanked me for suggesting he speak at the annual meeting of NCOSS. It would give him entre into the social work community rather quickly. He had already accepted the invitation. 'Watergate is on the front pages here every day. I must admit that I am glad to see Mr Nixon get his come-uppance, but upset about what this might mean for governmental processes. Meanwhile it all sounds like a good mystery novel that gets more complicated every day'.³⁸

On 27 June, I told Paul I would meet them at the Sydney airport on 7 August and take them to their hotel in Coogee. House-hunting and settling the children in school would most likely take a while. Since there was 2-week recess from classes from August 13, and classes in his MSW seminar course could be rescheduled later in the session, they should have reasonable time to house-hunt and settle their two children in school. A final letter from Paul described my meeting them at the airport and taking them to the Coogee Hotel as 'a lovely gesture, very much appreciated'. Spencer had sent him a very helpful letter about the MSW seminar course. It was very similar to one he had been teaching for a number of years. He was supposed to be writing a book in this area for Prentice-Hall. It was a compliment to have faculty 'sit in'. This was fine as long as the group did not get too big.³⁹

In July 1973, UNSW appointed Paul Glasser as honorary visiting professor in the School of Social Work during the period August 1973 to July 1974. He was welcomed to his first meeting of the professorial board on 4 September by Doug McCallum, the board's chairman.

Patsy McPaul, the school's administrative officer picked up the Glassers at the Coogee hotel on 8 August, took them to UNSW and began helping them with school enquiries.⁴⁰ On the Saturday evening, Trish and I had the Glassers and the Collivers to dinner in our home. Professor Al Willis had the Glassers, Athol Congalton, Spencer Colliver and myself to a lunch in a private dining room in the Round House at UNSW the next Monday, and Lois had an appointment with Frank Johnson from the Marriage Guidance Council. Some-one from the Australian-American Educational Foundation would have met the Glassers at the airport if I had not done so, and visited Paul from Canberra in his second week with us. Since we and Paul wanted him to be with us until the end of the first session in 1974, I requested and received a one-month extension of his senior scholar award from the Foundation.

In a letter to the Foundation on 26 September seeking clarification of the health insurance situation of his family, Paul thanked the Foundation for the extension and gave a brief report on his activities:

Planning for the conference in February on the integration of social and behavioural science into social work practice is proceeding well. Invitations to faculty in all the schools and departments of social work in Australia have been sent ... and the initial response has been quite favourable. We expect that this will lead

38 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 14/6/73.

39 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, early July, 1973.

40 The children were still in primary schooling. Heather was 11, and Frederick (Freddy) 9.

to requests for other forms of specific aid in curriculum development as well.

At present I am fully occupied in activities at the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. I am giving a two-hour seminar for faculty and advanced graduate students on behavioural science and social work. A number of faculty are consulting with me on curriculum change, and almost all of the Masters and Doctoral candidates are working with me on project and thesis proposals. I have also been consulting with agency field instructors and administrators. Since this University has the largest faculty and student body, with the most complete graduate program, this effort has provided me with an orientation to academic life and the profession in Australia which will be very useful during the remainder of my time in this country.

... my family and I are settled in a lovely house in Roseville-Chase. Colleagues and neighbours have been very gracious to us all, and with their help we are fully enjoying the beautiful environment of Sydney.⁴¹

Edna Chamberlain, as head of the Department of Social Work at the University of Queensland, was interested in a visit from Paul Glasser during the first semester of 1974.⁴² Paul suggested the week before the May recess. In his response, he noted that Edna was a member of the Australian government Social Welfare Commission 'which I gather places you in an influential position in terms of federal policy. That's good.' Lois, the children and Paul sent Edna and her daughter their warmest best wishes.⁴³ In October, Paul wrote to Len Tierney in response to Len's expression of interest in an earlier letter suggesting he might visit the University of Melbourne in mid-December to coincide with a seminar on curriculum evaluation and revision which he had heard about from Kevin O'Flaherty.⁴⁴ Another letter of interest in a visit came from La Trobe University Department of Sociology, interested in Paul's work on families in crisis.

At the end of Paul Glasser's time with us, I was asked to provide a short structured confidential evaluation report to the Australian-American Educational Foundation. I rated his ability as outstanding:⁴⁵

Professor Glasser made an outstanding contribution to the School's teaching and research program, and in addition his ability has been quickly recognised by other Schools of Social Work and Australian Government Instrumentalities. Particularly notable has been his contribution to the Australian Government Family Research Project which is operating in the School of Social Work.

On his 'general attitude and personal adjustment':

Professor Glasser has demonstrated a thoroughly professional attitude to his work and could not have been more helpful. He made a very quick adjustment to working in the School.

41 Letter, Paul Glasser to H. F. Willcock, Executive Officer, Australian-American Educational Foundation, 26/12/73.

42 Letter, Edna Chamberlain to H. F. Willcock, Executive Officer, Australian-American Educational Foundation, 3/9/73.

43 Letter, Paul Glasser to Mrs E. R. Chamberlain, 19/10/73.

44 Letter, Paul Glasser to Len Tierney, 16/10/73.

45 It was certainly better than 'very good', the other positive alternative available on the report form.

On any difficulties: health ... personal ... financial ... dependants ...:

None – to my knowledge

Should he, in the future, receive another grant?

Most definitely.⁴⁶

Paul and Lois returned to their pressured life in Ann Arbor. As usual Paul had too much to do, teaching a full load and working on several publications, and Lois was now full-time in the School of Public Health. On their return they had built an apartment extension to their house for Lois's aging parents. In a letter to my secretary Betty Davis and staff in late October, Paul wrote 'Frankly, I very much miss Australia, Sydney, the University of New South Wales, and most particularly, all of the friends and colleagues there. ... I am still hopeful that I may return for even a brief time to work on the national family study a year from January.' 'The children have adjusted well back at school'. Paul mentioned that Len Tierney was most likely going to spend the next academic year at the University of Michigan on his sabbatical, as I had done.⁴⁷

In November 1976, Paul sent me a copy of his very positive reference for Kevin O'Flaherty, an applicant for the second chair in the school.

Life continues to be overstimulating, and frankly, I fall into the same kinds of traps I described for Kevin. Since this is your weakness as well, I know you understand. ...

Please send warm regards from all of us to all our friends and colleagues in the School, in Sydney, and in Australia. We think of you often. Many is the day when, if I didn't feel such a sense of responsibility to family and friends here,⁴⁸ I would love to write to you that I was interested in the second Chair at New South Wales. Unfortunately, this is not possible at the present time.

In May 1978, Paul regretted that it had been some time since we corresponded at length. 'I guess each of us is involved in too many things.' A letter from Ross Webster at the University of Melbourne had reminded him we had not kept in touch. He thanked me for thinking of him as a possible applicant for the University of Melbourne chair. It was not the time for him to spend a great deal of time overseas. In three to five years it might be quite different.

You may be surprised that the family and I expect to leave Ann Arbor permanently. This summer, I have been offered an exceedingly fine position as Dean at The University of Texas – Arlington. ... We have wanted to move to a better climate for some time, and both the University and the area itself are rapidly expanding and wealthy. The School is relatively new with much potential, and a very forward looking central administration. Finally, the University of Michigan is having terrible problems, partly because of a financial squeeze. This School itself is in considerable

46 R. J. Lawrence, 'Evaluation Report on American Grantee', Australian-American Educational Foundation, 14/6/74.

47 Letter, Paul Glasser to Betty Davis, 28/10/74. Apparently Paul did not realise I was in England on study leave in the second half of 1974. He had not heard from me, although he had written to me a few times from New Zealand.

48 Lois's parents lived with them on their return to Australia. Her father had died suddenly in August and her mother now had terminal cancer.

trouble because Phil Fellin has provided almost no leadership. I am sorry to say that I am not the only one leaving.

But we are looking forward to an exciting new life in the Southwest.⁴⁹ We hope you and your family will come to visit us there. ... We do hope we will be able to get together soon.⁵⁰

In my response, I warmly congratulated Paul on his appointment. I had heard something of his news when Rosemary Sarri had visited. I told of the very successful national residential seminar on the evaluation of social welfare programs which she had run for us. A director for the university's Social Welfare Research Centre had been chosen and this very significant new development should get off the ground next year. Ron Baker, the person appointed to the second chair of social work was now well settled and was proving to be a very congenial and helpful colleague. I was distressed by his comments about the Michigan school, but supposed that every institution tended to fluctuate in its fortunes. I also sent him some of our family news:

Our family continues to mature in interesting ways. David is in his third year of the Industrial Design course at the Sydney College of the Arts and engaged to an English girl who is now living here in Sydney. Peter has commenced Arts/Law at the University of New South Wales and continues to be very keen on his cello. Ruth has changed schooling, and is thoroughly enjoying her environment. She has just become a member of the Sydney Youth Orchestra which means additional claims on her time but it also greatly extends her horizons. Finally and most important of all, Trish continues to cope with us all and stay marvellously unflappable.⁵¹

Rosemary Sarri

When Rosemary Sarri wrote from the University of Michigan in June 1969 about employment for one of her graduating students from the administration sequence,⁵² she told me about the problems the school had been having with the student movement. She added:

We are still in the process of modifying the social services and policy curriculum so when you feel like returning for a short curriculum meeting, you will probably find us still considering some of the problems talked about while you were here.⁵³

In my reply, I told her Spencer Colliver was proving the asset that I hoped he would. He had provided a course on social welfare administration for about 28 senior administrators. Their interest and response had highlighted the need for this development. I sent her an all-purpose advertisement for about three staff if she knew of anyone that might be interested. Finally,

49 Lois's mother who had been living with them sadly had had a lingering and painful death.

50 Letter, Paul Glasser to John Lawrence, 18/5/78.

51 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Glasser, 2/6/78.

52 See p. 147.

53 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 10/6/69.

Trish and I send our best wishes to Rom and yourself, and to all our other Michigan friends. Your book of Ann Arbor sketchings serves as a reminder of a very happy and stimulating year.⁵⁴

In March 1971, I checked with Rosemary Sarri about my recollection that she did not hold in very high regard an older, well-known social work educator from the USA. He was interested in a sabbatical in Australia in the autumn term of 1972. Rosemary told me in confidence she could not recommend him for employment as a visiting professor in our school. He was extremely traditional in his orientation and had not kept up-to-date at all about current contributions of social science to social welfare administration and policy. 'Since I know that many faculty from this School have been interested in obtaining opportunities in other countries for their sabbatical leaves, I am sure you can do far better.' She sent her warmest regards to Trish and Spencer. 'I continue to hope that the opportunity arises for us to visit you within the next few years.'⁵⁵ In my response, I wrote: 'The prospect of receiving a visit from you at some time in the future is most attractive. Please let's keep in touch about this possibility'.⁵⁶

My next correspondence with Rosemary Sarri was not until early 1975 when I wrote in support of an application to the University of Michigan by Elizabeth Ozanne from the University of Melbourne. My first knowledge of Elizabeth came from her participation in Paul Glasser's national 10-day seminar on the application of behavioural science to social work education. At one stage in the seminar she discussed with me the teaching of materials on values and subsequently sought from me relevant teaching materials. She impressed me as a serious-minded capable person concerned about important issues and willing to accept personal responsibility in tackling them. In general, I saw her as a promising prospect for post-graduate work and in fact had encouraged her in this direction. Elizabeth graduated from the University of Melbourne BA, DipSocSt in 1968. At the University of Michigan she completed an MSW (1976) and an MA (1978), and later completed her PhD (1985). She is currently an associate professor at the University of Melbourne – a very experienced social work educator and highly regarded scholar particularly in the area of ageing and social policy.

In April 1976, Rosemary Sarri wrote that she was considering the possibility of sabbatical leave in Australia. Len Tierney, Adam Jamrozik and Paul Glasser had encouraged this, and Paul had persuaded her to talk with her husband about arranging leave so they could be away for a year – September 1977 to August 1978 would be best for their children's schooling. She enclosed her 'vita' and added her 'particular areas of competence for teaching': social legislation, social policy and change, complex organisations, social deviance and criminal justice, and research design and program evaluation. She was particularly interested in the problem of adolescents in post-industrial societies. Originally she had expected to spend a 6-month leave in the Philippines and Hong

54 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 3/7/69.

55 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 7/4/71.

56 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 10/5/71.

Kong, with a brief period in China, to become better informed about adolescent socialisation in Asian countries. A Fulbright fellowship was available for 1977–78 at Flinders University in Adelaide. She wondered if some other type of arrangement could be worked out at UNSW.⁵⁷

I immediately cabled 10 June, 'Letter just received,⁵⁸ delighted at possibility, making urgent enquiries'. In a letter on 23 June, I told Rosemary I had discussed her letter with the university's pro-vice-chancellor and dean of our faculty, Al Willis. We agreed that it might work out well if she had a joint appointment of part-time teaching in the School of Social Work, and part-time as a visiting research fellow in the university's proposed Social Welfare Research Centre (SWRC). However, there were some complications. The university's funding situation in the next year or two would be very tight, and there was little chance of funds for any additional position. I was willing to get the funds from a full-time vacant tutorship if need be. Session 2 would start 25 July 1977, and session 1 would end in mid-1978. I was sure we could work out suitable part-time teaching assignments if she was with us over this period.

I had discussed the SWRC possibility with the vice-chancellor, Professor Rupert Myers. He saw it as a 'very interesting proposal', but it would be months before such a decision could be made.

I understand his caution. Only recently has the idea of the establishment of the Centre been publicly announced and detailed discussions between the University and the federal government about the Centre are only now commencing. I think, however, that the government is keen to proceed reasonably quickly and I certainly would anticipate that the Centre would be functioning by this time next year.

The Centre is a most interesting, and potentially a most important national social welfare development. Its draft terms of reference are very broad. It apparently indicates a national government commitment to a need for university based multi-disciplinary research in social welfare matters. The Centre will be an autonomous unit in the University directly accountable to the Vice-Chancellor. It will be fully funded by the federal government for most likely five years, with longer-term renewal expectations. It will have a nucleus of professional research staff, and in the initial draft proposal there is mention of the possibility of Visiting Research Fellows. I would see it as invaluable for the Centre to have someone with your capacity and experience in social welfare research attached to it, especially in its early stages. And I am sure this point of view would be shared by many people, including Spencer Colliver and Max Wryell, senior officials in the Commonwealth Department of Social Security who are very much involved on the government side in the establishment of the Centre.

If Rosemary delayed coming until the calendar year of 1978, this would give more time for the situation at the Centre to be clarified and I could apply before September 1976 for her coming to us on a Fulbright grant in 1978. She was looking for an arrangement that would provide half her salary. I needed to know the amount involved. We were very keen to work out an attractive

57 Letter, Rosemary C. Sarri to Dr R. J. Lawrence, 8/4/76.

58 Inexplicably it was not sent airmail, but by surface mail.

possibility for Rosemary, but it might take some time before the position could be clarified.⁵⁹

On 8 July, Rosemary Sarri wrote that they were still planning their leave in Australia beginning in summer 1977, through to about June 1978. No arrangements had been finalised and she was happy to learn of the possibility at our school. She had applied for a Fulbright on two bases, a lectureship at Flinders and a research award to do comparative research in Australia and the Philippines on adolescent socialisation and social control institutions, etc. She would know the outcome in about December 1976. If she received the latter grant she could locate at the new SWRC. If not, and she were to negotiate an arrangement with our school and the Centre, she would need about 50% of her salary, or \$19,000. Her sabbatical would provide for half of her salary over 12 months. She would prefer a combined teaching and research assignment if that were possible. Since she had had about 20 years' experience in research administration and was just completing a 5-year national study of juvenile corrections, she might be able to be helpful in the establishment of our new centre. They had four Australian students in the master's and doctoral programs, in addition to Len Tierney and Adam Jamrozik being there. It sounded as if exciting things were happening. She was also looking forward to meeting Ian Cox, who would be in Hamilton, Ontario, for the next year. Her husband Rom was hoping to obtain electrical engineering consulting work during the year.⁶⁰

In January 1977, UNSW received the list of American Fulbright scholars for 1977. Rosemary Sarri would be visiting the School of Social Sciences at Flinders University of South Australia for 9 months commencing in August. She would conduct courses on changing service delivery in human service organisations and on services to juvenile offenders, and would also contribute to social policy and research seminars and assist in the development of new courses. 'Professor Sarri has a B.A. in political science and economics and an M.S.W. from the University of Minnesota and a Ph.D. in sociology and social work from the University of Michigan'. I was pleased her visit to Australia was now organised but had some regrets she would not be based with us at UNSW.

After talking with Tom Brennan, I asked her to consider running some seminars for staff and at least postgraduate students from the two schools in Sydney, possibly in October. I also suggested she might visit the SWRC towards the end of her stay in Australia. Planning for the centre was proceeding soundly but progress was slow. By then, staff should have been appointed.⁶¹

Rosemary Sarri was happy to participate in a seminar with the two Sydney schools, after checking with Peg Norton at Flinders that the date would not interfere with her responsibilities there. Her children would be in school in Adelaide and it was important she was not away for too long. She could visit the SWRC in May 1978 after completing her teaching obligations early that month. Their arrangements for their visit in Adelaide were proceeding, but Rom had not yet obtained employment. They needed information about electrical

59 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Rosemary C. Sarri, 23/6/76.

60 Letter, Rosemary C. Sarri to R. J. Lawrence, 8/7/76.

61 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Rosemary C. Sarri, 11/2/77.

engineering and electrical power systems in the Adelaide area. Could I possibly put them in touch with appropriate help? Rom's vita was enclosed. Originally professionally qualified in Turkey, he had an MS in electrical engineering from the University of Michigan and was a licensed professional engineer in Michigan. Since 1964, he had been chief electrical engineer in a firm of consulting engineers and architects in Ann Arbor.⁶² Professor Murray Allen, head of the UNSW School of Electrical Engineering, and one of his staff, thought Rom should pursue his letter to the Electricity Trust of South Australia and also write to the secretary or the Adelaide branch of the Institute of Engineers for information about consulting engineering firms in the Adelaide area.⁶³ In July, Rosemary said that things remained a bit uncertain for Rom, but he would start at the Electricity Trust. The recession in Australia appeared to be the major problem.⁶⁴ In the event, Rom had to spend most of the year in Ann Arbor, but he did join the rest of the family in January 1978, for a month in Australia, when they travelled by car all around the south-east coast, and later met them in Greece and travelled through Europe and back home with them.

On the morning of 22 November 1978, Rosemary Sarri provided a joint seminar on social welfare administration and research, for staff and postgraduate students from the two Sydney schools; in the evening she spoke to a general meeting of the NSW branch of the AASW on her experience in the national evaluation of the juvenile justice system in the United States. Trish and I had her to stay in our home for a couple of nights during her brief visit to Sydney.

Proposal for a National Seminar on Program Evaluation

My letter to Rosemary Sarri in February 1977 raised an important possibility. A meeting of the joint liaison committee for continuing education⁶⁵ had agreed with my proposal that we should ask her to consider being responsible for the content and design of a national residential seminar on program evaluation in early February 1978. We had in mind a group of about 35–40 people, drawn from all states and the ACT, and involved in program evaluation at all levels of government and in non-government agencies. The group would be a mix of policy-makers, administrators, researchers and educators. 'The topic is very timely and in Australia at present such a seminar is likely to obtain widespread support. Your particular background and expertise, and your general standing make us enthusiastic about the idea'. I had mentioned the idea to Spencer Colliver and his department (DCSS) would certainly back and assist such a seminar.⁶⁶

The topic for the residential seminar on program evaluation appealed to Rosemary Sarri particularly since she had done a considerable amount of program evaluation in past years and most recently completed a national

62 Letter, Rosemary C. Sarri to R. J. Lawrence, 15/3/77.

63 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Rosemary C. Sarri, 31/3/77.

64 Letter, Rosemary C. Sarri to R. J. Lawrence, 21/7/77.

65 It consisted of representatives of the two schools of social work and the New South Wales Branch of the AASW. Two colleagues, Michael Hosburgh of university of Sydney and David Neeley, the president of the NSW branch of the AASW, joined me to plan the seminar.

66 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Rosemary C. Sarri, 11/2/77.

evaluation of the juvenile justice system. Since the seminar would be in the summer break the timing should not be a problem. She would like to have some indication about the issues and content for the seminar, she liked the suggested composition of the group, and in fact would be running a national conference in June on several aspects of program evaluation so would have a dry run to prepare for our seminar.⁶⁷

Planning the National Seminar

A small committee of three planned the seminar, with me as convenor. My two colleagues were Michael Horsburgh of University of Sydney and David Neely, the president of the NSW branch of the AASW. All of the detailed secretarial and administrative work was done by the school's staff, and the university's printing unit could not have been more helpful in helping to complete the urgent compilation of seminar papers. Initially the seminar was going to be held at Little Bay in the residential centre of UNSW's Institute of Administration about 9 miles from the centre of Sydney. Josh Owen, the Institute's director, commented to me after we made a tentative booking, 'If the Conference Leader is of the same calibre as Paul Glasser, I feel quite sure the Conference will be a success.'⁶⁸ Nearer the time, however, we had to change the location to Shalom College at UNSW, about 4 miles from the centre of Sydney. At the end of May 1977, I sent Rosemary Sarri a copy of a statement we had prepared about the seminar, which included a guide for participants. I also enclosed a copy of a letter I had sent, with the statement, to the recent conference of social welfare administrators,⁶⁹ enlisting their support for the seminar. I wrote individual letters to selected people and to departmental heads asking them to nominate possible participants.⁷⁰

Each participant was expected to prepare a case example of evaluating a social welfare program. For the purposes of the seminar, a 'program' was the pursuit of specified ends through an organised set of social, financial, technological, and physical arrangements, over a specified period of time. A 'social welfare program' was a program (1) that was 'social' in its auspice and accountability, i.e. there was some kind of collective/community auspice, government or non-government, and it was seen as in some way socially accountable, and (2) had 'social well-being' as its prime purpose, i.e. it aimed to maintain or improve general social and living standards with regard to such culturally valued ends as income, employment, education, health, housing, recreation, and civil and political rights, or it was primarily concerned with the social and

67 Letter, Rosemary C. Sarri to R. J. Lawrence, 15/3/77.

68 Letter, J. I. Owen to R. J. Lawrence, 3/2/77. I knew Josh from being on the board of the institute and also because he had married June Duncan, one of my fellow social work students at the University of Adelaide in the early 1950s.

69 The conference consisted of the permanent public service heads of each state 'social welfare' department and the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. It was a crucial group to approach concerning the proposed seminar.

70 Sid Sax, chairman of the Hospitals and Health Services Commission in Canberra, had hoped to get to the seminar but had just been asked to chair two major national inquiries, with possible deadlines early in 1978. He suggested Peter Moyle in his stead. Letter, Sidney Sax to R. J. Lawrence, 15/8/77.

living standards of particular vulnerable groups in the community.

At least analytically, each social welfare program might be seen to consist of an initiating set of concerns, a specification of goals to be achieved to do something about those concerns, a set of policies to achieve the goals, and a set of arrangements which used financial, manpower, technological, and physical resources in particular ways over specified periods in accordance with the program's policies.

Evaluation of a program involved not only periodic assessment of the program as a whole, but also periodic assessment of each of the above components, taking into account their logical and temporal relationships.

Each participant was expected to prepare a case example of evaluating a social welfare program. This would entail choosing a particular program, and evaluating its progress over a specified period of time. The program might encompass part of an organisation's activities. It might encompass a whole organisation. It might encompass a broader 'community' program in which many organisations or aspects of organisations were involved.

It was hoped that by the end of September, each participant would have informed the convenor of the planning committee of their selected program. Prior to the seminar, participants were expected to read generally about program evaluation, to indicate to the seminar leader particular issues they would like covered in the seminar itself, and to provide in written form at least a draft of their case study.⁷¹

In July, Rosemary Sarri sent a reading list for the seminar, as requested. People could select 3–5 items and read them carefully. 'There is always considerable redundancy with a set of readings such as this, particularly from the point of view of policy makers and administrators. It's only researchers who get concerned about some of the minute differences.' She would be in Sydney with her family 24–27 August. The Australian and American foundation had booked them in at the Hilton. She was keen to be briefed about the relevant and critical issues to be emphasised in the seminar.

I am not familiar with social welfare in Australia and I do not wish to come in acting like many Americans do in other countries "telling people what they should do". Our country is a huge welfare mess, so I'm very cautious.

I met the Sarris at the airport and took them to their hotel. In the course of their visit, the Lawrence and Sarri families got together in our home and we also showed them something of Sydney.

The planning committee for the national seminar met with Rosemary Sarri in Sydney on 25 August at the Smith Family. In September she wrote an appreciative letter from Flinders University in Adelaide and enclosed a suggested format to be used by each of the participants in preparing their case study, to be sent to them as quickly as possible. The possibility of the case reports and some aspects of the conference proceedings being published would be considered at the seminar. Rosemary also indicated that the timing of a return visit to Sydney to do the joint seminar with the two schools would need to be delayed

71 'A National Seminar – February 5–10, 1978.'

until later in November. She had been put on a special committee to draft the new juvenile code following the recommendations of a royal commission in South Australia.

By 22 December, Rosemary Sarri had only received 6 of the case reports.

Unfortunately nearly all are written very much like government reports and are far less dynamic than I would have liked. My suggestion that they focus greater attention on 'process' and that they consider the reader seemed to have received minimal attention. ... we will need to be far more specific and perhaps give each a concrete model when we ask them to revise for publication. ... I have already drawn up a tentative suggested outline. ... I would suggest that you go ahead and have someone xerox the reports as they come in without editing. ...

I will be sending a daily programme plan and schedule plus a classified bibliography ... You indicated that you would arrange a special lending library at the building where we will have the seminar. That will help and I intend to set aside a little time for reading because it looks as if people need more exposure to the wealth of evaluation literature. There's no need for everyone to "try to invent the wheel". ... the film on Sesame Street will not be available ... it is not being lent outside the U.S. and Canada at this time.⁷²

There was one slight complication:

I did a seminar in Canberra for Social Security and also met with Mr Lanigan, the Director-General. As a result he wishes me to work with his Division Heads and Regional Directors at some site in the Blue Mountains, Thursday-Sunday prior to the beginning of the seminar, ... on future directions and priority setting for Social Security. They want the meeting prior to final work on the Budget this year so reluctantly I agree to do it. I will be finished with my part by Saturday February 4 at mid-day I believe, so I would like to come to Sydney and go directly to some place where I can work on the seminar without interruption. It would be nice to stay with you but I know if I were to do that I would get very little down. So I'll get a hotel room and come to the University Sunday afternoon. I will take the girls to Melbourne where they will stay with the O'Flahertys because I cannot locate household help here (in Adelaide).⁷³

In early January 1978, Rosemary drew up a schedule for the seminar that took into account the preferences of people attending. The program avoided long blocks of lecture, and scheduled topics for lecture-discussion intermeshed with discussion groups and group presentations. Each participant was assigned to a small group for the presentation of her/his report. All participants were expected to review all case reports prior to the session at which each would be discussed.⁷⁴

Towards the end of January, we were able to send to each participant a large hard-backed folder containing 27 of the case reports in 488 numbered pages for easy reference, to be read prior to the seminar, plus detailed information

72 Letter, R. C. Sarri to R. J. Lawrence, 1/1/78.

73 Letter, R. C. Sarri to R. J. Lawrence, 1/1/79

74 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 4/1/78.

about the seminar and the seminar schedule. Copies of late reports, a classified bibliography, and a complete list of participants and their case study topic⁷⁵ were given to them on their arrival.

The Seminar, 5–10 February, 1978

Rosemary Sarri, provided the keynote address on a framework for program evaluation followed by discussion on what evaluation can and cannot accomplish. She then gave periodic lectures on : methodological issues in evaluation; roles of evaluation; values and ethical issues in evaluation and social experimentation; politics of evaluation – uses and abuses; and funding, training and structural arrangements of evaluation. Discussion groups reviewed their case reports in preparation for group presentations later in the program. Five groups focused on: studies of specialised community centre programs; studies of multi-purpose community centre programs; studies of voluntary welfare organisations; financial benefit, loans and grant programs; evaluation of health, educational programs; and a sixth group on miscellaneous studies.

The Participants and their Case Study Topics

Clyde Adams (State Treasury Department, Western Australia)

- A study of the inquiry in 1976 into residential child care in Western Australia, with particular reference to financial aspects.

Peter Allen (Victorian Council of Social Service)

- The use of the United Way of America services identification system in agency evaluation.

Peter Baume (Senator for New South Wales)

- Program evaluation-so what? : the funeral benefits scheme.

Robert Bell (Commonwealth Department of Social Security, Canberra)

- A study of persons receiving special benefit who are caring for near relatives.

Peter Bicknell (Sturt College of Advanced Education, Adelaide)

- The Parks community centre: a strategy for evaluation.

Graeme Brewer (Brotherhood of St Laurence, Fitzroy)

- Job Centre, an innovation in service delivery to the unemployed.

Shirley Castley (Department of Social Welfare, Tasmania)

- Evaluation of the preventive payment scheme.

Eva Cox (Council of Social Service of New South Wales)

- Evaluating a co-ordinating agency, preliminary to a case study.

Lynn Davies (Tasmanian Department of Community Welfare)

- Introductory report for the evaluation of the welfare client committee.

⁷⁵ Each participant provided information on: their employer, position, work address, qualifications and experience, and their case study topic. A full vita of the seminar leader, Rosemary Sarri, was provided.

John Davoren (the Catholic Church of Australia)

- Evaluation project: Catholic family welfare bureau, Sydney.

Frances Donovan (School of Social Work, Preston Institute of Technology, Bundoora, Victoria)

- Report on a case study of a voluntary organisation [Red Cross].

Andrew Duguid (South Australian Department of Community Welfare)

- Evaluation of a crisis care service.

Barbara Easteal (Welfare branch, Department of the Capital Territory)

- Woden community service child care facility survey.

Anne Gorman (New South Wales Department of Youth and Community Services)

- Community rebuilding project: inner city area, Sydney.

David Hall (Commonwealth Department of Social Security)

- Commonwealth subsidy for activity therapy centres for handicapped persons.

Stuart Hamilton & Mark Johnston (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet)

- Evaluating an experiment in access to welfare services – the north-west one-stop welfare [NOW] centre.

Allen Hapgood (New South Wales Department of Youth and Community Services, principal psychologist)

Michael Horsburgh (Department of Social Work, University of Sydney)

- Evaluation of the first ten years of the foster care system in New South Wales, 1881–90.

Jim Ife (Department of Social Work, Tasmanian College of Advanced Education)

- A review of the evaluation of the Hobart drug information and assistance centre.

Elizabeth Johnson (The Salvation Army, postgraduate student at UNSW)

- The haven – youth referral centre, Brisbane.

Peter Jordan (Commonwealth Department of Veterans' Affairs, Brisbane)

- The use of workload standards in evaluation of organisational performance.

Anthony Kelly (MSW student at University of Queensland, formerly director of QCOSS)

- A community case study: Rocklea family leisure club.

William Kidston (Department for community welfare, Western Australia)

- Evaluation of the parent help centre.

John Lawrence (School of Social Work, UNSW)

- seminar convenor.

John MacMahon (Commonwealth Department of Social Security)

- An evaluation of invalid pensions.

Elaine Martin, (School of Social Sciences, Flinders University of South Australia)

- The evaluation of social work courses.

Joe Martins (Health Commission of New South Wales)

- Community mental health services in New South Wales.

Peter Moyle (Commonwealth Department of Health)

- Evaluation of the objectives of the community health program.

Marie Mune (School of Social Studies, South Australian Institute of Technology)

- Designing the evaluation of a crisis care centre.

David Neely (The Smith Family)

- The implementation and progress of a loan scheme for low income families.

Clare Parkinson (Australian Council of Social Service)

- Monitoring and evaluation development project, April 1977 – June 1978.

Frederick Robinson (Department for community welfare, Western Australia)

- The evaluation of State-run Commonwealth funded programs.

Rosemary Sarri (School of Social Work, University of Michigan)

- seminar leader.

Jerome Winston (Preston Institute of Technology)

- The steering committee for evaluation.

Almost all of the invited participants who attended, in fact, eventually managed to produce a case report for consideration at the seminar. Ray Brown, Tom Brennan, Tony Vinson and Ian Yates all hoped to participate, but unfortunately for a variety of reasons had to withdraw. My letter of invitation gave three main reasons for the seminar – its topic had been of mounting interest and concern in Australia; the seminar's relatively neutral auspice should assist greater general understanding of the topic – between and across social welfare sectors and at different levels of social organisation under different auspices; and most important, the seminar would allow some strategically placed people throughout Australia's social welfare arrangements to take advantage of Professor Sarri's visit to Australia – her background and expertise in the evaluation of programs of widely varying scope and different auspice, and her experience as an educator, made her a most appropriate leader for a national seminar on the evaluation of social welfare programs.

The two obvious weaknesses in the social welfare mix we achieved with the participants were the relative absence of the massive education sector, where increasing evaluation activity was clearly evident, and the troubled and difficult area of aboriginal affairs. After losing our first invitation somewhere in its bureaucratic processes, the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs finally decided not to send a participant. A participant experienced in the evaluation of educational programs⁷⁶ was a last-minute withdrawal because of illness. The Labor opposition in the Commonwealth parliament indicated interest in the seminar but eventually did not send a participant.

76 Professor Mackay, Faculty of Education, Monash university.

Senator Peter Baume, chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, was an active participant. His committee had received a reference in June 1976 to report to the senate on evaluation of the adequacy of Australian health and welfare services with particular reference to: (1) standards of performance and provision of health and welfare services; (2) the pattern of current practice in the provision of such services in terms of need and demand; (3) mechanisms for evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of health and welfare services; and requirements for ongoing evaluation as an integral part of the development of health and welfare service programs. Senator Baume clearly found helpful, a well-attended informal discussion on a free evening during the seminar, which focused directly on the committee's task. Four of the seven special papers subsequently commissioned by the committee on various aspects of evaluation for the second volume of the committee's report were prepared by people who attended the seminar. (I think Peter Baume was one of us who enjoyed some light relief late on a very hot night with a swim at a nearby nunnery, by courtesy of Father John Davoren who had free access to the pool. It was just as well no press photographers were there – we swam in our underclothes.)

Peter Baume wrote to me immediately after the seminar, saying how much he had gained from the seminar and thanked me for what he described as 'a personal triumph' in conceiving and organising it. It obviously would not have been possible without Professor Rosemary Sarri. Throughout the week of the seminar, she made a massive systematic input on various aspects of evaluation, reflecting her extensive knowledge of the literature and her own practical experience as an evaluator. When I sent her a bank draft for her leadership of the seminar and travel and other expenses, I expressed the deep gratitude of all who had been involved in the seminar. 'This occasion could eventually prove to have been of considerable significance in the life of the nation, even though we at present of course see it much more modestly.'⁷⁷

Several of the participants wrote appreciative letters to Rosemary Sarri, so my choice of topic had been most appropriate for people's needs.⁷⁸

Clyde Adams⁷⁹ wrote to me from Perth:

Now that I have come back to earth again and the realities of my Treasury life, I thought it would be appropriate to express to you my appreciation of your contributions to what was a memorable experience.

I enjoyed my participation in the seminar more than I have enjoyed anything for a long time. It was interesting, absorbing and all-involving. I would like to think that the outcome will be worthy of the project itself.

He himself was shortly moving to another job in Darwin but he had reported his impressions, and was sure Fred Robinson would be waving the flag for more

⁷⁷ Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 15/2/78.

⁷⁸ Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 21/2/78.

⁷⁹ Keith Maine, director of the W.A. department of community welfare, told me in September 1977 that treasury were interested in the seminar and would be nominating Clyde Adams, the senior officer in treasury most concerned with the state's welfare programs. Letter, K. A. Maine to R. J. Lawrence, 23/9/77.

and better evaluation programs in social welfare efforts in Western Australia.⁸⁰

At the final session of the seminar, it was agreed that a book should be produced and those interested would rewrite their submissions for this purpose. Reflecting on the seminar's content, Rosemary Sarri and I decided the most appropriate publication arising from the seminar would be a book focused on the process of evaluation, the case studies being revised so that they examined and highlighted issues at various stages of the evaluation process. The book would begin with an introductory overview by Sarri, presenting a conceptual framework which incorporated program as a form of rational action, and evaluation as a form of rational inquiry, while recognising that non-rational elements were also involved in both situations. Each section would be devoted to an examination of issues in relation to a particular component of rational inquiry in an organisational context.

With the book manuscript anticipated to be ready in May 1978, I approached both Macmillan and UNSW Press about possible publication. Macmillan decided 'after a very extensive survey' that there were not sufficient numbers to warrant it.⁸¹ UNSW Press were interested because the subject area was topical and they would probably be publishing a book in a related area – accountability of higher education. However, to keep the price at about \$10, they would need a subsidy. They were happy not to make a profit from a book of this nature, but could not afford a loss.⁸² I applied for and received a subsidy from a special project fund within the university to make possible publication with the press. Douglas Howie was the general manager of the UNSW press and I knew him well from when he was the registrar's representative in the Faculty of Professional Studies. He was an arts graduate from a South African university and I was particularly pleased when he was appointed to manage the press.

In early March 1978, Rosemary Sarri sent to each seminar participant an outline of the proposed book, a brief elaboration of the conceptual framework that would be used, a chart indicating which papers would be assigned to the respective sections of the book, and her written comments and suggestions on the participants' paper. Critical reading of the case reports had taken longer than she had anticipated, but she also had had a number of unexpected assignments.⁸³ When she wrote in early April, she was concerned that her time at Flinders was getting short. She was leaving Adelaide for a week in Brisbane and Townsville on 7 May, and had fixed teaching commitments in Manila before eventually returning home. Before she left Adelaide, she could finish her opening chapter, and perhaps write introductions to each of the sections, and edit those revisions received by April 25 'After that date I will have to do them when I return to Ann Arbor or else invite you to undertake that lovely task.' 'Peter Baume has called for additional assistance but I can really do very little now from now on because of fixed commitments such as completing my survey of the children's programs in South Australia'.

80 Letter, Clyde Adams to John Lawrence, 15/2/78.

81 Letter, Dugald McLellan to John Lawrence, 17/5/78.

82 Letter, Douglas Howie to John Lawrence, 14/4/78.

83 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 5/4/78, plus relevant enclosures.

In July, when Rosemary was back in Ann Arbor, I told her that the UNSW Press were expecting our book manuscript as soon as we could supply it. I reminded her I would be away at the international conferences in Israel from 8 August to 4 September, but hoped we could complete the manuscript soon after then. I requested prompt action.⁸⁴ In a letter dated 1 November, she said she had almost completed reviewing and editing the papers.⁸⁵ She would have liked to spend a great deal more time doing further editing, but this was unrealistic; it was important to get the publication out. Her chapter had been delayed because she wanted it to relate to the various case reports. She explained that as soon as she returned, she had been extremely busy with a whole series of special unexpected assignments, including being on a committee to select the next president of the University of Michigan.

A hand-written addendum explained further:

John – undoubtedly you must be completely disgusted with me and I don't blame you but my life has been a horror of late because our faculty size is down one-third and we have over 800 students. However I'm making progress and will get all the materials to you this month plus the chapter – and the material for Peter Baume – My telephone calls from Australia continue unabated so I guess the controversy is still on about several areas (I presume in the senate committee report).

Again I apologise for my negligence but it was not due to laziness – all the best

Her letter mentioned several phone calls from Patrick Lanigan and Elizabeth Jeffries of the Department of Social Security about programs for the International Year of the Child and was able to provide them with a number of suggestions and ideas as well as recommendations of possible speakers.

We also spent considerable time in discussing evaluations and particularly Peter Baume's activity in the parliament during the past several weeks. I did provide Lanigan with some reprints which, I hope, will be helpful to him, but from what he says, certainly evaluation is on the front burner in Australia at the present time.

The Sarri roneoed Christmas Letter 1978 gave a graphic, very enthusiastic account of their year abroad – in Australia and travelling the world. It was an experience they would always remember with wonderful friends all over the hemisphere. Leaving Ann Arbor in July, after a short visit to the Conzemious clan in Minnesota, Rosemary and the two girls visited Fiji and Hawaii, on the way to Australia. In January, with Rom, they explored the south east coast of Australia. In Easter, Rosemary with the girls visited Tasmania and saw Ruth and Adam Jamrozik. They met a young teacher from the University of Wisconsin, who had come to Tasmania in 1970 when the peace and poverty movements became so problematic in the U.S.

She showed us how one can live a simple meaningful life – helping people and yet not harming the environment in any way. After we returned home, we realised that most of us here still have not learned that lesson.

84 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 26/7/78.

85 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 1/11/78. This was originally dated 19/10/78.

In May they left Adelaide and started the trip back home. In Brisbane they visited Edna Chamberlain and Rosemary had a productive seminar with students at the University of Queensland. Wolfgang and Eileen Grichting⁸⁶ made their visit to Townsville and the Magnetic Island and the Great Barrier Reef really memorable. In the Philippines, Rosemary met up with friends, some of whom she had not seen since graduate student days in Minnesota. Although they saw many beautiful things there, the overcrowding and poverty left a profound impression on them. Visits to Hong Kong – the new territories and briefly to China provided much contrast. With only time for a brief introduction to Chinese society, they hoped to return in a year or two. Two former students appeared to be having a significant impact. Rosemary taught social work seminars, but it was very clear to her that American social work was woefully inadequate when facing the problems of developing countries. Rom joined them in Athens and friends gave them a lovely time in the Athens area. A week in Crete was one of the highlights of the trip. Rome, Switzerland and Paris followed. They must have visited at least 50 museums and the whole family enjoyed them all.

Finally, Rosemary mentioned that her teaching back home in the fall had been particularly challenging, and expressed the hope that in the need to reduce government expenditures, ‘we will not do so in ways that hurt most those who are ill, poor and handicapped’. Both Cathy and Kris had noted, since they returned, that most people in the U.S. seemed unconcerned about problems of many countries where the majority of people were desperately poor and suffered greatly.⁸⁷

In her personal Christmas card to us, Rosemary mentioned that one of the girls had been ill, but she would be sending the material in the New Year. I wrote in February 1979 that despite her letter of 1 November, I had still not received the book manuscript. Various case study authors were getting restive, the UNSW Press had been expecting the completed manuscript for some time, and, most importantly, there was an obvious community need for the publication on evaluation to get out as soon as possible.⁸⁸ In April, I said I could not wait any longer for the sakes of the contributors and the publisher and asked her to return all the revised papers together with whatever work she had managed to do, and I would try to get the material into publishable form.

Perhaps I won't be able to retrieve the situation, but I must at least attempt to do so. The general interest in evaluation is continuing to develop but there is very little Australian material on the subject.

I have no hard feelings because I realise only extreme circumstances would have created our present situation, but I would appreciate your acting promptly in response to this letter.⁸⁹

86 Wolfgang was an experienced researcher from the University of Michigan who had settled in Townsville, although he had also seriously considered an appointment in our school to teach research. Paul Glasser regretted he had not spoken to Wolfgang before he made the decision.

87 Roneod Christmas letter from the Sarri s to Trish and John Lawrence, 1978. This was primarily for friends, with little mention of Rosemary's work commitments, but I did note that the national evaluation seminar did not score even a passing reference.

88 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 13/2/78.

89 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 18/4/79.

Finally, in August I received Rosemary's opening chapter, and she sent the rest with Elizabeth Jeffries who was returning to Sydney.

I sincerely regret the delay in getting these materials to you, but at least it is now complete. I believe a good typist should be able to handle it from here on. From what I hear from Peter Baume and Elizabeth the interest in evaluation continues high so people should still find the material useful. The publications in the U.S. are coming out so fast that one can hardly keep up.

Adam Graycar tells me that he will be joining you soon in Sydney with the Research Centre. I hope that it works out well. He is very enthusiastic about the prospects.

It was good to see Elizabeth Jeffries again and I believe that I was able to arrange a good study leave for her. She is anxious to stimulate more exchange between the U.S. and the Department of Social Security.⁹⁰

The book manuscript was expertly typed by my secretary, Lorraine Armour, and we finally delivered the book manuscript to the UNSW Press in November 1979. Doug Howie had been remarkably understanding and patient. However, he suggested that in my preface I should provide assurance that the findings were still relevant and give some explanation for the long delay in the production of the book from the seminar. The Press now needed an additional \$500 to add to the original subsidy of \$1,000.⁹¹

In the book's preface, I merely stated that with the large number of authors and the main editor at a considerable distance, the production of the book had taken much longer than originally hoped. I argued, however, that because it focused upon the process of evaluation and not on the findings of particular evaluations, the book had current relevance – especially since the publication in 1979 of *Through a Glass Darkly*, the report of the senate committee chaired by Peter Baume.

In 1980, more than two years after the national seminar, *Issues in the Evaluation of Social Welfare Programs: Australian Case Illustrations* was published by the UNSW press (208 pages). The revised and sometimes shortened case reports of 23 authors, under the guidance and editing of Rosemary Sarri, were grouped in the six sections of the book – the environment as a context for evaluation; goals, objectives and evaluations; design for evaluation; implementation and management of evaluation; assessment of organisational outputs; and linking evaluation to policy and program change. Rosemary's opening chapter provided an overview of the state of the art of evaluation, and each section had an introductory summary of the main ideas of each author.

My preface claimed that by the end of the 1970s in Australia 'evaluation' was promising to become the most fashionable word in the social welfare vocabulary. Earlier in the decade the main contenders would have included 'participation', 'decentralisation', 'community' and 'rights'. Each referred to values and concerns thought to have been neglected in Australia's social welfare arrangements, which were seen to be too paternalistic, centralised, fragmented

90 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 16/8/79.

91 Letter, Douglas Howie to John Lawrence, 12/11/79.

and specialised, and too neglectful of the claims of vulnerable and disadvantaged individuals and groups. The broad concepts had been used to mobilise political support and increase available financial and human resources, but the general political and economic climate had changed. All programs new and old were now being asked to justify their activities.

It is always salutary to remember that the word evaluation literally means drawing out or determining the values from something. It has built into it the notion of a process, and also specifying what and whose values are being achieved. ... There is a justifiable fear that program evaluation may only concentrate on a limited range of measurable values, and do gross damage to the other values also at stake. There is, however, nothing inherent in the notion of evaluation which makes this inevitable. Indeed, if the word itself is taken seriously how can you justify ignoring relevant values?

Whether it is seen broadly or narrowly, as an instrument for effective social reform or a device to cut down unpalatable activities, program evaluation is likely to receive increasing emphasis throughout the 1980s.

Not only through leading the seminar and editing the book, but also through her direct work with the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, and acting as a consultant to senior social welfare administrators, Rosemary Sarri has stimulated a greater understanding of program evaluation in this country, and we are in her debt.⁹²

In July 1981, I received a letter from Rosemary seeking additional copies of the book. She had shared it with some of her students and faculty, and they had shown considerable interest. People were really quite interested in learning more about what kinds of issues were viewed as problematic in evaluation in other kinds of environmental contexts. She had just received another publication from Adam Graycar, and congratulated me and Adam on the excellent progress we had made with the Social Welfare Research Centre. She had been impressed by the quality of publications she had already seen, and suggested a sharing of publications between the Institute of Social Research and the Centre. She now had a shared appointment between the Institute and the School of Social Work. Rosemary's daughter Cathy was leaving to go to Oberlin college in Ohio and she supposed that all of our children were now away at universities and that things seemed quite different at home.⁹³

In my reply, I told her Adam was very interested in an exchange arrangement for publications, and that Doug Howie would be sending her additional copies of the book on evaluation. I also provided this family news:

Our eldest, David, was in England with his wife for a number of very anxious months where he could not find appropriate employment in his professional field of industrial design. They are now settled back in Australia, and thankfully he has

92 R. John Lawrence, 'Preface', *Issues in the Evaluation of Social Welfare Programs*, UNSW press, Sydney, 1980, pp. ii-vii. I also thanked various office staff in the UNSW School of Social Work, who so willingly assisted in the organisation of the original seminar, and my secretary Lorraine Armour, for typing the final manuscript of the book.

93 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 17/7/81.

an industrial design/draftsman job with Philips the Dutch-based international firm. Peter is in the middle of an Arts/Law combined course, taking an additional year to do honours in History. His thesis topic, 'Australia's Intake Policy for Indo-Chinese Refugees, 1975–79', is certainly very recent history, but he is finding it engrossing. Ruth is in her second year of an Arts degree in which she is doing honours work in Education, and plans to undertake a social work course after that! Both Peter and Ruth are very keen on their music ('cello and violin respectively), and both seem to think they are still 'on a good thing' living at home. Of course, it may suddenly change.⁹⁴

In October, I again corresponded with Rosemary Sarri – about a prospective visit to the Michigan School of Social Work by our group work lecturer, Sandy Regan. She made appropriate arrangements, but Sandy's visit unfortunately did not eventuate. The Michigan school was in the throes of a major curriculum revision, and expected the new curriculum to be in place by the fall of 1982. Perhaps it was just as well a great deal of faculty energy was going into this, given some of the external environmental circumstances which prohibited any fundamental innovations in social welfare policies and programs at the present.⁹⁵ She offered to send me some of the new curriculum materials, and I said I was especially interested to receive materials in the area of social policy, social welfare and social planning, and I would be very interested to receive materials on the course 'Values and Ethics in Social Work Practice'.⁹⁶

In April 1982, Rosemary wrote a joint letter to myself and Elaine Martin at Flinders University to inform us about curriculum changes that were underway. The main thrust was to focus more heavily on fields of service as the organising constructs for the curriculum rather than the predominant emphasis in the past on intervention methods. They had selected five fields of practice for major developments – physical and mental health, basic and continuing education, justice, family and primary groups, and economic adaptation and support. She sent us documents that were still in working form to get some understanding how they were proceeding, and also copy of a study by Miriam Dinerman at Rutgers which surveyed social work curricula across the country. The CSWE was developing a new curriculum policy statement that would set in place some criteria for the development of accreditation standards. She thought the thrust of most of the change was towards improving substantive competence of social workers in a limited set of areas and also improvement of technical skills in whatever method a student selected as a major.

It was also probable the Master's program would once again take ascendance since a large number of the Bachelor of Social Work programs were now in trouble, given the social work cutbacks under the Reagan administration and the lack of employment opportunities for their graduates. Rosemary said they still experienced a great deal of pressure towards preparing people for private practice – far more than we had in Australia, and it was difficult to assess whether this area would increase as it had in the past decade. In any event, the

94 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 12/8/81.

95 Letter, Rosemary Sarri to John Lawrence, 9/12/81.

96 Letter, John Lawrence to Rosemary Sarri, 24/3/82.

major thrust of their new curriculum would be toward preparing people for public social services, although they recognised a substantial number of the graduates would ultimately go into the private sector.

In a PS, Rosemary added that Cathy expected to spend her junior year at Flinders in 1983, and she hoped she could return part of the time also. She would be teaching in Singapore for 4 months in 1983–84. She was back in Australia, not long before I attended the international meetings in Montreal in 1984, and I recall giving her a dry run of my Younghusband lecture for these meetings, since she would not be there. This, in fact, proved to be my last work contact with her. Trish and I saw her once more at a dinner party given for us when we were staying with Suzanne and Henry Meyer in Ann Arbor, when we visited the USA in the late 1990s. Syd and Ruth Bernard and Ed Thomas were also there. I had seen the Bernards when we spent time together at the 1978 international conferences in Jerusalem,⁹⁷ and I saw Syd again in October 1983, when I made a presentation on curriculum design for social policy teaching in social work education at the Michigan school.⁹⁸ At the dinner party, I can recall Rosemary's indignation at Bill Clinton, but now have no recollection why. Like other members of the Michigan faculty, she was an active member of the Democratic Party.

It is clear from the above account that Rosemary Sarri was one of the most able, committed and interesting work colleagues that I had the privilege of knowing. She and Paul Glasser, in the course of their own extremely busy and productive lives made a significant difference to the lives of countless others, not only in their own country but elsewhere as well. We were fortunate Australia was included in their spheres of influence. A small very presentable stream strengthened the Australian – Michigan connection which I had commenced in 1967. People like Spencer Colliver, Kevin O'Flaherty, Edna Chamberlain, Elisabeth Ozanne, Len Tierney, Adam Jamrozik, Herb Bisno, and Elizabeth Jeffries were an impressive bunch and they were obviously appreciated by some of the Michigan faculty.

97 In mid-December 1978, I asked Syd if something had happened to Rosemary because I had received no reply from letters and telegrams sent to the school and her home. I was just about to go on a camping holiday with the family, returning about 10 January. On 12 January he wrote that he had spoken to Rosemary and hoped this would help, but she certainly was busy.

98 I was on a special studies program at Case Western University in Cleveland.

Chapter 7

Community Activities

In summary, the range of community activities in which I was involved in Australia, 1969–1991, included:

At the local and state level

- a paper on retirement as a social issue to an ANZAAS symposium, 1969
- member, Council of the Aboriginal Legal Service, 1970–74
- member, Sydney region study group, NSW Department of Health, 1972
- speaker, seminar on field education, NSW College of Paramedical Studies, 1972
- evidence to arbitration hearing of social workers NSW Department of Health award application
- member, Welfare Work Advisory Committee, NSW Department of Technical Education, 1971–85
- member, committee to advise the advanced education board on welfare work and diploma course of the NSW Department of Technical and Further Education, 1973
- member, selection committee for head teacher, division of welfare studies, Department of Technical and Further Education, 1973
- founder of Joint Consultative Committee on Social Work and Welfare Education in NSW, 1975–76
- lecture, ‘The community as a changing phenomenon’, Institute of Administration seminar for departmental heads of NSW public service, 1975
- speaker, NSW health services clinicians’ seminar on ‘Whither Psychiatric Care?’, 1975
- evidence to Committee of Enquiry into Child Care Services in Victoria, 1975
- main speaker, ‘Social work values in a health service’, conference of social workers of the Inner Metropolitan Region of the Health Commission of NSW, 1976
- member, NSW ad hoc advisory committee on social work education for Eva Learner’s national study, 1977
- member and periodic chairperson, Joint Liaison Committee for Continuing Social Work Education in NSW, 1977–82

- Benevolent Society of NSW (Australia's oldest registered welfare organisation): board director, 1978–86; chairman, Scarba review committee, 1979; chairman, objectives committee, 1981; member, planning committee, 1985–86.
- chairman, seminar between family court of Australia counsellors and marriage guidance counsellors, 1978
- graduation address, La Trobe University, 1980
- commissioned by the minister of youth and community services of NSW to inquire into the department's handling of the Paul Montcalm case, and make policy and procedural recommendations, 1982
- invited by AASW (South Australian branch) to speak on 'Future directions for social work education', 50th anniversary seminar on social work education in SA, 1986.
- evidence to arbitration hearing, NSW public hospitals social workers award, 1987

At the national level

- 'Organised action for migrant social welfare', background paper, 1970 Citizenship Convention, Canberra
- chairman, steering committee of the Family Research Unit, 1972–80
- Social Welfare Research Centre (Social Policy Research Centre, from 1990)
 - an autonomous national body directly funded by the federal government centrally involved in its establishment, 1976–79, and subsequent development, 1980–96
 - member, advisory committee, 1979–89
 - chairperson, research management committee, 1985–89
 - presiding member, management board, 1990–96
- Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW):
 - federal president, 1968–70
 - first Norman Parker address, 11th national conference, Hobart, 1969
 - evidence to first 'work value' case on social workers employed in the Commonwealth public service, 1969
 - member, professional education and accreditation committee, (PEAC), 1971–73: sub-committees on accreditation of Western Australian Institute of Technology course, and AASW statement on minimum educational requirements for membership; PEAC consultant for Preston Institute of Technology course in Victoria
 - convenor, steering committee for AASW study on values in Australia's income security system, commissioned by the national government's Commission of Enquiry Into Poverty, 1973
 - member, College of Advanced Education (CAE) accreditation panel
 - social work degree at Tasmanian College of Advanced Education, 1975
 - member, AASW & CAE accreditation panel – TCAE course, 1980–1
 - chairperson, AASW & CAE accreditation panel – social work degree at Western Australian Institute of Technology, 1981

- chairperson, AASW assessment teams – social work degree at La Trobe University, 1981, 1986; University of Melbourne, 1985; University of Queensland, 1985
- plenary session paper, 22nd national conference, 1991
- member, NSW competencies project group, 1992–93
- member, national standing committee on ethics, 1993–95 – drafted revision of by-laws on ethics
- comments on successive draft revisions of AASW code of ethics, 1998–99
- Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS)
 - drafted submission to federal government for funding, 1969–72
 - opening plenary session paper, 6th national conference, 1970
 - paper to annual meeting of ACOSS, 1970, ‘The role of social welfare in Australian social development’
 - member, planning and program committee, 7th national conference
 - member, committee to review ACOSS constitution, 1970–72
 - member, committee responsible for ACOSS report for the national poverty enquiry, 1973
 - elected member, Board of Governors, 1973–77
 - vice-president, 1976–77
- member, steering committee of annual national seminars of the Australian National University Urban Research Unit, 1969–73
 - chapter, ‘Social welfare and urban growth’, in *The politics of urban growth* (1971 seminar)
- principal speaker, seminar on ‘The doctor in society 1970–80’, organised by the combined medical Colleges in association with the Australian Medical Association, Perth, 1970
- the Squibb academic lecture, 9th annual congress, Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, Hobart, 1972
- summing up paper and editor of the proceedings of the Australian child care conference, Monash University, Melbourne, 1972
- consulted by the Australian Department of Housing on alternative uses for Commonwealth hostels, 1973
- member, national archives seminar, convened by the special minister of state, in connection with Dr W. Kaye Lamb’s report, 1973
- convenor, committee of representatives of heads of schools of social work, AASW, and the Association of Teachers in Schools of Social Work, to propose a constitution for an Australian Council on Social Work Education, 1973
- member, research advisory committee of the Australian government Social Welfare Commission, 1974–75
- organised national residential seminars – in 1974, led by Professor Paul Glasser, University of Michigan, on the use of behavioural science in social work education; in 1978, led by Professor Rosemary Sarri, University of Michigan, on evaluation of social welfare programs
- guest speaker, ‘The social welfare scene in Australia’, 47th Legacy federal conference, Tamworth, 1975

- member, Standing Committee of Heads of Schools of Social Work in Australia, 1975–81
- representative of this group in a joint committee with AASW to review AASW accreditation criteria and procedures, 1978–79
- consultant for social welfare entries and author of the general ‘social welfare’ article in the 1977 edition of *The Australian Encyclopedia*
- opening paper, the first Australian conference on the family and health, sponsored by Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, Perth, 1977
- Australian Association for Social Work Education
 - actively involved in its founding, 1977–79
 - acting president, 1978–79
 - council member, 1978–82
- conference over-view paper and editor, proceedings of the International Year of the Child national conference, Canberra, 1979
- chairman, IYC national conference follow-up group (appointed by the Commonwealth minister for social security), 1979

As my archives indicate, this is not a complete list. My job as a senior social work educator, and as someone with a particular interest in social policy issues, entailed extensive community involvements. Some of the involvements were, of course, of more consequence than others, but together they constituted an interesting and often demanding component in my professional life. Providing an account of each of the listed involvements is obviously neither possible nor desirable. Already some account has been given of several of the community activities connected with social work education and the professional association. In addition, in the course of writing the history of the first 25 years of the social welfare/policy research centre, I have already given an account (told in the third person) of the substantial extent to which I was involved in the establishment and development of that institution, so will not repeat it here.¹ This was very much a community activity focused on the life conditions of people.

What follows is a selective account of some of the other more significant community involvements within Australia. The story of my various extensive periodic involvements internationally will be told in the next two volumes. Given the nature of the work, I saw all of it, at home and abroad, very much as ‘community activity’, aiming to improve the lives of people in their social context.

1 John Lawrence, *Social Policy Research: 25 Years of a National Research Centre*, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, 2006.

7.1 Retirement as a Social Issue – Symposium on the Aged in Australian Society 1969

My first paper as a professor was at a symposium in Sydney, organised by the NSW division of ANZAAS in October, 1969. One of the functions of ANZAAS was 'to identify problem areas and to bring both to its members and the general public, notice that there are current needs for specific information and informed interpretations which should be based on research.'¹ Important issues were posed by the increasing numbers of elderly people in Australia. Eight papers were given and published. My contribution focused on retirement as a social issue:

Retirement as a Social Issue²

THE CONCEPT OF RETIREMENT

I suppose most of us would agree that retirement means a permanent withdrawal from work – either the act of withdrawing or the state of being withdrawn. Whether or not it is at our own volition or is forced upon us does not affect the definition. If the withdrawal is not permanent, then we are likely to describe the person as 'unemployed' rather than 'retired'. The distinction between being retired and being unemployed is not, however, always easy to draw. First, people may 'do a Melba', that is, they may change their minds and return to their former working role. Outstanding entertainments and sportsmen may be able to do this with comparative ease, but not so the general retired populace. Second, some people, especially in later middle age, may stop working because of sickness or poor health or because they are laid off, and imperceptibly shift from the status of being unemployed to being permanently unemployed, that is, retired. Third, many people described as being retired are still working, but in what is sometimes called a 'retirement job', where the work requirements are different from those undertaken before retirement.

A further point for clarification is – what is a work role? Conventional definitions usually see work roles only in the context of the production and distribution of goods and services through the market economy, or through only formally organised arrangements outside the family. Normally, work is activity or energy expended for which one receives remuneration, whether or not this is the prime objective of the worker. Retirement is, therefore, retirement from paid activity.

Work roles in an industrial society are changing, specific, contractual and specialised. By convention they do not include the activities of people in the home and family. Increasing proportions of married people are described as 'joining the work force'. The other kinds of work married women do cannot be easily measured or fitted into economic models. Those who participate in the so-called 'work force' are described as being 'productive'. Those who do not are seen as 'non-productive' or 'dependent', whatever activity they may engage in which is valued for other than economic purposes.

1 Sidney Sax, editorial preface, *The Aged in Australian Society*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1970. At the time, Sidney Sax was director, research and planning, formerly director of geriatrics, Department of Health, New South Wales.

2 Revisiting this article, the sexist language of the time certainly grates, but obviously should not here be changed. That was the language of the time.

THE PREVALENCE OF RETIREMENT

How prevalent is retirement in Australia? At an earlier stage of industrialisation, retirement was not a common condition. The aged were numerically and proportionately a much smaller group; they tended to stay in work harness as long as they could. Large numbers of the population did not live to old age. A dramatic change had taken place. Now the great majority of the population survive into old age and become candidates for the compulsory and earlier retirement practices, the government and private pension schemes. In addition, the much greater participation of women in the work force makes their retirement a new factor in the situation. (I then provided data from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.)

THE SOCIAL ISSUE

Retirement has become potentially a major social issue in all Western industrial countries because it now affects, for better or for worse, and whether we recognise it or not, practically every person and family in the society. The permanent withdrawal of masses of people from the work role, and at an age well before their death, presents our affluent society with one of its emerging social issues.

I would suggest a social issue exists (1) when there is a social condition under active and widespread discussion, (2) which is seen to affect the interests and values of many people, and (3) concerning which, it is argued, action should be taken.

I do not think retirement in Australia has yet blossomed as a full-blown social issue. Our ageing section of the population is proportionately rather less than in other developed countries, we tend to accept our social arrangements uncritically, we do not collect relevant social data, we do not have a strong tradition of social criticism and expertise. A pointer to the existence of a social issue is the quantity and quality of literature addressed to it. If this is the only criticism used, then retirement can scarcely be described as a social issue in this country.

A literature search undertaken for me by a University of New South Wales librarian (Mrs Jocelyn Scarr) produced a poor local crop – I suspect because that is all there is to harvest. The main items are concerned with financial aspects of retirement, and most are limited and superficial in nature. As far as I know, there has only been one substantial inquiry into the retiring age – that by a Commonwealth Interdepartmental Committee 12 years ago (Report, Melbourne, 1957). Frank Weatherall's little book, *Plan Your Retirement*, published this year (Sydney, Hodder Books, 1969), is the first of its kind. It is true that general literature on the aged has burgeoned, but my focus here is specifically on retirement as a social issue – on the social significance of permanent withdrawal from the workforce.

THE INTERESTS AT STAKE

In the remainder of this paper, I will mention people's interests and values that seem to be at stake when the subject of retirement is being considered. The treatment will necessarily be brief, but, I hope, suggestive. The key social questions to ask all along are whose interests and values are recognised as being at stake, and who benefits from the policy decisions. Frequently, of course, care is taken not to personalise policy decisions or make explicit which particular people or groups of people gain and which lose, or in what ways. The danger of this is that the maintenance of social systems can become an end in itself and the system's point in terms of people's lives can be lost. Alternatively, advantage and harm are deliberately obscured in

order to preserve privilege. The tremendous complexities of social systems in modern industrial societies make cost-benefit analysis of different policies in terms of their effects upon people's lives extraordinarily difficult. Yet if those of us who are concerned that everyone should get a fair deal retreat into hopeless despair and cynicism, we leave the field clear for those who know what they want and willing to exploit these very same complex systems to the full for their partial ends.

A COMPLEX OF ISSUES

Permanent withdrawal from work raises not just one issue, but a host of interlocking ones. We are, in fact dealing with a problem area in which a great number of issues are involved, and on each issue there are multiple viewpoints. As Howard Becker has pointed out, 'A problem is not the same to all interested parties; indeed, there will be as many definitions of the problem as there are interested parties' (Becker, Wiley, 1966, p. 7). He sees laymen as typically defining problems in ways dictated by their immediate interests which develop around the various roles they play as community residents, taxpayers, parents and family members, workers, and potential victims of war or depression. Professions like education, social work, medicine, law, and politics have their own distinctive definitions of problem areas; as too have social scientists. Of the latter, Becker claims, 'The theories of society and social organisation used by social scientists point out in an abstract and systematic way the multiple connections and causal links between institutions that are often hidden from view by commonsense analyses'. (Becker, p. 9) My own view is that social policy making cannot hope to be rational and just unless it is served, at least in an advisory capacity, by social scientists. Apart from economists, just how well served are we in this respect in Australia?

ISSUES IN THE ECONOMIC AREA

Retirement usually means separation, not only from work, but also from a regular income gained in the economically productive sector of the society. Ideally the retired person wants an income which will match his family's needs, will not bring about a sharp reduction in his ability to maintain social status, will reflect increases in general productivity, will be protected against inflation, will be guaranteed and not vulnerable to the vagaries of the stock market or politics, will be paid to him by a system which he finds personally acceptable, and will be adequate for his spouse in the event of his death. In the event of illness, he does not want his financial resources overstrained.

How much, if any, should the worker, the employer, and/or the government set aside from current earnings to make retirement financial benefits available, either to the present retired population or future retirees? Who really pays? What should be the role of individual firms, industries, insurance companies and governments in setting up retirement schemes? Should the benefits be paid in lump sums or in pensions? Should younger age groups subsidise older age groups in retirement schemes and within families? What investment policies should be pursued for large sums accumulated in retirement funds? How can private pensions maintain their buying power? What should be the relationships between the various tax-supported schemes run for government employees? (Trimmer committee report – *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 October, 1969)

What should be the role of the national government pensions? Should they

be available to everyone beyond a certain age, or only after a means test? What should be the pension age? Should it be the same for men and women? Does a means test penalise saving and encourage people to divest themselves of their own economic resources? Does it encourage dishonesty with its psychological toll on the person concerned? What form should the means test take? Should pensions be automatically raised in accordance with changes in average earning, or some other economic measure connected with the work force? Should pension rates be set in terms of family budgets? Must there be a relationship between the contributions and benefits of individuals? Should government pension rate be removed from political controversy? Should fringe benefits be attached to pensioner status? Is this an extra penalty on the so-called thrifty? Is it preferable to provide direct benefits in kind for retired people, rather than additional income which gives them discretionary power to spend it as they see fit? Should standards of income of the retired be related to income standards for other economically dependent groups? What part do retirement schemes, government and private, play in economic planning, with its major dictates of full employment, economic growth, and holding inflation in check?

Should a worker be bound to particular employment because he loses his superannuation rights if he leaves? (Downing, 1965, p. 170, and other references were provided) Should contributions to retirement benefits be compulsory? Should there exist Commonwealth Government tax exemptions on life insurance and superannuation contributions? Isn't this subsidising the rich? Does the increasing practice of schemes of fringe benefits increase income differentials amongst the different sections of the work force?

Does the worker understand the retirement schemes in which he participates? Is he kept informed about the state of the scheme? What part have unions played in the establishment of retirement schemes? Are retirement schemes seen as essentially matters for decision by the management and/or trustees?

These are just a few of the questions raised by the need for economic adequacy and security amongst the retired section of the population, and other papers in this symposium will have suggested additional ones. These questions indicate choices open to policy makers. With increasing affluence, the choices become broader, and therefore perhaps more difficult. It is obvious that conflicting interests and values are at stake. At present, decision making is typically fragmented and pragmatic. Since community guide-lines for the decision makers do not yet exist, it is difficult to know if agreement could be reached on such guide-lines. Without them, however, broad questions of social justice will continue to be ignored. As Kewley has pointed out, not even the main object of the Commonwealth age pension has been pinpointed (Kewley, 1965, p. 386).

A further impediment to this whole exercise of comparing the present and future economic resources of the retired with those of the rest of the population is the absence of a thorough national study on income distribution throughout the society. A socially conscious national government would be concerned about the absence of such data, although political realities may prevent its concern being publicly expressed.

ISSUES IN THE POLITICAL AREA

This brings me to mention another group of questions, this time connected with the

political power of those who are permanently withdrawn from the work force. (See Cottrell, 1966, pp. 77–113)

Can and should the retired group be welded into a politically significant force? What political objectives should they pursue? How can they, outside of the political system, achieve their ends? A small formal move in the direction of organised political activity has taken place with the formation of the Pensioner Power Association of Australia by a Sydney medical practitioner. The Association had a handful of candidates in the 1969 Federal election and hoped to have influence through the distribution of preferences (*Nation*, 6 September, 1969, p. 5). The potential strength of such a movement is, however, very much open to question, because the retired are far from homogeneous in their outlooks and would be difficult to organise into a coherent political movement of any size. As far as I know, no local studies have yet been made concerning their political affiliations and activities. Retirement does, of course, give people free time for political activity, if they feel so inclined.

The retired have to come to terms with the fact that they are a minority group. In some situations they may be able to wrest gains by holding the balance of political power, but generally they must persuade majorities of the justice of their cause. One major strategy in doing this is to emphasise the special needs of the retired aged population; another is to emphasise the common values of self-respect, independence, income security, health, housing, recreation, and, to a lesser extent, education, which the retired person shares with the rest of society.

THE AGE AND NATURE OF RETIREMENT

Another group of issues is clustered around the age and nature of retirement. At what age should a person retire? Should the age be lowered in recognition of the increased community wealth and to allow a person time to enjoy his retirement, or should it be raised to decrease the numbers of the economically dependent? ... Should retirement practices be standardised throughout the society? Should governments give the lead? Must retirement at a chronological age be compulsory? If retirement is flexible in terms of age, what criteria are used in the decision for an employee to retire, and who makes the decision? If older workers do not retire, do they block the advancement of younger, better educated and more vigorous men? Is there any recognition of the need to modify jobs of men of advancing years? What really are the learning capacities and skills of older workers? In conditions of full employment, are older workers making an important contribution to national productivity? Should a man be retained in the same work establishment at a reduced status and on a lighter task, or should he change his employer? Should a pension be paid from a chronological age, irrespective of whether the person continues to work?

RETIREMENT PLANNING

Another set of issues relates to preparation for retirement or retirement planning. A report of the Cornell Study of Occupational Retirement states, 'Retirement involves the cessation of a major life activity. ... Many aspects of aging are a matter of gradual change or deterioration. However, retirement is a status change which is relatively clearcut, and as a consequence has a significant impact upon the person involved'. (Streib and others, 1958, p. 5) In our kind of society, work plays a central role in providing a person with status and prestige and a pattern of living. It is a source of

personal and social identity. Our culture does not, on the other hand, have well-established roles for retired people. This means that, in a very real sense, retirement is what one makes of it. To help individuals pattern a meaningful life for themselves in retirement, retirement planning programs have been established (Three U.S. references were cited as examples.) As yet in Australia, they are meagre, however.

Who should assume responsibility for this kind of activity? Employers? Unions? Adult education bodies? Social welfare organisations like councils of social service, or councils on the ageing? Professional groups, who can provide the necessary expert counselling? When should the preparation take place in a person's life? Should the preparation be in groups? Is the whole family to be included? If individual counselling is to be provided, who should do it? 'Anticipatory socialisation' is a concept used when people are helped to prepare for life crises. What are the special problems in helping older people to anticipate retirement? Is there continuity of counselling help available which continues into the retirement period? Is the planning notion a typically middle-class solution which has not much application for the lower socio-economic groups? Is it more effective in changing attitudes than in changing life circumstances?

ISSUES IN FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

One of the major adjustments that retirement is likely to call for is in family relationships. It is a time of considerable testing of the marital relationship and in fact of the full range of family relationships.

ISSUES RELATED TO HOUSING AND HEALTH

Other papers have concentrated upon the housing and health needs of the aged section of the population. As with all the other areas, the existing policies here reflect the resources available to the policy makers, their state of knowledge and their values. It has been cogently argued that we now know very well what housing and health services people in retirement need. Their needs are, however, in competition with those of the rest of society.

The direct connection between housing and retirement is that the retired person need no longer live near his work. But this new freedom is counterbalanced by new limits on choice placed by financial considerations and the need to pay full regard to all locational aspects of life in retirement.

The connection between health and retirement is often referred to. It seems plausible to argue that without the exercise and stimulus of work people deteriorate in health. The Cornell Study of Occupational Retirement could find no general trend of retirement leading to a decline in health. A Study report states, 'The correlation between retirement and poor health, which is typically found, is largely explained by the fact that people in poor health tend to retire, and not that retirement affects health'. (Sreib and others, 1958, p. 33)

THE CHANGING MEANING OF WORK AND LEISURE

Finally, I want to draw attention to a range of issues surrounding the changing nature of work and leisure in our kind of society. According to George Maddox, 'Technology has served man notice that he must find a home, a new anchorage point for himself, outside of the world of work, certainly by the time of retirement if not before then'. (Maddox, p. 125) Some observers see man's increased free time as an opportunity

for self-fulfilment. This is especially necessary because, it is held, increasing number of men receive diminished satisfactions from their work, and in any case the proportion of time spent in work is shorter. Others are pessimistic because as yet there is no strong cultural tradition of leisure; rising material expectations lead to overtime, two jobs and a working wife; and perhaps many people have not the capacity to use off-work time for satisfying leisure pursuits anyway. (de Grazia, 1962, pp. 300, 369) Does affluence mean more jobs that are patently useless in the view of the worker? Do automated systems mean greater alienation of the worker from his job? (Wilensky, 1966, pp. 117–166) As with so much else in our society, the meaning of work for different sections of workers is undergoing change, and this in turn will mean changes in the meaning of retirement for the workers concerned.

I think I have said enough to indicate that retirement has all the makings of a major social issue. As I see it, however, most of the community discussion so far has come not from the community at large, but rather from professional groups or officials concerned with the health and well-being of the retired sections of the population, or from a handful of academics especially interested in economic aspects of retirement.

It is hard to escape a feeling of drift and aimlessness in relation to many of these matters. It is true the 1969 Federal election has livened debate on at least some of the issues; the tapered means test has at long last removed a widely disliked 'feature' of the government aged pensions scheme, and some workers are about to gain portability of superannuation rights. As yet, however, as a society, we have few general guidelines for social policies to cope with large-scale retirement, and any established at this point anyway could scarcely be described as emerging from keen community debate, informed by extensive research.

REFERENCES

- Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, *Employment and Unemployment*, February 1969, and October 1963
- Commonwealth of Australia, *Report of Inter-Departmental Committee on the Retiring Age*, Melbourne, 8 July, 1957.
- Weatherall, Frank, *Plan Your Retirement*, Sydney, Hodder Books, 1969.
- Becker, Howard S. (ed), *Social Problems: A Modern Approach*, Sydney, Wiley, 1966.
- Downing, R. J., 'Social Welfare and Public Finance', in Hancock, Keith (ed), *The National Income and Social Welfare*, Sydney, Cheshire, 1965.
- Kewley, T. H., *Social Security in Australia*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1965.
- Cottrell, Fred, 'Aging and the Political System', in McKinney, John C., and de Vyver (eds), *Aging and Social Policy*, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Streib, Gordon L., and Thompson, Wayne E., and Suchman, Edward A., 'The Cornell Study of Occupational Retirement', *The Journal of Social Issues*, 1958, No. 2.
- Streib, Gordon L., and Thompson, Wayne E., 'Situational Determinants: Health and Economic Deprivation in Retirement', *The Journal of Social Issues*, 1958, No. 2
- Maddox, George L., 'Retirement as a Social Event in the United States', in McKinney and Vyver (eds), 1966.
- De Grazia, Sebastian, *Of Time, Work and Leisure*, New York, Twentieth Century Fund, 1962, pp. 300, 369. Wilensky, Harold L., 'Work as a Social Problem', in Becker (ed), *Social Problems: A Modern Approach*, Sydney, Wiley, 1966, pp. 117–166.

7.2 Migrant Social Welfare in a General Framework for Social Welfare

I provided one of the background papers for the Australian Citizenship Convention in Canberra, 20–22 January, 1970. I was grateful that the Department of Immigration made it possible for Trish also to attend. The immigration minister Phillip Lynch subsequently thanked me for my ‘excellent paper’. He believed the background material had played a major role in the success of the convention.¹ His letter was addressed to me as ‘professor of social administration’ – perhaps an understandable mistake given the content of my paper which he must have actually read! Gough Whitlam addressed the convention, and also is likely to have read my background paper.

I took this significant national opportunity to insist that migrant social welfare had to be understood within the context of a general framework for social welfare, and I set down for the first time in a public arena, the current state of the general framework I had developed for teaching and research purposes.

ORGANISED ACTION FOR MIGRANT SOCIAL WELFARE²

The scope and complexity of my subject are challenging. As a national occasion, the Convention should be concerned with all our migrants. Their social welfare is a broad and complex subject and one which cannot realistically be divorced from a consideration of the general state of social welfare in this country.

In this paper I will first comment on Australian social welfare in general, and then will discuss organised action for migrant social welfare.

It was noticeable that during the recent federal election commentators grouped various domestic policies together and described them as ‘social welfare’ measures. ‘Social welfare’ has been an ‘in’ concept for many years overseas and amongst the professional social work groups in Australia. Its use appears now to be spreading throughout Australian society.

My first task it to try to clarify the notion of ‘social welfare’. As yet, it appears to be a fairly neutral descriptive term indicating a breadth of interest in and concern for people functioning in society, and it is unhampered by the narrowness and sometimes negative ideas which have built around terms like ‘social work’, ‘philanthropy’, ‘charity’, and even, ‘social services’. In fact, however, existing definitions of ‘social welfare’ tend to concentrate not upon the life conditions of people, but upon organised activities which have as their prime objective the maintenance or change of these conditions.

The definitions usually come from persons centrally involved in such activities – on the production side of the services, and they tend to divert attention away from examining the actual outcomes and the way in which service consumers view the outcomes. For example:

‘Social welfare’ is an organised activity that aims at helping towards a mutual adjustment of individuals and their social environment. This objective is achieved through the use of techniques and methods which are designed to enable individuals, groups

1 Letter, Phillip Lynch to Professor John Lawrence, 30/12/70.

2 John Lawrence, ‘Organised Action for Migrant Social Welfare’, Australian Citizenship Convention 1970 Background Paper.

and communities to meet their needs and solve their problems of adjustment to a changing pattern of society, or through cooperative action to improve economic and social conditions. (United Nations, *The Development of National Social Welfare Programmes*, New York, 1959.)

As currently used, the term 'social welfare' denotes a full range of organised activities of voluntary and governmental agencies that seek to prevent, alleviate, or contribute to the solution of recognised social problems, or to improve the well-being of individuals, groups, or communities. The services undertaken by, or under the auspices of, such agencies require many kinds of technical and professional skills, rendered by various specialists: physicians, nurses, lawyers, educators, engineers, ministers, social workers, and so on. (John Kidneigh, 'History of American Social Work', in Harry L. Lurie (ed), *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, New York, National Association of Social Workers, 1965, p. 5.)

'Social welfare' is defined as including laws, programmes, benefits, and services which assure or strengthen provisions for meeting social needs recognised as basic to the well-being of the population and the better functioning of the social order. (Elizabeth Wickenden, *Social Welfare in a Changing World*, Washington, D.C., U.S. department of health, education and welfare, 1965, p. ii.)

'Social welfare' will refer (in this study) to those formally organised and socially sponsored institutions, agencies and programmes, exclusive of the family and private enterprise, which function to maintain or improve the economic conditions, health, or interpersonal competence of some parts or all of a population. (Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1958, p. 17.)

As late as 1961, I took up the first academic appointment in Social Administration in this country. It was a belated and very modest move by Australian universities towards systematic study and teaching of a subject area³ which in Britain, other European countries, and in international publications, had already received substantial attention. Since then only a handful of similar Australian appointments have been made, each of them in university schools of social work. Professor Ray Brown, the first Australian occupant of a Chair of Social Administration, has demonstrated in his publications the concerns of someone professionally located in this subject area. The publications of socially-minded economists like Downing, Henderson, Gates, and Scotton, have been seized upon as important contributions in the subject area, although they need balancing by material from the other social sciences. I think, however, that in general it is fair to say the subject area is ill-defined and little developed. Perhaps some leadership might have come from the Australian National University.

In overseas discussions of Social Administration as a subject area, it is obvious that 'social welfare' as roughly defined in the quotations above is a core concern. But it is also clear that many scholars of Social Administration wish to go beyond merely

3 See David C. Marsh, 'The Nature and Growth of Social Administration as a Systematic Field of Study', in Marsh (ed), *An Introduction to the Study of Social Administration*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

studying the existing 'social welfare services'. They are increasingly interested in the social mechanisms generally which distribute resources and opportunities to the different social groups who comprise a national society.⁴

In line with a broader definition of 'social welfare' and of Social Administration as a systematic subject area, I have designed a collective study of Australian Social Policy and Social Welfare. If this could be implemented, I believe it would provide national perspectives on social welfare matters which currently are non-existent, or present only in rudimentary form. The study would deliberately avoid merely describing existing 'social welfare services'.⁵ It would be concerned with what is known about key social conditions of the Australian people,⁶ how they compare with each other with respect to these conditions, and social processes (including formally organised social welfare services) by which these conditions are maintained or changed.

Very briefly, it would be in four parts:

Part I. Demographic Analysis of the Australian Population

Population policies and processes

Part II. Part II – Sections on the following:

Income and wealth

Housing

Education

Employment

Health

Recreation

Family well-being

Civil and political rights⁷

Each section would (1) describe what is known about the distribution of levels across the population, and (2) describe and discuss social mechanisms, which, deliberately or otherwise, maintain or change this distribution of levels.

Part III. Part III – Sections on Population Categories, for example:

Age groups

Ethnic groups

Sex groups

Geographic groups

4 For example: D. V. Donnison, 'The Development of Social Administration', in Donnison et al., *Social Policy and Administration*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1965. D. V. Donnison, 'Social Administration Evolves'. *New Society*, 20 October, 1966. Richard M. Titmuss, *Essays on 'The Welfare State'*, London, Unwin, 2nd edition, 1963. Richard M. Titmuss, *Commitment to Welfare*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1968.

5 Not that this has yet been accomplished at a national or even state level. (As yet we have no Penelope Hall (UK), or Walter Friedlander (USA).

6 Note: Donald S. Howard, *Social Welfare: Values, Means and Ends*, New York, Random House, 1969, p. 69. Howard lists the following as 'end values' whose attainment is fostered by social welfare services in various countries: Life and health; Sense of dignity, worth and purpose; Aspiration to achieve; Freedom to make choices; Role and status; Food; Housing; Clothing; Family Relationships; Home management; Education and training; Employment; Legal protection; Group and community participation; Leisure and opportunity for its use; Aesthetic enjoyment; Religion; Promise of decent burial.

7 These were the main common social goals, but the list could of course be extended.

Social status groups

Each section would (1) examine what is known about the levels achieved by members of the category with respect to each of the basic areas in Section II, and (2) describe and discuss the social mechanisms which, deliberately or otherwise, maintain or change this distribution of levels.

Part IV. The Distribution Mechanisms

This final part would examine directly aspects of the major social mechanisms (described in Parts II and III) which distribute the social largess across the society, and the values we attach to these various mechanisms. These mechanisms include the nuclear and extended family, mutual aid arrangements, market transactions, taxation systems, profit-making organisations, government ventures at various levels, voluntary associations, and so on.

This very brief sketch should suffice to indicate what perhaps a rounded interest in the social welfare of a democratic modern industrial society like our own might amount to. The focus is essentially upon all members of the national social system, and the system's institutions and arrangements are being reviewed in terms of what is known about their effects upon the lives of people. The study would not be concerned directly with making policy prescriptions, but rather would be suggestive of the terms in which the social policy debate might be pursued in this country. These are terms congruent with democratic, humanitarian values and a concern for social justice in the sense of distributive justice.

In moving towards the implementation of this study, I have spent considerable time discussing and trying to locate potential contributors. The study scheme has aroused considerable interest and support, but contributors with relevant expertise, either in university or government circles, are very few indeed. A contributor needs to have both a national focus and an ability to examine the subject area in a systematic but multi-disciplinary way. Both attributes are not common amongst present-day researchers and policy-makers, but in addition there is a chronic shortage of relevant data. A major contribution towards social policy discussion would occur if government administrators were to produce more frequent, and more meaningful public reports on the work of their Departments. There are many British and American guides. White papers in social problem areas would be an important innovation.

We are now being told that Australia is on the threshold of vast industrial expansion based on mineral wealth. Unless we wake up to ourselves and have considerably more talent, resources and power to attend to social welfare values, we will live increasingly in a society characterised by gross inequalities and disregard for individual well-being.

I think I have said sufficient to indicate that study of migrant social welfare must be closely bound up with study of the general state of social welfare in this country, but that as yet the latter is poorly developed. Recent official statements and the activities of the Integration Branch of the Immigration Department demonstrate a new-found concern for the social welfare of migrants. This recent concern seems to have been stimulated at least as much by the need to have living conditions

which, competitively with other countries, will attract and retain skilled labour, as by a genuine concern for their personal well-being as human beings. Whatever the motivation, this new concern could lead to a much more careful examination of the adequacy of the social welfare systems experienced throughout the Australian population.

It is doubtful if members of the dominant Australian culture would tolerate migrants receiving better services than those generally available, even though on a cost-benefit analysis it could be shown that such differential treatment was worth it from an economic viewpoint. Most would agree, however, that at least some special services must be made available to migrants, especially when they demonstrate obvious language and cultural differences. But what form these services should take, how long they should continue, and who should be responsible for them, are controversial matters, because of conflicting objectives and vested interests.

(The rest of the paper drew heavily on my plenary session paper on responsibility for the welfare of ethnic minorities at the 1968 ACOSS conference on ethnic minorities in Australia.)

In a recent paper, I have discussed a number of general strategies for action to cope with the well-being of migrants, who need realistically be seen as minority groups in a dominant host culture:

1. Control the overall size and composition of the minority by regulating the flow of immigration. The larger the minority, the greater the threat to the dominant culture.
2. The acquisition of linguistic skill in the dominant language. Without this, migrants cannot participate fully in the social systems of the broader society, nor will the broader society learn about the problems and aspirations of migrant groups.
3. The continued maintenance of conditions of full employment and the use of migrants in areas where they do not have to compete strongly with dominant culture members – areas where skills are in short supply, in heavy industry, and in outlying locations.
4. The tolerance and sometimes encouragement of separate cultural groups based upon ethnicity. Such a group can give protection, security, power and satisfaction to the migrant, but may delay his participation in the dominant culture. On the other hand, it may give him a secure social base from which to operate in the general community. Serious conflict will occur to the extent to which the *basic values* of the ethnic group differ from those of the dominant culture.
5. Improvement in the range, adequacy, and relevance of services available to all members of the society, including its migrant members. For this, far greater attention needs to be given to questions of access on the part of the consumers of services, and also to the amount of power they have.⁸ Migrants are particularly vulnerable in both these respects because of their lack of knowledge of local arrangements, and their especially heavy dependence upon formal systems of services, compared with the rest of the population.

8 See R. J. Lawrence, 'The Consumer Perspective in Social Welfare', The Norma Parker Address, *Proceedings, 11th National Conference, AASW, May 1969.*)

Action for migrant social welfare must, of course, be organised, but whose responsibility is this?

Modern government, especially national government, with its greatly increased resources, has taken responsibility for a great range of functions, and there is substantial support for this. Many of the social systems likely to be encountered in a modern man's life cycle are connected or likely to be connected with government. Theoretically government is concerned with 'the general welfare'. In fact it is a vehicle for an array of powerful specialised interest groups, including politicians, political parties, public servants, professionals, and public departments. This is not to deny that these groups often talk 'general welfare' language, and sometimes they do try to act in the general interest. However, allocations of responsibility to government need to take into account these realities of government policy-making and administration.

Separate government departments or divisions of departments exist to service the needs of migrants. Their effectiveness is determined by the clarity of their objectives, by their status in the political and public service hierarchy, their relationships with other government departments and with outside agencies, the degree of cooperation with migrant groups themselves, the career ambitions of their personnel, the personnel's social insight, knowledge and skill, and so on.

A modern community member has to participate in a great number of different social systems, usually formally organised, if he is to have his needs met as he moves through life. Therefore, to be effective in terms of improving the life conditions of migrants, the government instrumentality specialising in their welfare has to influence the many social systems in which migrants participate or wish to participate – in addition, perhaps, to setting up new ones of its own.

Beyond the many government-sponsored social systems to be influenced are a great range and variety of other social systems. The voluntary social welfare organisations are included here, although certain migrant groups may assiduously avoid them, especially if they have a strongly paternalistic, middle-class, charity flavour.

The migrant's dealings with formally organised social systems tend to be limited and for a particular purpose. The exchange is in terms of the functions of the organisation, not in terms of the likes and dislikes or prejudices of the organisation's employee with whom the migrant is dealing. Prejudices still operate in restricting the migrant's participation in informal social systems, but thanks to modern man's extensive participation in formal systems this can be of less account than previously.

The availability of opportunities alone, however, will not cause the migrant to improve his life conditions. To accomplish this, he has to become an active participant in the social systems available to him, and take responsibility for his own life, his own choices and actions. No one else can take this responsibility, and it can be an especially onerous and lonely one in the modern, urban, industrial, specialised society, with its emphasis on personal choice, combined with the breakdown of clear traditional guides to action.

Migrants are particularly prone to having identity problems, and to be under social stresses not experienced to the same degree by dominant culture members. It therefore seems sensible to make especially available to them professional services that will help them to assume realistic responsibility for themselves and their lives. A strong case can be made for training members of ethnic groups as social workers,

psychologists, and psychiatrists who will work, at least some of their time, with people of similar ethnic background.

Support could also be given to the existing work of priests and others to whom at present many migrants take their troubles, but only a close knowledge of a particular migrant group can reveal its counselling needs and the kind of persons most likely to fulfil these.

It would seem obvious, however, that migrants need especial help during their initial period in the country. Perhaps the biggest pay-off in welfare terms is likely to come from a carefully organised concentration of services at this stage. These need to include social work counselling to help migrants use available services most productively from their own and their family's point of view. Skilled group work techniques also would appear to have great potential, especially, though not exclusively, in migrant hostels. Special efforts need to be made to include in relevant services all migrants, not just those under government sponsorship.

Community skills of the highest order are required of workers who attempt to help the multitude of diverse groups and organisations to work together for migrant social welfare. This leads me to my concluding observations on the need for greater professionalism in Australian social welfare.

The skills and knowledge required to make modern social welfare services effective in the lives of individual people are considerable. Organised action for individual welfare needs to be taken at all levels of our social organisation – the interpersonal, the administrative, the community, and the societal. I believe that Australia is critically short of skilled professional workers operating at other than the interpersonal level, partly because working at these broader levels of social structure and social processes is often not seen as a professional task. Yet surely coping with intra-organisational problems, inter-organisational and community relationships, and helping to make broad social policies – in ways that enrich rather than stultify the lives of individual human beings – all these require a level of knowledge, competence and social responsibility which one might associate with professional people. Without such professionalism at these levels of social organisation, 'service' systems are more likely to serve the needs of the functionaries of the system rather than of the people for whom the system has been established. In a changing, better educated society, professionalism of the kind I have mentioned is likely to be more functional than traditional bureaucratic ways of operating. But it must be recognised that professionalism itself may become merely another device to secure and preserve unwarranted privilege.

In an advanced industrial society, to get things done we cannot escape organisation, or putting it another way, from organised social systems. Keeping these systems subservient to and congruent with our various social welfare ends is a complex and demanding task, which as yet we are merely tinkering with in this country.

Our social welfare policies and services need to have conceptual underpinning which relates them to the tasks which individual citizens and families face at different stages of their social careers. Patterns of services in a society such as ours inevitably are complex and uneven, and individual citizens and families have to do the best they can in integrating them into their own lives. But some patterns are surely more functional than others. The idea of the right service at the right time, and in the right place – 'right', that is, from the citizen's viewpoint – is at least worth striving towards.

7.3 Urbanisation Seminars, ANU

From 1965, the ANU Research School of Social Sciences organised urbanisation seminars to focus attention on various aspects of the growth and administration of Australian cities. People from government, private enterprise and various academic disciplines were brought together. In 1967, the organisation of the seminars became the responsibility of the school's newly-established Urban Research Unit. Senior fellow in charge of the unit was Max Neutze, a fellow Rhodes scholar from New Zealand who settled in Australia in 1960, taking up a lectureship in economics at the ANU. Trish and I had got to know Max and Peggy Neutze when they were near neighbours in the Reid flats with us.

By mid-1968, Peter Harrison and Patrick Troy had joined Max in the Unit. In addition were a couple of research assistants, a secretary, and two PhD students.¹ The Unit's major research project was a study of the process of urban development, with a focus on four case studies in Sydney. A broadly parallel project was being planned for Melbourne, through the Australian Institute of Urban Studies. The Unit's early seminar program was 'High Investment Public Service' (June 1967), 'A Critique of Physical Planning' (December, 1967), 'Planning for Schools in Urban Areas' (June 1968), and physical environment effects on public health (December 1968). The seminars were, however, then reduced to one a year, because of the amount of staff time they involved.² The December 1969 seminar was on housing; the December 1970 one, on the impact of technology on urbanisation. Seminars were held in the R. C. Mills room of the ANU chancellery building, with about 40 invited people participating.

I was invited to be a member of the steering committee set up to plan the annual urbanisation seminar and continued as a member 1969–73. I valued what the Unit was aiming to achieve, and enjoyed these periodic visits to Canberra and the ANU associated with the seminars, particularly since I usually stayed with Peggy and Max Neutze. I, and Geoff Sharp (Department of Social Studies, University of Melbourne), were obviously on the committee to ensure that social welfare and equity aspects of urbanisation were not neglected amongst the multiple competing perspectives. The steering committee was responsible for selecting and discussing seminar topics and main papers well in advance, and suggesting speakers and participants. In July, 1969, I responded by letter to Pat Troy about two seminar proposals I had suggested for the December 1971 seminar – the politics of urban growth, and urban growth and social welfare. The proposed outline he sent me for the first seemed adequate, at least at this early stage, and Bob Parker was 'keen to be in'. Pat's outline on the social welfare possibility was, however, more sketchy and would need to be filled out if it was likely to become a serious proposal in the near future.

1 John Paterson – the public costs of urban expansion in Melbourne, and Michael Jones – state housing for low income families.

2 G. M. Neutze, 'Australian National University, Research School of Social Sciences, Urban Research Unit', June 1968.

Perhaps at this stage it is more sensible to concentrate on the 'Politics' possibility. Peter Westaway may be a possible speaker at such a seminar and obviously Gough Whitlam has had a number of people helping him in this area, in view of his recent Wilkinson lecture. I don't, however, know the field well enough to make sensible suggestions.³

Shortly before the meeting of the steering committee in December 1969, Geoff Sharp wrote, wondering if I had gone further in working out a tentative framework for the 'welfare and planning theme'. In his view, if you are going to talk about the development of welfare planning, 'you just have to start off with a structural view of the person, his likely problems, and the planned steps needed to assist him. I'd hope the forthcoming seminar can get down to the guts of planning at this level'.⁴

The 1970 technology seminar opened with a paper on economic trends and projections by Colin Clark, followed by one on social trends and projections by Tom Brennan, whom I had recommended. Max Neutze chaired the morning session and Pat Troy the afternoon session on the first day, and as chairman of the general discussion throughout the next morning, I had the privilege of receiving all the papers in advance. The other papers were on leisure; two examples of internal influences – transport, and industrial and commercial location; and two examples of external influences – bulk shipping and containerisation, and air transport.

The 1971 seminar on the politics of urban growth resulted in a significant book on the subject.⁵ Its chapters were prepared as background papers for the seminar. The book's preface by the editors stated:

The aim of the book is to explore some of the ways in which politics and government have influenced the growth and shape of cities; to show how urban growth affects economic and social welfare and administration of all kinds in public services; and to discuss the possibilities of ordinary city dwellers, in their various political capacities, to have some say in the nature and direction of future growth.

Sydney, the largest Australian metropolis and where urban politics in Australia had so far been best documented, was taken as a case study. In both the Sydney studies and particularly in the more general chapters, broader issues were discussed, such as the relations between planning, politics and popular participation, which were matters of common concern throughout the modern world. Serious writing on metropolitan government in Australia was still rare. The book aimed at increasing understanding on the basis of sound knowledge, rather than to preach or prescribe. Extended, detailed research on the realities of politics in our large cities had scarcely begun, but some was now developing in the Urban Research Unit of the ANU. Urban growth was inevitably infused with politics, and urban problems could not be met except by political action.

The successive chapters of the book considered: 1. The growth of an

3 Letter, John Lawrence to Patrick Troy, 4/7/69.

4 Letter, Geoff Sharp to John Lawrence, 27/11/69.

5 R. S. Parker and P. N. Troy (eds), *The Politics of Urban Growth*, Australian University Press, Canberra, 1972.

Australian metropolis – Eric Fry, a reader in history, School of General Studies, ANU. 2. Planning and politics – R. S. Parker, professor of political science, RSS, ANU. 3. The role of government – Gerald H. Francis and Colin A. Hughes, senior lecturer and professor of political science, Department of Government, University of Queensland. 4. Planning the Metropolis – A Case Study – P. F. Harrison. 5. Social welfare and urban growth – R. J. Lawrence, professor and head of the school of social work, UNSW. 6. Citizen participation in urban planning – Peter Loveday, senior fellow in political science, RSS, ANU.

The book was the result of a careful planning process which involved meetings of possible authors and coordinating our respective topics. I was initially down for a chapter on 'Equity and urban growth', and prepared an outline accordingly, although realising it was a tall order. The outline set down a brief analysis of the nature of equity, and how the concept might be applied to making judgements about the processes and outcomes of urban growth. To pursue equity was to identify the claims of all interested parties. Were there sufficient common values in terms of which comparative judgements of well-being could be made? There was a noticeable interest in 'values' by social scientists becoming increasingly policy-conscious. It was in terms of values that policies were justified. The chapter would be concerned with disparities in life conditions and opportunities experienced by different population categories. An attempt would be made to relate disparities to urban growth. Lack of data would not prevent a particular possible equity perspective being discussed. My outline was, however, too normative and speculative for the tenor of the rest of the book, so I turned to a much more empirically-based contribution grounded in Sydney data. The preface to the book subsequently acknowledged that it touched 'only in passing on the impact of urban growth on style and quality of life, and the problems of equity it raised.

My chapter on 'Social Welfare and Urban Growth' commenced with this quotation from David Donnison:

... the social services are not an unproductive frill tacked on to the economy as a charitable afterthought, but an integral part and (in some form or other) a necessary part of our economic and social system – a form of collective provision required to meet the needs of an expanding industrial society and to provide a market for its products. They are developed, differentiated, and developed again, in accordance with the changing aspirations of those who work in them and those whom they serve. (Donnison et al., (1965), *Social Policy and Administration*, London, Allen and Unwin, p. 23.)

After tracing patterns of social change in Sydney in the first part of the chapter (pp. 100–111), the rest focused on the social welfare response (pp. 111–128).

PATTERNS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

The city's first major strategic plan for physical development, completed in 1948, and designed to extend to about 1972, proved wildly astray in its population

estimates. The population increase had been two-and-a-half times greater than was the forecast, most of it coming from immigration from outside of New South Wales and from natural increase, the rest (about one person in six) from the state's country areas. By 1966, the Sydney Region contained about 23% of Australia's total population, and 62% of the population of New South Wales.

As Sydney's post-war population grew, the distribution of the population by local government areas had changed, with considerable significance for social welfare. Details were provided, for 1947 and 1966, of the changing proportions of the populations, numbers and residential densities in the city, and in the three rings of local government areas inner, middle and outer. The names of the government areas and their distance from the Sydney GPO were given. A table showed local government areas ranked according to population size at censuses of 30 June 1947, 1954, 1961, and 1966, and estimated at 30 June 1970.

It can be seen that there have been great disparities in the numbers of people served by each local government authority. These have serious implication for such matters as economies of scale, range of services, quality of political representation, the quality of local government staff, and possibility of sectional interest having influence. The table also shows how particular authorities have felt the impact of Sydney's population growth at times when the population of other authorities were relatively stable or declining.

Jeans and Logan (1961) had suggested higher rating levels in the new suburbs to help meet the costs of establishing them, but it was not obvious that they should bear all the costs, especially when their residents tended to be less affluent than the rest of the community and rate revenue was raised by a flat rate tax, not a progressive one.

Because local government authorities are varied – in population, history of settlement, financial capacity, governing machinery, the demand for their services, and their willingness to provide services – the local government services a person will have received had depended a great deal on where 'home' was in Sydney. Was this equitable?

Those who emphasised pluralism, local democracy, and 'self-help' for each local region, irrespective of comparative needs, demands and resources, might regard this unevenness as reasonable. Others would emphasise the interdependence of modern urban industrial systems, and the need for everyone, particularly more vulnerable citizens, to be assured by government of a basic range of services, and regard the present situation as unjust – a further confirmation of an increasingly stratified society, in contrast to Australian egalitarian ideology.

Using the work of UNSW colleague Athol Congalton (*Status and Prestige in Australia*, Melbourne, Cheshire, 1969) to provide a rough guide on the social prestige of each local government area, I constructed a table showing local government areas – the city and the three rings, inner, middle and outer – with Congalton's A, B, C, and D grading of the suburbs in each local government area. While it was recognised that residential areas were not completely homogeneous, a clear pattern was evident. The city and the inner ring local government areas had almost a monopoly of the lowest grade suburbs.

These are the old partly decaying suburbs which contain a high proportion of the city's poor, its non-British migrants, its unattached youth, its childless adults, and its social deviants (see Rose, 1967). The more these suburbs are 'redeveloped', either for commercial or for residential purposes, the more these people are forced to seek accommodation elsewhere. This is a help to local government authorities anxious to 'improve' their area, especially its rating base. But what happens to the people displaced, many of whom will have lived in the area for much of their lives? Alternative accommodation in the inner ring of suburbs at a manageable price is increasingly difficult to find. The 'solution' is often moving to an outer suburb with all the social and economic costs involved.

The table indicated also the developing degree of social segregation in the city's spread to the west and south-west, a wedge-shaped area which now housed almost a million people living in suburbs all classified as C grade. Hugh Stretton had strongly criticised Sydney's increasing social segregation, but because of the city's topography, he accepted it as virtually inevitable – that is, if Sydney must continue to grow. Only a massive 'new towns' policy, replacing the present tinkering decentralisation policy, could hope to divert new population away from Sydney. For such a policy to become politically acceptable and technically feasible would take time, if it happened at all, and Sydney was already out of time. For Stretton, Sydney was already almost beyond redemption, a place increasingly to avoid 'if you enjoy a civilised and creative life, or are concerned with social justice'. (Stretton, *Ideas for Australian Cities*, Melbourne, Georgian House, 1970, pp. 256–68.)

The age distributions and migrant settlement patterns within Sydney's local government areas were then examined, using tables constructed from 1966 census data. These had evident implications for what community services were particularly relevant in the various areas.

Work location and residence data indicated that large number of people had to journey to work, in many cases for long distances.

The impact of these regular journeys on public and private transport systems, air pollution, personal and family finance, family structure and family life, health, traffic accidents, hospital services, job choices, friendship patterns, local versus metropolitan identification, and personal use of time, call for urgent study.

There was an emerging awareness of the need to examine the costs and benefits, and the inequities of alternative transport arrangements. 'Progress' and 'development' do not necessarily mean bigger and better expressways, especially when they cut a path through established residential areas, dispossessing people of their homes and tearing the social fabric of their lives.

THE SOCIAL WELFARE RESPONSE

People met their daily needs through a variety of social arrangements – national, state and local government services, voluntary services, and private enterprise. In addition, primary groups of family, neighbours and friends could still be important sources of service. The social welfare services under government and

voluntary auspices might be seen as having special and direct responsibilities for human well-being, but distinctions between welfare and other types of social institutions were not clear-cut, and beside the stated objectives of a social welfare organisation, closer analysis revealed a variety of personal objectives being pursued through the organisation by legislators or board members, and by agency employees – to say nothing of the customers (Lawrence, 'A social transaction model for the analysis of social welfare', *AJSI*, 3, 4, pp. 57–8, 1968.) The social services were no longer seen merely as individually motivated 'good works', or as redistribution of wealth from the 'haves' to the 'have-nots' (Donnison et al., 1965, pp. 15–30.)

I then provided some examples of how the social welfare services had responded to the nature and distribution of Sydney's population outlined in the previous sections. All of the services had been under strain. Education, one of the most important, was seen as in a state of crisis and had been exposed to prolonged public debate. I turned for my main example to public health which had received little public discussion.

An Illustration: Public Health

During the 1960s the health authorities began to talk about 'community health', 'community medicine', and 'community psychiatry', and to act in line with these concepts. With a few outstanding exceptions, however, there was little evidence that the people concerned had an understanding of the social welfare enterprise as a whole, let alone many other important aspects of 'the community'.

In 1963, Dr H. Selle (chairman of the NSW Hospitals Commission), after an overseas study tour, had recommended rationalisation and regionalisation of the state's public hospital services 'to improve service to the community as a whole, at a reasonable cost'. Various developments were traced which led to the Askin government setting up in 1970 a steering committee and working party within the Department of Health, to plan a NSW Health Commission, which would amalgamate the state's health, hospital and ambulance services, with a significant degree of decentralisation of the administration into regions.

Sydney social workers had been slow to realise the social welfare implications of this planning and reorganisation of the health sector. However, in May 1971, representatives of the NSW branch of the AASW, partly mindful of the British Seebohm report, told the steering committee and working party that the 1969 Starr committee report (which had led to their establishment) had not tackled fundamental questions about the relationship between health services and other social welfare services.

It is ironic that this should occur in a Report supposedly on community health services. Unless these questions are now belatedly tackled in this more detailed planning stage, the new health service organisation could do considerable damage to the future overall community service pattern. ... Unilateral action by the health sector, out of relationship with the other social service sectors, just does not make sense to a government concerned with making the most effective community use of limited manpower and financial resources ...

The strength of powerful vested interests in this health sector makes its

reorganisation a difficult enough task, without the broader social welfare involvement. Yet the broader involvement will help to get the reorganisation and the vested interests into a community and citizen perspective. The broader involvement does, however, require servicing by professionals with relevant knowledge of 'the community' and its social service structures, and with community work skills. (Letter to the Steering Committee and Working Party, May 1971).

(I played an active part in this AASW committee and became a member of the Sydney region study group set up by the NSW Department of Health in 1972.)

A table I compiled from 1966 tables in the 1969 metropolitan hospitals survey showed the distribution of hospital beds provided in the city, and the inner, middle and outer local government areas, and theoretical bed requirements according to their population numbers, disregarding their different age compositions. With only about 6% of the population, the city of Sydney (old boundaries) had 36% of Sydney's total of acute illness and obstetric hospital beds. For the total metropolitan population of 2.6m, the figure of total hospital beds in fact was slightly higher than that for beds theoretically required. The hospital beds were mainly where people used to live. In 1966, Sydney's 5,748 psychiatric beds were concentrated in the psychiatric hospitals, all located along Parramatta river, except for North Ryde, 2½ miles north of Gladesville. While there was considerable diversification and spread of psychiatric facilities in the 1960s, the psychiatric hospital was still being described as 'the cornerstone of psychiatric care'. Its remoteness from large numbers of modern Sydney's population was inconvenient for both patients and their relatives. For admission purposes under the mental health act, metropolitan Sydney had been divided into six zones, each served by one of the psychiatric hospitals. Each hospital was on the fringe of its zone; none was in the centre of the area it was intended to serve.

Income security

A completely different approach to social needs was represented by the national income security system. Throughout the post-war period this had provided Sydneysiders, wherever they lived, with some basic financial protection against the hazards of old age, invalidity, widowhood, unemployment and sickness (see Kewley, 1965). In an earlier generation relieving financial poverty was the main concern of social welfare. Australia's income security system had not been submitted to a full-scale public inquiry since World War II. There was no Sydney equivalent of Henderson's poverty survey.

The elimination by the federal cabinet of proposed new income questions in the 1971 census has maintained a basic ignorance of our poorer citizens. The politics and morality of getting, disclosing and using information are important topics. The various social inequities that have been commented on in this chapter are likely to hurt most the lowest income groups, but much of this has been guesswork (and therefore can easily be dismissed) because relevant data are not collected by government or anyone else.

With data provided by the NSW director of the Commonwealth Department of Social Services (Alan Cox), I constructed a table of the numbers receiving the different categories of benefits (as at 13 September, 1971) in each of the 40 local government areas of Sydney. The LGAs were rank ordered by population and their numbers of beneficiaries in each benefit category were rank ordered. The geographic distribution of beneficiaries revealed had profound significance for planning other relevant services for these categories of population.

Crime

The Prisons Department had now changed its name to Department of Corrective Services, and was under increasing pressure to reform, both from its minister and its permanent head, as well as a small but influential minority of the public. Urban growth and crime were usually claimed to be closely associated, but serious study of criminal behaviour in Sydney only began to emerge in the later 1960s, partly stimulated by the University of Sydney's Institute of Criminology. Data from the Bureau of Census and Statistics showed each local government area in terms of the number of its residents convicted by higher criminal courts in 1970, per 1,000 of its general population. The figures required careful interpretation, but there were striking disparities between different areas. The five areas with the highest incidence were all inner city areas, the next three were in the far west. On his return from the UN congress on the prevention of crime and treatment, the minister for justice, John Maddison, had prepared a report on 'Social Defence Policies and Planning for Development'. The incidence of crime was seen as a collective responsibility with relevance for virtually all Departments of Government but with special relevance in the development planning of local government, decentralisation and development, housing, health, education, social welfare, and lands. Research and interdisciplinary collaboration were essential. 'If planning fails to take account of criminogenic factors, then ultimately the problem of crime will be as devastating and as expensive to solve as that of pollution'.

The Need for Coordination

The recognition by the under-secretary for public health and the minister for justice of the need for a greater sharing of knowledge and cooperation between the various components of Sydney's social welfare services was one sign that a new emphasis was emerging. For example in May 1970, the state cabinet had appointed an interdepartmental committee⁶ on essential services in rapidly developing housing areas. A 'new town forum' was held in September 1970, the culmination of a study of Green Valley, by three of my former colleagues in the Department of Social Work at the University of Sydney. Green Valley was a housing estate built for low-income people by the NSW Housing Commission, who saw itself merely as a housing authority without broader responsibility or

6 The departments represented were Education, Child and Social Welfare, Housing Commission, Local Government, Public Health, and Transport. Betty Vaughan, a social worker from Child and Social Welfare, convened and chaired the committee.

mandate. 'Many of the responsible senior officials who had been working for years on what ought to have been a coordinated cooperative venture met each other for the first time at the meetings which preceded this seminar'.

Machinery had now been established to plan Campbelltown's development into a city of half a million people, and the departmental committee concerned primarily with social welfare planning had turned its attention to this area. Its 'palliative' brief did not suggest, however, that it was part of the basic planning machinery, and in any case it was scarcely representative of the social welfare 'industry', for both the Commonwealth government and the voluntary sectors were absent. The 'real planning', to the extent that it was being undertaken, apparently remained in the hands of the land use planners and the public utilities. What Stretton called 'the civilised spenders from whom any social thought can be expected – education, welfare, health, police', were not directly represented on the Campbelltown development committee, nor on the State planning authority itself. The authority had no apparent expertise in social welfare matters, since traditionally these had not been associated with 'planning'. (See Maurice Broady, *Planning for People: Essays on the Social Context of Planning*, London, The Bedford Square Press, 1968.) An engineer-planner employed by Lend Lease Corporation, a major investor in the Campbelltown district, had proposed many-sided integrated planning based on the functional needs and values of the people in the area.

In Sydney, as elsewhere, social welfare organisations had arisen in a piecemeal, largely haphazard fashion. By definition they were all concerned with the personal well-being of individual Sydneysiders – but which ones, in what locality, in what aspects of their lives, with what skill, and under whose sponsorship? Obviously every organisation was specialised and limited in its social welfare interest and scope. Whose responsibility might it be, then, to coordinate the work of these organisations so that from the points of view of individual citizens and the community at large their efforts are most productive? If people answered: 'the democratically elected government', which level of government and which authorities within the government? Earlier chapters had already pointed out the complexities of the systems of government dealing with the people of Sydney and the fact that a metropolitan-wide government had not been established. In any case, would and should government intervention be tolerated by Sydney's non-government sector of social welfare? Structurally the situation was greatly complicated by the possibility of coordination according to any of the specialised bases on which the organisations were built – clientele, location, program, and auspices.⁷

The NSW Council of Social Service

Councils of social service, which now existed in every Australian state and at a national level, attempted to provide a framework within which these coordination problems could be tackled. Copied from models in North America

7 The reader was referred to my paper on organisational issues in social welfare at the 1966 ACOSS conference.

and Britain, they were specialised only in terms of broad locality and general social welfare purpose. The first of such councils was founded in Sydney in 1936, and despite its name its membership and activities remained overwhelmingly focused on Sydney – although from about the mid-1960s, a small number of non-metropolitan organisations had begun to join.

Sydney's population growth was 1.7m in 1947 to 2.78m in 1970. A table constructed from its annual reports showed the steady increase in the membership size of NCOSS at 4-yearly intervals over this period. Agency members had grown from 79 to 194, with an increase of almost 100 since 1959. Society members (mainly professional bodies) had only increased from 8 to 10, although in 1967, it had been 15. Associate members (interested individuals) had increased from 85 to 281. Throughout the post-war period, NCOSS claimed to have in membership 'most of the more important welfare bodies in Sydney' (from 1968, 'in the State'). Since 1959, 11 local governments had joined, 8 of them metropolitan – a small but significant government participation. However, not one of the major state and federal government social welfare departments had yet chosen to take up membership, although for most of the post-war period the Commonwealth Department of Social Services and state Department of Child Welfare and Social Welfare had been represented on the council's executive committee.

The failure of NCOSS to gain more than a superficial participation by government departments and the consequent tendency to identify the council with the non-government sector of social welfare had greatly hampered the pursuit of its objectives. In the post-war period until the late 1950s, these were:

1. To promote cooperation between all social service agencies in achieving high standards of social service and the efficient and economical use of community resources.
2. To study social conditions, problems and community facilities.
3. To encourage the interchange and dissemination of ideas, arouse interest and develop an informed public opinion, with the object of stimulating community action and influencing social legislation.

The objects were then revised, at least partly to make contributions to the council clearly tax deductible. The price paid was a 'new' set of objectives with a decidedly nineteenth century flavour – reference being made to relieving and alleviating poverty, distress, suffering, destitution, and helplessness, through charitable and benevolent action.

The idea of a general social welfare coordinating body had appealed to many of Sydney's professionally qualified social workers. Some had given their free services to the Council, its executive officer almost from the beginning had been a social worker, and many organisations had joined at the initiative of their social work staff. Yet social work education had not concentrated upon community work or social policy matters.

Despite the large contribution of unpaid time by a wide variety of professional and lay people to the Council's work, it had been and remained understaffed for the functions it attempted to perform. Its annual reports avoided precise reference to its staffing position, but in 1970/71 only about

\$13,000 was being spent on salaries and superannuation. In addition the state government was providing \$6,000 towards the salary and other costs associated with the work of the Council's recently appointed community services consultant. A further \$11,000 came from grants from the state government and the Council of the city of Sydney.

Although there was increasing interest in the idea of an annual appeal on behalf of the maximum number of charities, extensive schemes for federated financing for voluntary social welfare agencies had not been established. From American experience, such schemes could greatly strengthen a council of social service, because the council would usually have some formal part in the budgeting of funds. A relatively weak council perhaps suited social welfare agencies who did not wish to see their autonomy breached in any way, but might be willing to pay lip-service to 'coordination' and community-wide perspectives. In 1957, the general social welfare coordinating body in Detroit, roughly the same size as Sydney, employed 25 professionals (exclusive of top administrators), and this had been criticised as a staff inadequate to the coordination task (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965, p. 264).

Towards the end of the 1960s, the emergence in Sydney of local welfare coordinating bodies (by June 1971 – in Baulkham Hills, Manly-Warringah, Mosman, and Sutherland) was a new development, long evident in the North American scene. A growth of such councils throughout the metropolitan area could greatly strengthen NCOSS, provide it had the staff to service the relationship.

These local welfare coordinating bodies were part of a more general movement towards local services. An NCOSS seminar on welfare services and the local community, in October 1966, led to the establishment of a standing committee on local community services, chaired by N. T. G. Miles, secretary of the Local Government Association. In its report in June 1968, it observed that many of the voluntary community groups with a concern for coordinated local service in their areas were 'looking towards the local government councils for support and the possible provision of a professional social worker to coordinate service and guide their activities'. In 1971, only 8 local government authorities employed any social work staff, although more were anticipated through state government subsidies.

There had been considerable wrangling over the respective roles of Commonwealth, state and local governments in this development of local services and over whether it should be primarily focused on the aged section of the population, a development stimulated by the NSW Council of the Ageing (as it was called after 1968). The latter highlighted the competition for scarce resources, and community and government attention, between various parts of the social welfare industry. By 1971, a variety of coordinating bodies more specialised than NCOSS had come into existence and, like the Council, these were often directly linked with a coordinating body at the national level. Some of the state coordinating bodies – the Council on the Ageing, the Association for Mental Health, the Association of Sheltered Workshops – were helped into existence by NCOSS and maintained links with it. Others like the Good Neighbour Council had not joined NCOSS on the rather specious grounds

that coordinating bodies cannot join other coordinating bodies!

In the last few years Sydney's social service infrastructure had been undergoing substantial growth and change. It now included a series of state government consultative councils or committees – for the physically handicapped, the mentally handicapped (a field where the change, strongly pushed by parent groups, had been recent but dramatic), and the aged. One of the greatest services to coordination of social welfare services in Sydney had been rendered by the directory of social service agencies published by NCOSS. There had been seven post-war editions – the first running to 201 pages, the last to almost 600. Entries were brief, but in some fields, for example mental handicap, more detailed directories had been produced. No-one had as yet written even a descriptive book on Sydney's social welfare industry.

As the industry grew and became more diverse, the recruitment and deployment of its manpower, especially its more expensive and highly educated manpower, became critical. The most extensive specialisation and development of professional and technical functions had occurred in the health sector, but the same processes were increasingly observable in other sectors. In the late 1960s, the Australian Institute of Welfare Officers was established in Sydney specifically to cater for the interests, functions and training of non-professionals in social welfare activities. The Institute had been a prime mover in the development of a welfare officers' certificate course, carefully differentiated from the professional social work courses run by the universities. The NSW Department of Technical Education planned to introduce the certificate in 1972.⁸

Conclusion

The 'quality of life' slogan currently tends to be monopolised by people concerned about clean air and water, the elimination of excessive noise, and the preservation of native flora and fauna. These are seen as commonly held 'goods' increasingly being placed in jeopardy by industrial and urban growth. This chapter, in its concern with social welfare aspects of Sydney's growth, has drawn attention to many other 'goods' also at stake and with which politics and planning need to come to terms. A systematic social welfare concern would include the conditions of life for all Sydneysiders, throughout their lives and in comparison with each other. As yet such a broad concern is without an organisational or political base.

Political Influence of ANU Urban Research Unit

Tom Uren recorded in his autobiography that Whitlam had been making speeches on urban issues from the mid-1960s onwards. 'He was concerned at the rapid population growth Australia had experienced in the postwar years and the inability of governments to keep pace in providing basic social and physical amenities and services'. Uren was the ALP spokesman for urban and regional affairs from 1969. To prepare for his subsequent appointment as Australian minister for urban and regional development in the Whitlam

⁸ I was on the relevant planning committee, and on the selection committee which chose Peter Einspinner to run this course. It proved to be a good selection.

government (in December 1972), he had spoken with and studied the work of Pat Troy, Peter Harrison and Max Neutze, whom he would meet at least once a week at the ANU. He had been introduced to them by Race Mathews, who was on Whitlam's personal staff.

In 1972, Troy was working for a year at the OECD in Paris, and was not scheduled to return until after the election. Uren talked to Troy in Paris on his way back from a trip looking at urban and environmental problems in the USA.

It took me a while to convince him that there was a new era coming, and that we needed him to be part of it. Following my trip and in the lead-up to the election, I corresponded regularly with Troy about our plans for urban and regional affairs.

He trusted Troy ideologically, 'and frankly, the struggle will be within the department as well as outside it. ... Our logic and our arguments have to be set on sound principles and it needs clear thinkers who know where they want to go'.⁹

Uren stated that 'Troy in particular played a significant role as one of the early architects of our urban programs, Neutze was probably the most outstanding urban economist in the country'. The Urban Research Unit at the ANU believed people in government departments should have generalist education and be skilled in a number of disciplines that cut across and interrelated with one another so effective programs would require a broad approach to social problems.

For instance, they believed you couldn't just fix up housing, but had to look also at the social welfare problems, health problems, transport problems and location of employment problems, which were connected to housing.¹⁰

The Department of Urban and Regional Affairs did not survive the demise of the Whitlam government.

9 Tom Uren, *Straight Left*, Sydney, Random House, 1994, pp. 218–9.

10 Tom Uren, *Straight Left*, Sydney, Random House, 1994, pp. 254–5.

7.4 The Benevolent Society of New South Wales

7.4.1 Its Historical Context

Australian Social Welfare History

In May 2008, I wrote these over-view comments for discussion with Amy Delore, who was preparing an article on the Benevolent Society for the *Sydney Morning Herald*:

A full-scale history of the Benevolent Society of NSW, Australia's oldest registered welfare organisation, is still to be written. Ron Rathbone produced a mainly descriptive history in 1994.¹ In 2006, in response to the Australian Senate Committee report 'Forgotten Children': A report on Australians who experienced institutional or out-of-home care as Children: the Benevolent Society issued a public apology to former residents of their Scarba Home, and produced a history of what was known about life at Scarba during its operation from 1917 to 1986. Its public apology read:

It is now recognised that out-of-home care for children needs to include regular and meaningful family contact, placement with siblings, consistent care givers, opportunities for children to emotionally process what they have experienced and freedom to express their views and wishes for their future care.

The Benevolent Society is currently under progressive leadership, with a commitment to 'delivering leading edge programs and services, by finding innovative solutions to complex social challenges and by calling for a more just society'. As an independent secular organisation it can work across all sectors of society. Any careful study of the historical record does not, however, reveal a continuing progressive tradition since its inception in 1813 – or even for a long period after the Second World War. When I joined the Board in 1977, the Society's work was dominated by the Royal Hospital for Women, and its traditional welfare activities lacked relevant professionalism, and were not community or social justice oriented. Chasing government bricks and mortar subsidies had produced dispersed, uncoordinated facilities for the aged, Scarba House badly needed rethinking, and the Society's objectives needed to be recast and taken seriously. By the end of the 1980s, the Society had begun to develop as a genuinely progressive social welfare agency. It still, however, clung to its archaic 19th century name. Almost everywhere else, 'benevolent societies' have changed to names relevant to community or well-being.

John Lawrence

*Emeritus Professor of Social Work, UNSW
Board Director, Benevolent Society of NSW, 1977–86
Chairman, Scarba Review Committee, 1979
Chairman, Objectives Committee, 1981
Member, Planning Committee, 1985–86*

While teaching social administration at the University of Sydney in the 1960s, I was very much aware of the need for serious historical study of the way welfare policies and services had developed in colonial Australia and after

1 Ronald W. Rathbone, *A Very Present Help: Caring for Australians since 1813: the History of the Benevolent Society of New South Wales*, Sydney, State Library of New South Wales Press, 1994.

federation. In 1965, I was delighted when Brian Hickey discussed with me, and subsequently, his PhD thesis at the ANU on 'Charity in New South Wales, 1850–1914'.² In his original contact, Brian Hickey wrote:

I think I can talk coherently of the values as well as modes of action, and about the people receiving aid. One of the things that interests me vis a vis your book, is the growing number of full-time inspectors attached to the State Children's Relief Department grew to 33 inspectors and a total staff establishment of 120. I wonder whence they came and what sort of people they were? Certainly I feel confident the plea you make for the writing of our social welfare administration history will in a small way be answered by the time I've presented my dissertation, incomplete though it must be.³

In October 1965, Cherry Parkin (Department of History, University of Adelaide), at the suggestion of my friend Dr John Tregenza, wrote about her proposed PhD thesis topic in Australian social history in the period 1850–1900. She would like 'to examine the growth of a social conscience in various colonial communities (probably Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia) during this period, the function of philanthropic societies and perhaps their effect on social legislation'.⁴ I suggested she get in touch with Brian Dickey, who was undertaking a parallel study of New South Wales in the same period.⁵ In addition, I suggested she write to Max Crawford and Ruth Hoban at the University of Melbourne:

For some years they have apparently been engaged on a research project specifically on the development of a social conscience in Australia (and presumably more particularly in Victoria), but to my knowledge none of their work has yet been published and no-one seems to know just what they are really up to!

I enclosed a work plan for my own project on Australian social welfare. 'You will realise from the document that my project is very long-term and that it is in no way a substitute for interpretative thesis work. In thinking about social provision, my statement may be of some assistance to you'.⁶

A notable milestone for the period after federation was the first edition of Tom Kewley's book on social security in Australia, published in 1965. Its introductory chapter did, however, trace government and voluntary charitable relief up to 1900. The 'oldest and most important' of the voluntary organisations was the Benevolent Society of New South Wales, often referred to as the 'Government Almoner'.⁷ With approval and pressure from governor Lachlan Macquarie, this organisation was formed in 1818, transformed from an earlier evangelical Christian organisation, The New South Wales Society

2 His thesis supervisor was Robin Gollan, who had also been one of my supervisors at the ANU.

3 Letter, Brian Dickey to John Lawrence, 6/7/65.

4 Letter, C. W. Parkin to Dr Lawrence, 27/10/65.

5 Shortly after, in 1966, I could have also told her about the existence of an MA thesis at the university of Sydney – N. Gash, 'A History of the Benevolent society of New South Wales, 1813–1901'.

6 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to C. W. Parkin, 8/11/65.

7 T. H. Kewley, *Social Security in Australia: Social Security and Health Benefits from 1900 to the Present*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1965, pp. 8–12. A second edition took the story to 1972.

for Promoting Christian Knowledge and Benevolence in these Territories and Neighbouring Islands, which had been founded in 1813. The stated object of the Benevolent Society of New South Wales was:

to relieve the poor, the distressed, the aged, and the infirm, and thereby to discountenance, as much as possible, mendacity and vagrancy, and to encourage industrious habits among the indigent poor as well as to afford them religious instruction and consolation in their distress.⁸

Brian Dickey went to a lectureship in the School of Social Sciences at the Flinders University of South Australia in 1968. In May, we discussed his proposed book 'Care for the Poor in NSW 1788–1914'. In April 1969, he told me he had been unable to interest either the ANU Press or Sydney University Press in the book, 'because, according to both, there is no market.' Some of his thesis had already been published in journals, and I provided suggestions on possible journals he might approach for further articles.⁹ Brian Dickey continued with his interest in the history of social welfare policy and administration in Australia, producing in 1980 *No Charity There: a Short History of Social Welfare in Australia*, (Melbourne, Thomas Nelson) 1980, and in 1987 a second edition (Allen and Unwin). Working with Dr Elaine Martin at Flinders, he wrote to me in October 1979 about their work on social work/social welfare archives in South Australia. He hoped I would not be too harsh on his forthcoming short history, because he had 'left the operators' out (unlike Trattner and Leiby in the U.S.).¹⁰ I told him I planned to involve Michael Horsburgh in trying to do something about social welfare archival material on his return from a sabbatical. This could possibly become connected with the Social Welfare Research Centre being established at UNSW.¹¹

It is significant that in both Dickey's general social welfare history, and Kewley's social security history, the Benevolent Society of NSW is not mentioned after the colonial period.

7.4.2 The Society, 1968–71 – Welfare Progress Thwarted

My involvement with the Benevolent Society was in two parts. The first ended in 1971, after frustrating efforts to help the Society begin to become progressive in its social welfare activities. When I first joined UNSW in late 1968, it seemed that very belatedly the Society was showing signs of moving in this direction and that the UNSW School of Social Work might play a significant role in this. My predecessor at UNSW, associate professor Norma Parker, had played a key role in this development, and I was obviously expected to build on what had been started.

At the time, a Society document (it included the act of incorporation, by-laws, and UNSW agreement) stated at the end of a brief historical background to the Society,

8 For a brief account, see: Brian Dickey, *No Charity There*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1987, pp. 12–20.

9 Letter, Brian Dickey to John Lawrence, 3/4/69.

10 Letter, Brian Dickey to John Lawrence, 1/10/79.

11 Letter, John Lawrence to Brian Dickey, 5/10/79.

With a view to improving the social and community welfare services offered by the Society, 1967 saw the setting up of a Sociological Services Committee comprising some of Australia's most eminent professionals in the fields of social work, psychology, medicine and charity.¹²

Emanating from this Committee was the decision to integrate within the resources of the Benevolent Society, namely the Royal Hospital for Women, The Scarba House for Children, and the Senior Citizens' Homes, a fully developed social and community welfare programme.

The programme has as its aims the extension of the Society's medical service to supply domiciliary and/or hospital care for the aged; the provision of adequate accommodation and psychological care for unmarried mothers; a fully developed programme of child welfare which will include an adoption agency; and the training of student social workers from the University of New South Wales.¹³

The 1968 annual report boldly announced 'The Society's Community and Social Welfare approach has been modernised and a Senior Social Worker, Miss J. Brooker, was appointed'. A special community and social welfare sub-committee of the Board had been established to help her in the introduction of community and social welfare activity. As a 'by-product', the Society had participated in the training of social work students from the UNSW, under the supervision of university lecturers. The first report of the newly-constituted Department of Social Work, now three members, indicated offering a professional service to the children's home, Scarba, the Royal Hospital for Women, the William Charlton Homes at Allambie Heights, and a clientele in head office who formed the nucleus of the family case work agency.¹⁴

It seemed that at long last the Society was beginning to professionalise its welfare activities. For 60 years, it had engaged medically qualified professionals to provide clinical services to women and young children at the Royal Hospital for Women. In 1962, the Society had entered into an agreement with UNSW to become a teaching hospital of obstetrics and gynaecology for the university, taking over from the University of Sydney in 1965. There was no question of the need to be fully professional in its provision of medical services, but what about the need for professionalism in its various other welfare activities? However well-intended these were, and fulfilling to the people doing their 'benevolent' work, how effective and well-informed was it in terms of social welfare outcomes? The society was not highly regarded in the more progressive social welfare and social work circles. It enjoyed a high reputation with many prestigious people and continued under the patronage of the state governor. It had clearly not moved with the times and did not question the value of its historical record. Not to employ professionally qualified social workers until the late 1960s was a clear indication of this.

As already mentioned,¹⁵ when my social work colleagues Spencer Colliver

12 Norma Parker must have been the eminent social work professional on this inappropriately named committee.

13 Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, and Agreements*, p. 26.

14 Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *Annual Report 1968*, pp. 6, 43.

15 See p. 141.

and Michael Horsburgh conducted a survey of voluntary welfare organisations through the NSW Council of Social Service in 1972, they found that only two of the 95 respondents thought any training was necessary for board members. Spencer's comment on this, in 1977, is worth repeating:

It is astounding when you consider that a person who may be erudite in other fields can come onto a social welfare board ignorant of the factors relating to social welfare and be responsible for making critical policy decisions about clients – families, children, aged people and others – who are cared for. If any group in the whole field of voluntary social welfare needs training, it is the members of boards and committees. Yet in most cases it is the same people who see themselves as being above the need for such training. As a result of their policies and the programs which give those policies effect, the lives of many people are changed (sometimes irrevocably), and those life changes are not always in the best interests either of the person or of our society.¹⁶

These comments very much applied to the situation in the Benevolent Society during my first experience of it. The situation there was further complicated by the advanced age of a number of the board members, including its president, the power and influence of university members concerned primarily with the Royal Hospital for Women, a retired dominant honorary treasurer who chaired the new community and social welfare sub-committee, and a relatively ineffectual chief executive.

A key strategy to deal with both the quantitative and qualitative problems of students' field education in social work was to institute, with the cooperation of a number of selected agencies and field instructors, a series of student units. It was anticipated that at least seven of these would be operating from 1971, and at least ten from 1972. Given the groundwork that had already been done at the Benevolent Society by UNSW social work colleagues, its stated espousal of a modernising social work approach, and its strong links with UNSW through the Royal Hospital for Women, the Society seemed an obvious possibility for one or two of our student units. Because of its historical standing and potential breadth of community activities, its educational potential for social work was obvious.

Spencer Colliver and I, and other teaching staff in the school spent a great deal of time and effort trying to get adequate understanding of what was needed. However, in April 1970, with full agreement of the school's staff, I had to send a letter to Reg Della Bosca (secretary and executive officer of the Benevolent Society) which brought into serious question the school's future relationship with the Society.¹⁷ The letter provided a clear account of the difficulties we had been experiencing with the Society:

I think the time has come for me to review the relationship of this School with the Benevolent Society of New South Wales. To do this, I wish to call your attention to the following sequence of events:

16 'Spencer Colliver', *A Career in Social Work: Seven Personal Accounts*, a series devised and edited by R. J. Lawrence, UNSW School of Social Work, 1978, pp. 20–1.

17 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to R. T. Della Bosca, 17/4/70.

1. In 1968, Mrs Colby and Mr McCouat, Lecturers from the School of Social Work, worked in the Society, without payment from the Society, with a group of our students. My predecessor, Professor Norma Parker, agreed to this not only because it provided field work opportunities for our students, but also because it would help the Society to develop modern social work and social welfare programmes.
2. When I took up my appointment in November 1968, it was evident that the School had already played a significant and recognised part in helping the Society to improve its levels of service. I noted, however, that a letter from you to Professor Parker stated: 'Inevitably in developing a new teaching programme at the same time as the Society is re-organising its resources administrative difficulties arise and I trust these were not unduly frustrating to your students and their mentors.' In fact, Mrs Colby indicated to me that she had had to tolerate extremely frustrating working conditions in the Society and preferred not to continue working in that setting.
3. To build upon what had already been accomplished, on 27th March, 1969, I had a very full discussion with you (and subsequently with Miss Brooker and Dr Greenwell) on the possibility of establishing in the Society two embryonic student units each of 3 students. One was to be located at Scarba under Mr McCouat's supervision; the other to be associated with the Royal Women's Hospital, under Mrs Colby's supervision. My letter to you of 11 April, 1969 fully set out the proposal. I indicated that this was part of the School's plan 'to move towards field work pursued mainly through a series of student units located in selected agencies around Sydney.' I expressed the hope that possibly in 1970 the Society would be able to provide most of a unit supervisor's salary and said:

This would not be unreasonable because (1) the unit, though educational in focus, would be providing service to the clients of the agency, (2) the agency should benefit generally from the stimulus provided by the presence of the unit, (3) the students in the unit could become later agency staff members, and (4) existing staff members engaged in student supervision would be freed from this responsibility, for which they may not be well suited in any case.

4. The Society approved my proposal for 1969, and I was assured that suitable accommodation could be made available for both embryonic units. In the event, Mrs Colby's unit could not commence until as late as June 23rd because of delays over the provision of accommodation, and even then the accommodation provided was most unsatisfactory. Your letter to me on 15th August spoke of arranging a meeting of the Sociological Services Subcommittee 'to have more definite space allotted to the students when placed at the Society'. You added:

I trust the interim arrangements have not been too distressing to the lecturer or the students. So much has developed quickly within the Society that coordination of resources, including space, is a little bit more complex than I originally anticipated.

In fact, Mrs Colby and the students had been forced to be based in the Society's Board Room, a quite unsatisfactory situation, and one that I would not have agreed to if I had known in April that this would be the 'suitable accommodation' which would eventually be provided.

5. During 1969, the Society received free of charge, not only the services of Mrs Colby and Mr McCouat and their work of their student units, but also extensive consultation on its Scarba programme from Mr Colliver, a Senior Lecturer in the School. Early in 1970, the School made available to the Society the services of Mr Colliver to run a course on administration for the Society's administrative staff, this time on a paid basis.
6. Before Mrs Colby left the School for overseas towards the end of 1969, she expressed the view that medical social work was too underdeveloped in the Royal Women's Hospital for a student unit in the Hospital to operate effectively in 1970 – unless developmental work was done in the interim. To this end I persuaded Miss Jennifer Caldwell, recently returned from the United States, to take a temporary appointment with the Society at the Royal Women's Hospital, in anticipation of the School appointing her as a Tutor in 1970 and be running a student unit in the Royal Women's Hospital in 1970.
7. In a letter from you to me on 31st October, you stated:

I am attempting to arrange a suitable date for members of the Sociological Services Sub-Committee. One of the items included in the agenda which I have prepared for this meeting is the agreement between the Society and your school for teaching of social work ... we must be sure that appropriate physical facilities are available for each of the teaching units.

The overall problem of accommodation should have eased in 1970, when the Undergraduate Medical Teaching Block and the Gynaecological Block will have been completed.

The Society is most grateful to the School of Social Work for the assistance given by yourself and Mr Colliver.

Your Memorandum on 14th November to Members of the Sociological Services Sub-Committee claimed:

Of particular importance is the question of appropriate accommodation for the social work students during 1970. As soon as a mutually acceptable date is available I will notify members of the Committee.

8. In the event, a meeting of this Committee was not called until 5th February, 1970. In the meantime, early in December, before going on leave, I indicated to the Society's Senior Social Worker, Mrs Perrott (née Brooker), our precise plans for the two units in 1970. They were that from about mid-April to the end of September, there would be two student units on a Monday and Tuesday. One would consist of 4 students connected with the work of the Royal Women's Hospital, and under Miss Caldwell's supervision – without charge to the Society. The other would consist of 6 students working with the general social work programme of

- the Society. This unit would be jointly supervised by Mr McCouat and Mr Pavlin (another School Lecturer) – again without charge to the Society.
9. On 16th January I began a series of discussions with the Society which included yourself, Mrs Perrott, and Dr Greenwell.¹⁸ At the meeting of the Sociological Services Sub-Committee on 5th February the School's plan was generally endorsed, with the question of the accommodation still to be pursued. The matter of the School entering into a formal agreement with the Society was fully discussed and I indicated that I would prefer to wait until the experience of the units during this year had been completed. I expressed the view that the School was not related to the Society in the same way as the University's Medical School and that the nature of the relationship needed to be worked out carefully. It would be irresponsible on both sides to enter into a formal agreement without this having been done. No-one dissented from my view at that meeting.
 10. Subsequently Miss Caldwell and I spent considerable time discussing with yourself and other officers of the Society the accommodation possibilities. Throughout this discussion, it was known that the Society had a general policy not to spend money on buildings due for demolition, but there was an agreement that the only way to provide the necessary facilities for the teaching of our students for the next two of three years was to use such accommodation. All accommodation possibilities were very fully examined, and finally the architects were asked to give an estimate for a consolidated plan which would have housed in a Hospital block due for demolition in possibly 3 year's time, the Society's general Social Work Department, the Medical Social Work Department of the Hospital, and the two student units, including their three university-paid supervisors.
 11. At a luncheon meeting in 19th March, immediately prior to a House Committee meeting of the Society's Board, attended by the Society's President, yourself, Dr Greenwell, Mr Tuckwell, Miss Caldwell, the Society's architect, and myself, the architect's sketch plan and estimate of \$20,000 were discussed. You will recall that I expressed the view that the figure seemed excessive, and in any case I spent most of the meeting indicating a variety of ways in which the plan could feasibly be changed in order to reduce the cost, but not harm the work involved. Right at the end of the meeting, the Society's President strongly put the view that the original plan should not be changed and he was assured by yourself that the Society had the money available. I was later informed that the original plan had been approved in principle by the House Sub-Committee and that local government approval would be immediately sought, and I also learn that \$12,000 not \$20,000 was involved in implementing the original plan. At this stage, it was obvious that the beginning of our units for this year would be delayed to some extent, but at long last it appeared that the Society was going to honour its continuing promises about suitable accommodation.
 12. When I heard from the acting Secretary two days ago that two working

18 General medical superintendent and chief executive officer, Royal Hospital for Women.

committees of the Society, without any new evidence or change in circumstances, had rejected spending this money for this purpose, and that therefore there was no chance of its acceptance by the Finance Committee, I was dismayed – especially for the sake of our 10 students who were to benefit from the two proposed units.

13. I wish to make the position of the School quite clear. I will not submit either my students or my staff yet again to completely unsuitable make-shift arrangements, and until and unless the Society demonstrates by its actions that it really places value on its association with our School, I am afraid we have no choice but to place strict limits upon our degree of cooperation.
14. The Society does not apparently realise just how generous was the School's offer of providing free the services of three of its staff for substantial periods of their time. Spreading the \$12,000 over the likely three years of life of the accommodation involved and deducting the proportion of the expenditure not related to student units, surely the Society has not been asked to foot a heavy bill for the additions to service that it will be receiving. I would also point out that the bill would have been significantly less if my economy view urged at the meeting on March 19th had prevailed.
15. For the sake of our teaching programme I have been forced to make last-minute alternative teaching arrangements. I have arranged with Mrs Perrott that, as happened last year, Mr McCouat will supervise three students from Scarba, and that one other student will be placed separately with Mrs Booker. The remaining students who were to have been placed in the Society will now be placed in a new student unit under Miss Caldwell's supervision at Lidcombe Hospital. This Hospital is very suitable for a student unit and has been urging the School to become associated with it in this way, but I had not yet pursued this because of our long-standing negotiations with your agency.

I am sorry to have written at such length, but I considered that it was important to try to clarify exactly where we stand.

R. J. Lawrence

Professor of Social Work and Head of School, UNSW

I sent copies of this letter to C. A. Hardwick K.C (Benevolent Society president), E. L. Callaway (Benevolent Society treasurer; chairman, community and social welfare committee), Dr J. Greenwell (general medical superintendent and chief executive officer, Royal Hospital for Women), Mrs J. Perrott (director of community and social welfare), and Professor B. T. Mayes (board member and senior honorary consultant, Royal Hospital for Women).

My letter was considered by a meeting of the Board in May. A process was then set in train that ended a year later with a final exchange of letters between the president of the Benevolent Society, C. A. Hardwick, and vice-chancellor of UNSW, Rupert Myers. The Board of the Society had resolved that a proposed agreement between the two organisations should be 'indefinitely deferred until

such time as the University wished to raise the matter'. Mr Hardwick wrote:

I feel that until the Society has its Community and Social Welfare Division fully organised, this decision is the wisest that can be taken in all the circumstances surrounding the matter.

With a view to attaining the end mentioned in the last paragraph, the Board, having fully considered the situation and the need for a tangible and clear policy relating to the development of its Community and Social Welfare Division, has appointed Dr. Howard Maurice Saxby to advise and prepare a full review ... to determine:

1. The direction and extent of relief to be given in the department,
2. The conduct and manner of regulation of the department,
3. Which problems the Society should be investigating and assisting in the community,
4. What subsidy might be available to assist the Society's own subsidy for this division. The Society's own subsidy towards the cost of community and social welfare in 1970 has been \$34,000.¹⁹

Neither I nor my social work colleagues were impressed by the appointment of a retired medical administrator to investigate and recommend to the Board re-structuring or improvements in the community and social welfare department of the society. In fact, his wife, an experienced qualified social worker, was subsequently appointed as coordinator in community and social welfare. Scarba was left without a social work service (until 1973) and the concentration was on adoption and geriatric work with very thin professional resources. By the end of 1972, the coordinator in community and social welfare had resigned and this first attempt to develop and coordinate the Society's social welfare activities on a modern professional base had finally disappeared.²⁰

The Preceding Process

Near the beginning of the process which led to this outcome, Della Bosca had referred to 'the amicable and cooperative attitude between the Society and the Faculty of Medicine of the University of New South Wales since our agreement was settled in 1962'.²¹ My senior university colleagues currently on the Board of the Benevolent Society – Professors Chaikin (applied science), Frank Rundle (surgery), and Rex Vowels (pro-vice-chancellor) – were obviously keen for the issue of the relationship of the UNSW Social Work School with the Society not to harm the Society's relationship with the university, and the Medical School in particular. I remember telling Frank Rundle when he said you can work with these people, that while that may have been his experience in relation to medicine, it was not our school's experience in relation to social work. A letter from Rex Vowels (7/9/70) reported that at the last board meeting, it was apparent that the Royal Hospital for Women was 'awaiting advice'

19 Letter, C. A. Hardwick to Rupert M. Myers, 7/4/71.

20 'Report on Scarba House for Children', November 1979, pp. 3-4.

21 Letter, R. T. Della Bosca to R. J. Lawrence, 14/8/70.

from the University regarding the future social work program. Our proposals should be transmitted by the vice-chancellor, 'as consideration is being given to new accommodation'. Perhaps I might like to discuss these with Professors Chaikin and Rundle.²² I recall telling Rex Vowels that the university, and certainly not its School of Social Work, should not be seen to be associated with the unreformed welfare work of the Society.

The Board had, in fact, already asked Professors Chaikin and Rundle to form a sub-committee to discuss with me the school's future requirements not just in relation to the hospital, and I had learnt that 'the only basis for any teaching arrangements' would be:

It now appears that the Society is faced with a decision as to the priority of teaching of undergraduate social work practice within its organisation. Already its community and social work programme, which is not subsidised from any source, is absorbing approximately \$25,000 per annum in recurring costs and teaching of students must add substantially to that sum.

The Society is faced with capital costs in developing its facilities at the Royal Hospital for Women, extension of its programme in the care of senior citizens, development of its child care programme at Scarba House. Each of these works is directly related to the practical extension of physical relief to the needy which can be maintained and developed with its present graduate social work establishment. ...²³

I also found out that student placements would not be considered in the interim, pending a decision on the matter.

After full consultation with the staff of the school, I prepared a draft letter in response to the Society's request for 'a specific programme ... to avoid any misunderstanding'. On 24 September, I sent this to Professors Chaikin, Rundle and Vowels. It was suggested that the substance of the letter should be incorporated in an official letter from the university signed by the vice-chancellor, so I prepared a re-draft for consideration by the four of us in Professor Rundle's office on 8 October. The outcome was a much shorter letter with an attachment, sent by the vice-chancellor to Mr Hardwick, 21 October. For a number of reasons, he believed it would very desirable for the Benevolent Society and the university to cooperate in the field education of social work students. If the Society agreed in principle, he proposed a joint University/Society committee of about six to explore general principles to guide future relations, and the kind of standing committee structure which would be needed within the Benevolent Society. The university members would be professors Chaikin, Lawrence and Rundle. 'For the interest of the Society', he attached 'a general statement prepared by Professor Lawrence on the School of Social Work's field education program'.²⁴

A General Statement on the School of Social Work's Field Education

The following is a description of the broad characteristics of the School's field

²² Letter, Rex Vowels (acting vice-chancellor) to R. J. Lawrence, 7/9/70.

²³ Letter, R. T. Della Bosca to R. J. Lawrence, 14/8/70.

²⁴ Letter, Rupert H. Myers to C. A. Hardwick, 21/10/70.

education as it will operate next year. Since this field education involves us in continuing arrangements with a large number of social agencies, it will be appreciated that arrangements we make with any one agency must be seen in this overall picture.

As a professional school, we give high educational priority to the learning of professional behaviour – the relevant knowledge, skills and attitudes – in actual practice settings. There are three field subjects specifically designed to accomplish this, and the School is doing all it can to improve the teaching and learning in these subjects. These in fact constitute a basic requirement for the professional recognition of the degree. The Field Instructors used are normally selected members of the social work profession.

SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE IB

Under supervision of a Field Instructor approved by the School, usually in a fairly structured social work agency, a student begins to learn to apply the principles of professional practice. The emphasis is on work with a broad range of clients and social problems, rather than on depth of experience. Students study either within or in connection with the agency, examples of the main social work methods, and examples of social welfare services. The prime purpose, however, is to begin to acquire, in an actual practice setting, skills and responsibility in interpersonal relations.

The duration of this first field work placement is 42 working days (294 hours). This occupies a 2-week block in July of the Second Year; then a Thursday and Friday until the first week in November.

SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE IIB

Part 1. Usually as a member of a Student Unit located in a social work agency and supervised by a Field Instructor approved by the School, the student has learning experiences which help him to acquire skills in the casework method at some depth. Stress is placed on gaining self-awareness, understanding of the diagnostic process and the development of treatment skills.

The duration of this second field work placement is 45 days (315 hours). This occupies a 3-week block period in February of the Third Year; then a Monday and Tuesday until the second week in June.

Part 2. The emphasis in this third supervised field work placement is upon field evaluation of aspects of service, using a theoretical basis gained from classroom teaching. For instance, students may devise means to evaluate their own clinical practice or the agency's method of delivery of service to clients or the effectiveness of a particular form of social work intervention. Where possible, a student studies in depth an aspect of social work practice in which he has developed a particular interest.

The duration of this placement is 40 days (280 hours). This covers a 8-week block period in January and February between the Third and Fourth Years of the course.

SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE IIIB

Usually as a member of a Student Unit located in a social work agency and supervised by a Field Instructor approved by the School, the student has further learning experiences in the method on which he has elected to concentrate in Social Work Practice IIIA. Students may be select from the following – social casework, social

group work, community work, and administration.

The duration of this fourth and final placement is 51 days (357 hours). This occupies a 3-week block period in June-July of the Fourth Year; then a Monday and Tuesday until the end of November.

(The enclosed table [not replicated here] sets out the field work timetable for 1971.)

ANTICIPATED STUDENT NUMBERS

In 1971, we anticipate roughly 70 students in Social Work Practice 1B; just over 60 in Social Work Practice 11B; and about 60 in Social Work Practice 111B. These are very considerable numbers for whom to organise adequate teaching and learning in the field.

THE ROLE OF STUDENT UNITS

As a key strategy to deal with both the quantitative and qualitative problem of students' field education, the School is instituting, with cooperation of a number of selected agencies and field instructors, a series of Student Units. There is every chance that at least seven of these Student Units will be operating from 1971, and at least ten from 1972. It will be noticed from the above descriptions of the field subjects, that a student's second and fourth placements will normally be in Student Units.

PRINCIPLES IN ESTABLISHING A STUDENT UNIT

From experience to date, the School is guided by the following principles when it negotiates to establish a Student Unit.

1. A Unit is constituted in association with a reasonably well established professional social work service. Occasionally, the School uses, on a short-term basis, its own teaching staff to help develop a possible agency setting for a permanent Unit.
2. The Unit consists of an average of 6 students, not less than 4 and not more than 8.
3. It is under the supervision of an agency staff member who -
 - (a) is specially competent in teaching students,
 - (b) is appointed for the task by the agency and approved by the School of Social Work, and
 - (c) is responsible to the agency for the students' service to the agency's clients,
 - (d) is responsible to the School for the student's educational progress,
 - (e) participates in seminars with the School's other Student Unit Instructors, Field Instructors, and the School's staff,
 - (f) uses both individual and group teaching methods.
4. The Student Unit Instructor is paid by the agency, but also receives an honorarium from the School in recognition of the person's specialised contribution to the School's work. (This honorarium is paid directly to the person and is not seen as a direct payment for services rendered. The amount varies according to the School's finances. In 1971, the proposed honorarium is \$600 for each Student Unit Instructor.) Our experience has shown that a Student Unit with its Instructor, in fact, provides more actual service to the clients of the agency than the Instructor alone could if engaged wholly on direct service. The nature of the service needs, of course, to be taken into account, but it is clear that the

- provision by the agency of the salary of the staff member to act as a Student Unit Instructor tends to add to rather than detract from immediate service.
5. Normally the senior social work administrator responsible for the overall social work service, does not act as a Student Unit Instructor. The latter is usually administratively responsible to such a person in the Unit's work. The learning programme to be pursued in any one student placement is organised by the Student Unit Instructor in consultation with the School's field work coordinator and the agency's senior social work administrator.
 6. The Student Unit operates throughout most of the year. As already indicated, normally students in their second placement are in the Unit for a 3-week block period in February, and then on a Monday and Tuesday until the second week in June. After a 2-week break for the Unit, students in their fourth placement are in the Unit for a 3-week block period in June-July, and then on Monday and Tuesday until the end of November. The Unit Field Instructor is responsible for ensuring continuity of service for agency clients served by the Unit.
 7. The Unit has accommodation and other facilities which allow it to perform both its educational and service functions. These include:
 - (a) A separate room for the Unit Field Instructor.
 - (b) A room, or rooms, with adequate desk and cupboard space for each student, not so cramped as to hinder effective work.
 - (c) Sound-proof interviewing rooms for student use.
 - (d) Adequate telephone facilities.
 - (e) Stenographic, clerical, and record-keeping help.
 - (f) A seminar room for group discussions within the Unit, with client groups, and with students from other disciplines.
 - (g) Access to an agency library which especially contains material relevant to its work.

THE ADVANTAGES TO AN AGENCY OF A STUDENT UNIT

1. Although the Unit is established specifically for an educational purpose, as a whole it provides an addition to the actual social work service of the agency, over and above what the one qualified staff member involved could provide on his own. (see above)
2. The Unit may be used to initiate and develop a particular aspect of service in the agency, for example, developing a social group work programme for a particular client group, providing a follow-up casework service to clients who could not otherwise be offered this.
3. Agencies testify to the general stimulus to the quality of work of the agency because of the presence of the university-connected Student Unit.
4. The professional development of the staff member who is the Student Unit Instructor becomes a special responsibility of the School of Social Work. This, in turn, benefits other staff members of the agency.
5. Experience has shown, later staff recruitment to the agency is facilitated when considerable numbers of students have undertaken a field placement in the agency.
6. The specialised task of teaching students is mainly in the hands of someone with special skills in this direction. This frees other staff members for other vital tasks.

FIELD EDUCATION OUTSIDE STUDENT UNITS

It will be noted that regularly in their first and third field placements, students will continue to be placed in a large number of social agencies under individual Field Instructors. This is the traditional arrangement agreed upon by the agencies who, by mutual agreement with the School, provide suitable staff members to instruct students singly or in twos or threes. In addition to its development programme for Student Units, the School is giving considerable attention to improving the quality of the field teaching by these Field Instructors who are not as specialised in their role as are the Student Unit Instructors.

OTHER FIELD OBSERVATION AND STUDY

One other traditional area of field experience should be mentioned. This is when a social agency is requested to cooperate by allowing social work students to observe and study particular aspects of its programme, without the students actually being placed in the agency. In future, the School hopes to extend this experience so that it is used not only in connection with the Social Work Practice subjects, but also in connection with the Human Behaviour and Social Welfare Subjects.²⁵

Not included in the vice-chancellor's letter, or in its attachment, was the following material in my earlier drafted response to the Society's request for 'a specific programme' from the school.

THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND THE BENEVOLENT SOCIETY

For a number of reasons, it would be sensible for the School of Social Work to include the Benevolent Society of New South Wales amongst the agencies who participate in the School's field education programme.

1. The Society is a voluntary agency with a range of programmes extending from children to the aged.
2. It has recently begun to modernise its various social work services, at least partly stimulated by help from staff of the School of Social Work.
3. The Society's Royal Hospital for Women is a teaching hospital of the University of New South Wales. It is widely acknowledged that a modern hospital cannot function effectively with a well-established social work department. Such a department is vital in linking the hospital with its surrounding community.
4. Apart from Professor Rundle, the University's Professor of Medicine, the University is represented by Professors Chaikin and Vowels as Directors on the Board of the Society. This gives the University some general responsibility in the Society's work. Although the Society's work in the Royal Hospital for Women dwarfs its other interests, it still claims primarily to be a social welfare organisation. The School of Social Work is concerned with the Society as a social welfare organisation, which includes the provision of a social work service in the Royal Hospital for Women.
5. The Society's work, being primarily in the Eastern Suburbs, is conveniently located for the School and its students.
6. The School shares the Society's interest in Australian social welfare

²⁵ Attachment to letter, Rupert H. Myers to C. A. Hardwick, 21/10/70.

history, and could assist in the development of Australian social welfare archives.

7. The School has already used considerable staff time to prepare the way for student field instruction in different parts of the Society's work. It would be wasteful not to build upon this.

PROPOSAL

In view of the above, the University proposes that the future association of its School of Social Work with the Benevolent Society should take the following forms.

1. The Society should continue to provide field work for a small number of social work students under individual instruction by selected social work staff members, both in the Hospital and in other sections of the Society's work. This would be arranged, as in the past, by the University in collaboration with the Society's Director of Social Work Services, Mrs. Perrott. Hopefully, too, the Society would cooperate in arranging for ad hoc observation and study by students of different aspects of its work, which the School might arrange from time to time.

In cooperating under this first proposal, the Society would be doing what is already done by a large number of other social agencies in the Sydney area. The School believes, however, that the Society could reasonably become one of a much smaller group of selected agencies in which Student Units of the School are located.

2. The University's second major proposal, therefore, is that the Society consider the principles the School had laid down for establishing Student Units, together with the suggested advantages to itself which could come from such arrangements. The University suggests that in the not-too-distant future, two such Student Units might be established in connection with the Society's work - one in the Royal Hospital for Women, the other in connection with the Society, if and when the Society wishes to establish either one or both of these possible Student Units along the lines indicated above.²⁶ (These were set down in my general statement on the school's field education which was sent as an attachment to the eventual letter sent to the Society by the vice-chancellor.)

On 30 November, Mr Hardwick informed the vice-chancellor that his letter had been presented to a Board meeting and that representing the views of the Society on the proposed joint committee would be 'Mr E. L. Callaway, Honorary Treasurer, Mrs E. Cox, Subscribers' Representative, Dr J. Greenwell, General Medical Superintendent, and myself'. 'I have read the general statement on the School of Social Work's field education and believe with cooperation that the aspects of teaching stated by Professor Lawrence could be merged with our people care activity in the Society'.²⁷

All was not well, however, within the Society's still small Community and Social Welfare Department. It was evident that despite the efforts of its director

²⁶ Draft letter, 30/9/70.

²⁷ Letter, C. A. Hardwick to Rupert Myers, 30/11/70.

Joan Perrott, and our earlier efforts to help develop it as a possible setting for a student unit/s, the Society could not be seen as having 'a reasonably well established professional social work service'. Before leaving to work in another agency, from mid-January 1971, Joan discussed with me her frustrations and her professional assessment of the situation.²⁸ Included were these observations. Reg Della Bosca (secretary and executive officer) influenced by Eric Callaway, seemed no longer interested in social work, saw social workers as 'paid Christians', went with the wind, was a know-all, was obsessed with himself. Eric Callaway (treasurer and chairman of the community and social welfare committee) was retired and spent most days in the society's headquarters. He was the only active board member, was highly influential, and was primarily concerned with money. In fact, he ran the place. Mrs Cox (member of the Board, and the community and social welfare and Scarba House for Children committees), was very vocal ('whatever the professional says is wrong'). Social work had no influencing voice on the Board, or on any of the policy-making structures of the society. And so on. During 1970, Joan Perrott had been asked to develop a general draft policy and regulations for her department for submission to the community and social welfare committee and the Board, but according to the society's annual report for the year, 'a new beginning will have to be made with incoming staff in attempting to determine the rationale of the Society's activity in the area of community and social welfare during 1971'.²⁹ Joan had told me on 9 December, that you cannot interpret to closed minds. Until the thinking and attitudes of the people with power in the organisation were brought up-to-date, recommendations of skilled people would continue to be disregarded. It will be noticed that both Eric Callaway and Mrs Cox were the society's nominees on the joint committee proposed to discuss an agreement with the School of Social Work and the Society!

Given this recent history, not surprisingly the Benevolent Society was having trouble to recruit a new social work director of its community and social welfare department, and I was happy to let the possibility of a formal agreement with the Society to lapse indefinitely. The organisation had demonstrated that despite its claims to be modernising its social welfare work, it was unable or unwilling to accept inevitable changes and expense which would follow from giving substance to the claims. I have no record of the joint committee on an agreement actually meeting during the earlier part of 1971. I fully discussed the situation with Rex Vowels and he agreed that in the all the circumstances, it was wise not to waste any more time on it.

²⁸ In my archives are brief notes of our discussions.

²⁹ Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *Annual Report 1970*, p. 36.

7.5 Redfern Aboriginal Legal Service

Hal Wootten

In September 1969, UNSW appointed Hal Wootten as the foundation professor and dean of the Faculty of Law, and the Law School began operating in 1971. Hal, in fact, was at UNSW for only about four years, before moving on in an outstanding career of professional and community service – judge of the Supreme Court of NSW (1973–83), president ANZAAS (1974–75), chairman NSW Law Reform Commission (1976–80), chairman Australian Press Council (1984–86), president Australian Conservation Foundation (1984–88), royal commissioner for Aboriginal deaths in custody (1988–91). His relatively brief time at UNSW left a continuing legacy – in an unusually socially aware law school at UNSW, and in establishing Australia's first Aboriginal Legal Service (ALS) in Redfern, which became a model for a state, then nation-wide development, and also for other types of Aboriginal services. I served on the Council of the ALS from its inception in October 1970 until April 1974.

In his 2008 lecture, 'Living in the Law', Hal Wootten gave a graphic account of the professional and other life experiences which had shaped his abiding values and vision for the new law school.

The vision saw lawyers as a socially important and honourable profession, the purpose of which was not to maximise the income of lawyers or the GNP but to serve society and those who lived in it in an enlightened, honourable and socially responsible way.

Students were seen as minds and personalities to be developed into lawyers who could accept the responsibilities of a profession critical to the functioning of an economically complex liberal democratic society. They were not receptacles into which the law should be poured, which was the old view.¹

Hal described his involvement in the establishment and running of the ALS as 'one of the most rewarding experiences of my life, my entrée to the Aboriginal community with all its warmth, humour, wisdom and generosity of spirit that were to mean so much to me, and to engage much of my subsequent life'.²

After this autobiographical lecture, I wrote to the dean of the Faculty of Law, David Dixon:

The Hal Wootten Lecture 2008 was a truly memorable occasion. Hal's career is worthy of a full-scale biography. His own sharp autobiographical reflections would, of course, be of great assistance to a biographer. The sociological literature on professional occupations can only be enriched by biographies of people committed to their professions. 'Profession' as an organising concept for society, social groups and individuals, remains a matter of high empirical and normative significance,

1 Hal Wootten, 'Living in the Law', The Hal Wootten Lecture 2008, UNSW Faculty of Law, p. 21. This splendid lecture is available on the web.

2 The Hal Wootten Lecture 2008, p. 20.

despite intellectual and political cross-currents undermining it. Martin Krygier³ rightly observed Hal's exceptional integrity. The underlying ethical values of his profession fitted well with his conception of 'self'.

I have told my son Peter, a senior lecturer in international law at the University of Tasmania, about the lecture, describing it as inspirational for people pursuing law as a career. Is the lecture to be published? Peter is a UNSW law graduate in law and history, and is keen to see it.

I originally came to know Hal, Garth Nettheim, Richard Chisholm, and others in the Law School, as a member of the Council of the first Aboriginal Legal Service. Their genuine social concerns and their focus on effective professional education, made it a very different school, and I appreciate my association with them.

With best wishes and thanks for the invitation to the Lecture.⁴

The Story of the ALS

An enlightening and impressive account of the origins of the ALS is provided in a discussion between Hal Wootten and Professor Gordon Briscoe, now an Aboriginal historian who was appointed the first field officer for the ALS. It is part of a project to celebrate 40 years of this pioneering Aboriginal legal service. The project, available on the internet, produced a short written history and videos of 40 people who had been associated with the ALS.

The service originated from the response of a group of young Aboriginal people to police activities in the Redfern area at the close of the 1960s. Aboriginal people were being arbitrarily detained and arrested by the police after forcing them from the Empress and other hotels enforcing a 9.30pm curfew. 'There were many complaints of assaults in the cells. ... Many people appeared before a magistrate, unrepresented and simply pleaded guilty'. The young Aboriginal activists sought to stop the repressive police action, by passing on to the press and government agencies, photographs and records of incidents. They also spoke to students at university campuses and to trade union groups. Some Sydney university law students approached Hal Wootten, because he had talked in the press about establishing a socially aware law school. Hal had been heavily involved in New Guinea with indigenous people, and 'for a very long time' had been feeling uncomfortable about not having any contact with indigenous people in Australia. He 'jumped at the opportunity' to get involved with the young Aboriginals in Redfern. His meeting with them was an 'eye-opener' about the situation in Redfern. He 'clicked' especially with Paul Coe and Gary Williams, and these two and Hal worked closely together on what needed to be done. The idea of a permanent source of legal advice and representation emerged. Hal wrote to all the barristers and solicitors in the Sydney area and many wished to be part of it, offering their professional services free.

3 Martin Krygier, a professor of law at UNSW, formally thanked Hal Wootten at the conclusion of the lecture.

4 I had met David Dixon and was very interested to learn that his first degree was in social administration with Ronald Drinkwater at the University of Hull in the UK.

A Respectable Governing Body

An Aboriginal community-controlled organisation was desired, with 'white fellers' there to help. As yet there were no Aboriginal lawyers, but both Paul Coe and Gary Williams were in the first batch of law students at UNSW. Hal was keen to make it a respectable organisation with a governing council that could not be rubbished by the commissioner of police or other government officials. To this end, a particularly interesting foundation council was recruited. Four were barristers who became judges, with one of them, Gordon Samuels, becoming the chancellor of UNSW and later the NSW governor. Garth Nettheim, a senior lecturer at the University of Sydney, became a professor of law at UNSW in 1971, and later twice dean of the Faculty. His interest in racial issues started in the 1960s with a focus on apartheid in South Africa. His involvement in the ALS marked the start of his central concern with aboriginal rights in Australia and the role of UN instruments to help to achieve these. Other members from the nascent UNSW law school serving on the council were Eddie Newmann as secretary, and Richard Chisholm as treasurer. John Cawte, a professor of psychiatry who had taken a special interest in Aboriginal welfare, and myself, who headed the School of Social Work, were both seen as professorial colleagues of Hal's at UNSW who were interested and had something to contribute. Hal took responsibility for recruiting these various the non-Aboriginal members of the council, and also Faith Bandler who considered a specialised legal aid agency was needed. She was currently president of the Federal Council for the Advancement of Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islanders (FCAATSI). As general secretary of this organisation she had led the campaign which resulted in the 1967 successful constitutional referendum which removed discriminatory provisions from the Australian constitution.

At least a third of the starting ALS governing body had to be Aboriginal, and it was important that they should be for representative of the whole Aboriginal community, not just the young radical group. A rift existed between the young radicals and an older group connected with the 'assimilationist' Foundation for Aboriginal Affairs. This organisation had been set up in 1965 in George Street, with Charles Perkins the first manager, using money from the wider community. The young radicals Gary Williams, Paul Coe, and Gary Foley (described by Gordon Briscoe in his reminiscences as 'self-confident, angry, and expressive') were foundation members of the ALS Council. Gary Williams was its first vice-president, and Paul Coe was to take over the ALS presidency from Hal Wootten in 1973. The most radical of the three, Gary Foley, subsequently became chairman of the management committee taking over from Ross McKenna, but left after an altercation in the Council over his handling of funds. Gordon Briscoe was a foundation member, who had known Charles Perkins in Adelaide, had been in England playing football, like Charles, and had interrupted his studies at the ANU to come to Sydney to help the Aboriginal cause. An obvious selection to be the ALS field officer when federal funds became available, he departed to stand for parliament in the Northern Territory. Tom Williams and Trudy Longbottom came from the La Perouse Aboriginal community. Tom Williams, then manager of the

Foundation for Aboriginal Affairs, had had some experience with Aborigines in trouble with the law.

The foundation members of the ALS council first met in October, 1970. I notice that Shirley Smith (Mum Shirl) is not listed as a foundation member. She must have agreed to join us soon after. Getting her blessing and involvement was crucial, on both the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal the side. Her influence in Redfern was unique. In the words of Hal Wootten, she was 'such an anchor in Redfern'. Chika Dixon, an older person with extensive experience in the trade union movement, was another who joined us soon after that first meeting, and who served as a bridge between the two Aboriginal groups. Other subsequent council members were Sol Bellear who became the first Aboriginal judge, and Paul Landa, who became the attorney-general in the NSW government. Altogether the ALS governing group were 'pretty impressive people', as Hal later described them in his reminiscences.

The service started, manned entirely by volunteers and financed by voluntary donations. With telephone help from South Sydney Community Aid in Regents Street, Redfern, legal representation for Aborigines in legal difficulties was arranged by calling a panel of participating lawyers prepared to appear without charge. A management committee of Aborigines and non-Aborigines conducted the day-to-day operations. Being completely voluntary, it was in fact a complicated, rather cumbersome arrangement, but Hal has said that it had never occurred to them to ask for government money. Then came the break-through. Bill Wentworth, the minister for Aboriginal affairs, phoned Hal Wootten. He knew Hal, had just read about the new legal service, and said he thought he could help.

In October 1970, Gary Williams and Paul Coe had taken Hal Wootten in his landcruiser to an Aboriginal reserve to introduce him to their people living in the bush. A letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* from Hal resulted in immediate emergency relief by the state government to the people living in intolerable conditions beside a swollen river. Reporters got interested in why a QC should be spending his time on an Aboriginal reserve, and this had given publicity for the legal service.

After talking with Paul, Gary and Ross McKenna (chairman of the management committee) Hal drafted for council, a submission by the ALS to the Commonwealth government. It was in three parts – a description of the general community problem of Aborigines' difficulties with the law and law enforcement agencies; a consideration of broad strategy to deal with the problem; and the specific role of the ALS and the amount of Commonwealth government financial support necessary to undertake the role. The general problem was described in these terms:

In recent years, heavy concentrations of Aborigines in certain areas of Sydney – in inner City and La Perouse – have highlighted Aborigines' problems with the law and law enforcement agencies.

Aborigines are particularly likely to have problems because:

1. They tend to belong to the most disadvantaged sections of the community, and these are the areas most likely to be in trouble with the law.

2. Alcohol serves a social and leisure purpose for many Aborigines thrust in upon themselves by the discrimination and social pressures of the wider society. Alcohol and legal offences are often connected.
3. Drinking in groups at a limited number of hotels increases the likelihood of Aborigines committing offences. It also exposes them to closer police scrutiny, as does their distinctive appearance.
4. Many Aboriginal adolescents and young men commit offences involving cars, because they have reduced chances of owning their own car, of obtaining a licence, and also of meeting the various legal requirements of car ownership.
5. Feelings of victimization by the police are widespread amongst the Aborigines.
6. The formal atmosphere of courts and other law enforcement machinery intimidates Aborigines with poor education.
7. Aborigines often do not know their legal rights, and because law enforcement authorities are wholly non-Aboriginal they are likely in any case not to insist upon their rights.
8. Aborigines' financial resources are a serious handicap to their finding bail. Among other things, this can seriously prejudice the preparation of a defence.
9. Paying for adequate legal representation is usually impossible.
10. Existing legal aid does not provide a sufficient cover for aborigines involved in legal problems. (The inadequacies of each of the existing legal aid services are briefly described.)

For these various social, psychological, economic, legal and organizational reasons, it is clear that Aboriginal citizens have a considerable need for legal assistance. No-one knows how large is the problem, partly because relevant data are not at present kept by law enforcement and corrective authorities. Those close to the problem, however, are convinced that it is large, and it extends far beyond the confines of the Sydney metropolitan area.

Under 'broad strategy to deal with the problem, seven strategies were listed:

- finding out more about the size and scope of the problem
- helping Aborigines to be aware of their legal rights
- ensuring that these rights are fully recognized by the law enforcement and corrective agencies
- making legal aid available whenever and wherever it is needed by Aborigines
- ensuring that full use is made of all existing legal aid services
- enlisting widespread honorary participation of the legal profession
- making relevant agencies and general public aware of issues concerning the legal problems of Aborigines.

It is sensible for a new organization to be established which would concern itself specifically with the above functions.

It may be asked why ... confine its work to Aborigines alone. Many of the problems ... apply to other ethnic groups and indeed to large numbers of other Australians. ... the problem is especially acute for Aborigines ... they are in fact the

most disadvantaged... why should not (an existing Aboriginal welfare organization) assume these functions? Only an organization specifically designed for the purpose could hope to gain the active cooperation of the legal profession and the Aboriginal community. Moreover, the range of suggested functions is sufficient to warrant a separate organization.

While, initially, such an organization may confine its activities to the Sydney metropolitan area, it could quickly build on this experience and its geographical cover could be extended.

The submission then briefly described the formation of the ALS, its composition including a listing of the foundation members of its governing council, and its activities. Finally financial aid was requested from the federal government:

... while retaining and even enlarging the role of voluntary participation and support, its work would be very much more effective if it had its own premises, and could employ a full-time Aboriginal field worker, a full-time solicitor and a stenographer/secretary. ...

The required attributes and duties of the field officer and the solicitor were listed. The field officer must be Aboriginal, and was a key person in the operation of the scheme, forming a link between the Aboriginal community and the (at the moment) non-Aboriginal side of the Service. The solicitor would be personally committed to the Aboriginal cause, capable of working well with the field officer, other Aboriginals and members of the panel, and have the capacity to undertake research connected with his work.

The submission concluded with this exhortatory paragraph:

*We are sure that the Commonwealth Government will agree that the ALS is engaged in a most important new community venture. We have enlisted widespread interest and support, especially amongst the Aborigines themselves, but the most crucial support now necessary is of the tangible financial kind. We know that the national government is strongly committed to furthering the well-being of our Aboriginal citizens and look forward to a favourable response to our submission.*⁵

Early in 1971, a government grant of \$24,500 enabled the ALS to become firmly established with the appointment of three staff. A shop-front free legal aid service was opened in Redfern, after we all joined in cleaning up and painting the place. Gordon Briscoe remembers the enthusiasm and new sense of pride amongst the Aboriginal people. It was a genuinely Aboriginal-controlled organisation growing up from the ground, not imposed from above. It 'created a model for a new wave of Aboriginal community-controlled organisations in health, housing, child-care and other legal organisations around the country'.⁶

Funding from the Whitlam government stimulated the extension of Aboriginal legal aid. By 1974 the ALS had regional offices throughout New South Wales, and there was an Aboriginal legal service in every Australian

5 'Submission to the Commonwealth Government by the Aboriginal Legal Service' – in my personal archives.

6 'A Short History of the ALS', p. 5.

state and territory. In a letter in early December 1973, ALS secretary Eddie Neumann informed me the day of our next council meeting would need to be changed because it clashed with the conference of Australian legal services being held in Canberra. At the last two meetings which I had been unable to attend, the size of the service had been rapidly increased by the appointment of various field officers in country areas and the appointment of a bookkeeper at last.

There were stormy scenes at the last meeting ... there has been some criticism of jobs for the boys. As you can see, there is now a real need for looking closely at the organisational aspect of the service. In addition, we should now implement our decision concerning social work training of the staff.⁷

I generally tried to attend the monthly meetings of the ALS while I was on its council, but was fully aware of the need for the governing body to become fully indigenous as soon as possible. The increase in its financial resources and scope were, however, putting it under considerable pressure. It needed to learn how to be accountable for its use of government money, and to become more effective and efficient in its organisation. Deliberately when Hal Wootten was president, meetings of council were unstructured. There was no formal agenda, meetings did not start on time and often meandered to a close after midnight. People seemed to come and go as they pleased. I remember one meeting towards the end of my time on the council, when David Barr and I were the only non-Aboriginals present. We had both been founding members of the council. David said to me 'What are we doing still here?' I argued that we should stick around a bit longer – particularly David, for he was providing essential assistance ensuring the ALS had an adequate legal office. One of the young Aboriginals had drifted in inebriated and started abusing us 'whiteys'. We, of course, stayed silent, but not Mum Shirl. After a while, she could stand it no longer, and said 'Will you shut up, Billie, or I'll box your ears. These men are here to help us.' In mid-1974,⁸ the ALS voted into office its first fully Aboriginal council.

In April 1974, I wrote my letter of resignation to Paul Coe, who had taken over as ALS president from Hal Wootten:

The time has come when I must tender my resignation for membership of the Council of the Aboriginal Legal Service. I will be going to England on sabbatical leave in a couple of months' time and will find it increasingly difficult to attend the next Council meetings. Since I believe Council members should be active in their membership, I think I should resign now rather than wait until I leave the country.

I have considered it a privilege to have been associated with yourself and others in helping in the development of the Aboriginal Legal Service since its inception, and regret that I cannot continue to be formally linked with the Service. If I can be of any informal help to you on social welfare or social work matters, please don't hesitate to ask.

⁷ Letter, Eduard Neumann to John Lawrence, 3/12/73.

⁸ 'A Short History of the ALS', p. 6, claims this was achieved in 1973, but this was not the case.

With warmest best wishes for the future of the Service.⁹

I was not surprised when the ALS did not subsequently take up my offer of further help. Aboriginal recognition and self-determination was beginning to gather momentum in a society which was becoming increasingly conscious of how badly its indigenous population had fared since the British settlement/invasion in 1788. Since the early 1970s, in many respects their situation has greatly improved – through action taken by Aboriginal communities themselves and by successive federal and state governments. Anti-discrimination and land rights legislation by the federal government were important milestones. Paul Keating's 1996 Redfern speech and Kevin Rudd's 2008 apology in the national parliament were highly significant prime ministerial acknowledgements of injustices done to the indigenous people. And yet, they continue to have lower life expectancy, and worse health, educational and employment outcomes, than the rest of the Australian population. There are, of course, no simple 'fixes' for any modern society in relation to its indigenous population even when goodwill abounds on all sides. Apart from a small minority still living a traditional life in isolation from the rest of society, all other members are embedded in more general social structures and their problems, as well in cultural conflicts between their indigenous cultural inheritance and the dominant culture. I regret that for a variety of reasons, social work did not play a more important role in Aboriginal affairs. This was at least partly because schools of social work, including UNSW, were slow to recruit and professionally educate indigenous students who wished to work with aboriginal communities.

Thanks to anthropological research, various Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal television programs, Aboriginal drama, and a growing international appreciation of Aboriginal art, the sophistication and complexity of traditional Aboriginal culture is beginning to be appreciated in the rest of contemporary Australian society. That culture is the product of more than 60,000 years of living in an island continent – in fact, the oldest surviving culture in the world. At the time of the so-called 'terra nullius' declared by Britain to justify its occupation of the land, there were about 500 Aboriginal tribes or 'nations'. Each tribe consisted of a group sharing the same language, customs and general laws. They were not led by a chief. The complexity of their kinship system, and religious and totemic structuring based on animals, plants, or places indicated a highly-developed culture, but one vastly different from the invading European culture.

9 Letter, John Lawrence to Paul Coe, 2/4/74.

7.6 Australian Council of Social Service

I have already indicated various involvements with ACOSS in the 1960s – discussing ACOSS concerns with an ICSW official in New York in 1967,¹ delivering plenary session papers to its national conferences in 1966 and 1968, editing the 1966 conference proceedings. I continued to act as abstracts editor of the *Australian Journal of Social Issue*, after ACOSS became jointly responsible for the journal in 1967, handing on this responsibility to Dorothy Sorrell at the University of Sydney in October 1968. Commenting on an ACOSS document on ‘Communications and Combined Action to Government’ (May 1968), I indicated interest in supervising a study by an honours student on ACOSS approaches to government.² The following sections trace my main involvements with ACOSS from 1969 to 1977. Other parallel community involvements will follow.

7.6.1 ACOSS ‘Transformed’

In the later stages of the twenty-three years of government by the conservative coalition, a greater interest and activity in social welfare matters was emerging akin to the activity in the war and early post-war years. Kewley traced features of this in a second edition of his book (Kewley, *Social Security in Australia 1900–72*, Sydney University Press, 1973, pp. 377–565). ACOSS was described by Kewley as ‘transformed’, partly because of a regular subsidy from the Commonwealth Government since 1966. He referred to its pamphlets and monographs on social issues, the proceedings of its biennial conferences, reports of its various committees including an annual one to the Government on the forthcoming Budget, and to its two journals the *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, and *Australian Social Welfare*.³ (Kewley, 1973, p. 388.)

Joan Brown – an Outstanding Executive Officer/Secretary-General

Joan Brown succeeded Hope Clayton as ACOSS executive officer in July 1970. When she left as secretary-general in September 1974, moving to a position with the Canadian Council for Social Development, she had made a remarkable contribution to the quantity and quality of the work of ACOSS at a critical time in its development. ACOSS president David Scott recognised her contribution with these words:

She has made an outstanding contribution to the many significant changes that have taken place within ACOSS and in national social welfare policies and programmes.

This Annual Report, and those of recent years, record much of Joan’s work. We

1 See Vol. 2, pp. 333–4.

2 This eventuated in Michael Davies, ‘Historical Analysis of A.C.O.S.S.’, his thesis for a BSW(hons.), UNSW, 1969/70. Hope Clayton was in general agreement with the main lines of argument, but found it rather depressing reading.

3 This replaced a Newsletter, in 1971, and was intended to provide ‘communication within the social welfare sector and for all those interested in the development of social welfare in Australia’. (*Australian Social Welfare*, Vol.1, No. 1, March 1971).

will miss her enthusiasm and sense of humour as well as her knowledge of social issues and her ability to bring together people who are able to develop ideas and evaluate policies through ACOSS Committees.

Thanks largely to Joan Brown, the ACOSS she leaves has clear objectives, a carefully planned structure and an enthusiastic and well-qualified staff.⁴

A tribute from Beth Ward wrote in similar terms:

The values and goals Joan set for herself and ACOSS and the method of achieving these were moulded by her unswerving principles which place human rights and in particular the rights of the least powerful as paramount. ... It is a therefore very different ACOSS which Joan leaves in 1974 to the one to which she came in 1970. ... the stature and effectiveness of ACOSS has been raised, its direction is clear and its principles well defined. ... Wherever Joan goes she will contribute her enthusiasm, creativeness, and her capacity for clear thinking and prodigious output. ... those who have worked with her on committees wish her a happy and satisfying future, as productive as the past four years.

Joan Brown was an honours graduate from the University of London. After social work training and twelve years in child care and family welfare in England, 1950–62, she moved to the Tasmanian Department of Social Welfare where she became a state child welfare supervisor and completed part-time her master of arts degree with a study of the development of social services in Tasmania 1803–1900.⁵ Her experience included being president of the Tasmanian branch of the AASW, and a member of the executive of the Tasmanian Council of Social Service. Although she had not yet operated at a national level, I thought Joan's was a promising appointment to the ACOSS executive officer position. This became quickly evident in our highly pressured work in the pre-conference working party for the 15th ICSW conference in Manila in August–September 1970. She was an excellent rapporteur for one of the three groups into which the working party divided.⁶

A testimony to Joan Brown's 'energy and organisational ability and unfailing knowledge of all facets of the problem', was made by Professor Noel Drane, chairman of the ACOSS poverty inquiry committee, in the introduction to the extensive evidence submitted to the Henderson poverty inquiry. I was a member of the committee and Joan and I represented ACOSS at public hearings of the inquiry for the committee. She and I worked closely together on a number of ventures during her time at ACOSS and her work was consistently exemplary.

Joan McClintock, with a social work qualification from the University of Sydney, was appointed deputy secretary-general and worked extremely well with Joan Brown. The 'two Joans' were an impressive team.

4 David Scott, 'A Time to Reflect', *ACOSS Annual Report 1973–74*, p. 7.

5 J.C. Brown, '*Poverty is not a Crime*': *The Development of Social Services in Tasmania*, Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 1972. As mentioned I was one of her examiners.

6 See Vol. 5, pp. 18, 27.

7.6.2 Submission for Federal Funding

SUBMISSION TO THE COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT FOR A TRIENNIAL GRANT 1969-72

In the triennium July 1966 to June 1969, the Commonwealth government provided a \$5,000 annual subsidy for ACOSS's international work and a \$10,000 matching grant for local administrative and functional services. In November 1968, ACOSS treasurer Walter Lippmann discussed with me and Spencer Colliver, a suggested outline he had prepared together with Judith Green and Alan King, for the ACOSS submission for the next triennium 1969-72. We all recognised the importance of increased government funding for ACOSS and the need to put a persuasive case. Walter asked if I would draft the submission and sent me relevant material. Although snowed under with other responsibilities, I kept in close contact with Hope Clayton and managed to get the draft to Walter by mid-February 1969. He wrote:

This is certainly extremely helpful and, as far as I am concerned, I am very happy with it. I hope that it will pass the scrutiny of the Executive meeting, and look forward to being in touch with you in finalising it in due course. Very many thanks for helping us in this work in spite of the heavy commitments which you have had. I am very grateful for your help.⁷

On 11 March, Hope Clayton wrote:

At its meeting last month my Executive Committee expressed its great appreciation of the thought and the time you had put into the preparation of the Draft Submission ...

As you know there has been very general agreement with the case you have outlined, and the dimensions of the grant you have envisaged.

Your expression of belief in the Council's role, and your generous help in this matter is a great encouragement to all associated with the Council, and we know you will be most interested in the outcome of this request.⁸

The committee responsible for the final submission basically adopted my detailed draft, making a few editorial changes and providing some additions which I thought were reasonable. I thought we had made a persuasive case to the Commonwealth government for a considerable, but still modest, increase in its funding support of ACOSS.

THE SUBMISSION⁹

AUSTRALIA'S NEED FOR A STRENGTHENED ACOSS

This submission is made in the belief that the welfare of Australian society urgently

7 Letter, Walter Lippmann to John Lawrence, 18/2/69.

8 Letter, Hope Clayton to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 11/3/69.

9 Australian Council of Social Service, 'Submission to the Commonwealth Government for Financial Support for the Three Year Period - July, 1969 to June, 1972', April, 1969. (The Submission was signed by R. R. Gordon, Chairman.)

requires a firmly established Australian Council of Social Service which will help to tackle the current and anticipated social welfare challenges of our rapidly changing national society. If this is to occur, ACOSS must be underpinned by a professionally qualified Secretariat which comprehends and can develop the organisation's potential role and which is located in the national capital

Thanks in considerable measure to Commonwealth funds in the past three years, it is obvious from our attached Annual Reports (Appendix 1) that ACOSS has been strengthened, but, paradoxically, we are even more acutely aware of the great disparity between the resources directly available to ACOSS and the size of the job to be done.

We believe therefore that the outcome of this submission to the Commonwealth Government will affect the quality of life of the Australian people, not just in the next three years, but for many years to come.

The idea of a community-based general national social welfare coordinating body has received active attention in this country since at least 1946, when the establishment of such a body was suggested by the Commonwealth Director-General of Social Services.

ACOSS is now in its 13th year, and clearly will survive as an organisation doing a number of useful, if limited, tasks. But there is a danger that it will remain chronically fixed at a level of expectation, operation and achievement that will be quite unsatisfactory from a future national viewpoint.

Breadth Of Concern, And The Need To Extend ACOSS Influence

Unless an effective ACOSS exists, together with equally effective State councils of social service, the lively interest in social welfare that is increasingly apparent in Australian communities will find expression only in limited sectional or local frameworks. These frameworks have their own legitimacy, and are an essential part of any effective national machinery, but they in turn need to be placed within a broadly-based national and international framework which concentrates not just upon the needs of one population group, like the aged, or the physically handicapped, or upon a particular kind of social need like income or health.

ACOSS has not had sufficient personnel resources to interpret or make obvious the advantage of membership in its structure to many sectional social welfare bodies like the Australian Council on the Aging, or to work out cooperative arrangements with such bodies even if membership is not yet entered into. But, the increasing acceptance that the provision of services by special groups which have the effect of separating them off from the main stream of community life may be detrimental both to these groups and to the community itself, does require machinery that will encourage the close relationship of all social welfare fields.

The Council's main comprehensive membership achievement to this point (see Appendix 11) has been the membership of the six State councils of social service and the councils of social service of the two Territories. The additional 25 national organisations currently in membership in ACOSS represent no mean achievement for a body which has lacked until very recently even one full-time executive officer, but they fall far short of the potential that adequate resources would give.

With additional qualified staff, ACOSS could extend its membership and therefore its influence, and also establish within its own structure new national coverage, for instance dealing with family and child welfare, where such organisation does not at present exist.

As pointed out in our previous submission to the Commonwealth Government, ACOSS has accepted a wide definition of 'social welfare' which includes

- all the socially beneficial organisations and policies whose aim is the maintenance or improvement of general social and living standards with regard to income, employment, education, health, housing and recreation, or which are primarily concerned with the social and living standards of particular vulnerable groups in the community.

It is this comprehensiveness of view that provides a body like ACOSS with its legitimacy, and which can capture the imagination and insight of more thoughtful politicians, officials and citizens. But it is this scope which makes its work the more demanding in terms of knowledge, skill and resources.

By its establishment of a Standing Cabinet Committee to include Ministers responsible for Health, Social Services, Aboriginal Affairs, Housing, and Repatriation, the Commonwealth Government has given some recognition of the need for coordinated approaches in social welfare matters. A strengthened ACOSS would prove of inestimable value both in helping the Commonwealth Government in strengthening community liaison on social welfare matters generally, and in providing the Government with an effective channel of communication to voluntary social welfare bodies. This is because, through its structure, ACOSS can gain access to information and opinions from the voluntary sector in social welfare, and, through its own work and that of its member bodies, it is in touch with all levels of government.

(a) Government Departments

In countries like the United Kingdom and Canada, to which Australian eyes often turn, government departments are directly represented on each country's general community-based social welfare coordinating body. The 49th Annual Report of the National Council of Social Service in Britain shows the following government departments with representation on the Council: Charity Commissioners, Department of Education and Science, Home Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Housing and Local Government, the Department of Employment and Productivity, the Ministry of Social Security, and the National Savings Committee. The 48th Annual Report, 1968, of the Canadian Welfare Council, shows that amongst its members there are 97 government departments (7 federal, 27 provincial and 63 municipal).

As yet, despite the continued availability of membership of ACOSS to government as well as voluntary national social welfare organisations, not a single Commonwealth Government agency has become a member, although recently observers from the Department of Social Services and from the Immigration Department have been attending Council meetings. But the Council's work has significance in areas of responsibility of a number of Commonwealth Ministries:— Social Services, Health, Immigration, Interior, Housing, External Territories, Labour and National Service,

External Affairs, Attorney-General, as well as Ministries of the Armed Services. The cautious view that legal and political complications make such participation in a body like ACOSS impossible is hardly tenable in the light of experience at the State level in Australia, where some government authorities have been, for many years, members of the State councils of social service, to the benefit of all.

While admitting that Government decisions cannot be bound by policy discussions at ACOSS level, to view ACOSS as a voluntary body representing voluntary bodies vis-à-vis Government is to misperceive the intention of national general coordinating social welfare bodies. Their very strength lies in their being focused upon the social welfare needs of the general population and the extent to which both government and voluntary bodies are meeting these needs.

ACOSS can only operate through cooperation, discussion and persuasion. It cannot breach the autonomy of its member organisations. Its influence can only be the influence of ideas and information, not of legal coercion. In a free society it provides a broad arena for the government and voluntary sectors of social welfare to intermingle and to get better informed about each other's programs, and their relevance to community needs.

(b) Other Community Bodies

There is a noticeable movement abroad to expand the membership-base of council of social service (or community welfare councils, as they tend to be called in North America) to include not just social welfare organisations but a wide variety of community representation and opinion. This is to give greater legitimacy and relevance to current social policies and programs and not see them through agency eyes alone. Only a strengthened and skilful Secretariat could achieve a broader community base for ACOSS in these directions, which could include representation from trade unions, the business world, 'service' organisations, professional groups, political groups, the universities, and also individuals who identify with the aims of ACOSS.

A COMPARISON OF RESOURCES

At the end of May 1968, the Canadian Welfare Council had, including part-time and temporary personnel, 71 professional, technical and clerical staff. The average number of persons employed by the British National Council of Social Service in 1967-68 was 263, and the aggregate remuneration paid to them over the year was £226,560. In contrast, \$5,872 was spent by ACOSS on salaries and wages in 1967-68. Even taking into full account population differences and other factors, the contrast between the personnel resources available to ACOSS and to the national general social welfare coordinating bodies in these other two countries is striking.

THE NATIONAL CHALLENGE

In these next three years, ACOSS needs to be lifted onto a new level of expectation, operation and achievement. The national challenge is an immediate one because, unless the social welfare field can be placed in a position to contribute appropriately to economic planning there is a danger that those responsible for economic development will lose sight of the fact that it is towards social goals that all economic and social development strives. The longer that adequate machinery is lacking to ensure the accurate assessment of social factors, the wider the gap between the community's social goals and their achievement is likely to be, and this will be so no

matter how great economic development may be.

It is in the area of a national assessment of these factors through the development of an effective framework of Federal and State councils of social service and of broadly-based local community groups, and with the strengthening influence which nationally organised bodies and individuals with special knowledge can provide, that it is important for ACOSS to make real headway within the next three years.

As will be apparent from this submission, Commonwealth Government initiative and leadership could achieve this. We have been led to believe that the present Government is interested in fostering national perspectives, and this is precisely what the idea of ACOSS is designed to do in the social welfare field. Given adequate resources the Council has good hope of success because, already through its membership it has extensive reticulation both horizontal and vertical, throughout Australian society. It is to spread the network of cooperative affiliation and to make much more use of this network for national social welfare purposes that ACOSS requires greatly increased resources.

THE INTERNATIONAL CHALLENGE

A strengthening of ACOSS's national activities will make it better equipped to play its proper role on behalf of Australia in international social welfare activities.

One of the main reasons for the origin of ACOSS was so that it could form a National Committee of the International Conference on Social Work. This would enable Australia to be formally represented at a Conference which had first been held in 1929. In 1956, Australia became the 28th nation to affiliate, barely ahead of its neighbours Indonesia and Thailand. At the 13th Conference, in Washington in 1966, when there were now 47 affiliated National Committees, the Conference was renamed the International Council on Social Welfare, to reflect its expanded scope. Under the new Constitution its purposes are:

- (a) to provide a world-wide forum for the discussion of social welfare and related issues;
- (b) to foster the development of social welfare through the world;
- (c) to promote the exchange of information and experience among social workers, social agencies and others interested in social welfare throughout the world;
- (d) to facilitate and promote cooperation among international organisations related to the field of social welfare.

Australia is in the Asia and Pacific Region of the International body and there is considerable interest in the development of Regional programs in accordance with ICSW aims. At the 14th International Conference on Social Welfare in Helsinki in 1968, the leader of the Australian Delegation, Major-General R. R. Gordon, particularly noted the extent to which countries of the Region look to Australia for leadership in the area of social welfare. In response to this, ACOSS is at present attempting to sponsor a seminar for the 14 ICSW National Committees in the Region. Further, in conjunction with the Department of External Affairs, it is, in August 1969, providing a training course on services to children for social welfare personnel coming from countries under the Colombo Plan, Special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan and Australian South Pacific Technical Assistance Program. The international activities of ACOSS certainly need expanding if we are to do more

than make a gesture towards the new broad objectives of the ICSW.

Apart from arguments of moral obligation to do all we can about the increasing gap in living standards between the different peoples of the world, international participation is likely to improve Australia's own social development and social welfare programs. The United Nations 'Development Decade' of the 1960s has emphasised above all the need for what has come to be called 'balanced development', and in particular the need for the twin objectives of economic growth and social development to proceed hand in hand. It is considered that there is little evidence in Australia that the need for such balanced development is understood. There is a paucity of relevant data, national, state and local, government and non-government, which we use to measure our social progress. It is also significant that Federal Ministers only meet formally leaders of commerce and primary and manufacturing industries in pre-budgetary talks, but do not seek advice from equivalent experts in the social welfare field. Even if our policy-makers consider it important to stay mainly within an economic growth and stability framework, it must be recognised that human resources are a crucial form of investment in an industrial society. For those with social welfare values, human beings are, of course, far more than this. They are an end in themselves, and economic values are justifiable only to the extent that they improve the social and living conditions of people.

International forums and contacts are, then, likely to make us look more closely at what sort of society we have and at our values and procedures.

The demands of the international side of the work of ACOSS will increase but, if it is at the cost of its indigenous work, both will suffer. Again, ACOSS needs an adequate Secretariat to cope with both its international and national obligations, the programs for which are outlined (later in this Submission)

The next section of the Submission considered the Secretariat and the Program of ACOSS in the next three years.

ACOSS IN THE NEXT THREE YEARS

THE SECRETARIAT

To enable ACOSS to tackle effectively the tasks of the next three years, we propose the following:-

1. That the Secretariat shall consist of:
 - i. **Director:** This is a position of fundamental significance for the development of the ACOSS idea, and should be seen as one of the top social welfare appointments in the country. To attract the kind of person needed, a salary of at least \$10,000 a year may have to be offered. It requires a highly qualified professional person who can work with and command the respect of a great variety of organisations and persons at all levels; who is able to travel periodically; and who, perhaps above all, thoroughly understands and can participate in the processes involved in community work and social policy formation.
 - ii. **Executive Officer:** To enable the Director to devote his major attention to the development of the role of ACOSS in Australian and international social welfare, an Executive Officer will be appointed who will be responsible to the Director for the day-to-day running of the office and the affairs of the Council. The Executive Officer will need to be professionally qualified so

that a fair measure of responsibility can be devolved from the Director. A salary of about \$7000 a year is estimated as needed to fill this position.

- iii. **Research and Information Officer:** ACOSS needs the services of a person with a research degree in the social sciences or social work, and an understanding of research problems in social welfare. This person will act as a consultant in research design for ACOSS committees, and ACOSS members, will keep members informed on relevant research developments, and will encourage more adequate and standardised record-keeping on the part of social welfare agencies. In conjunction with the Librarian, this staff member will build up an information retrieval system for the uses of ACOSS staff, members, other bodies, governments and the general public. Depending on the person's prior experience, from \$7,000 a year will need to be offered as a salary to obtain the required type of person. Such a person must be fully at ease with new techniques and must be able to command the professional respect of research colleagues in the universities and government departments.
- iv. **Librarian:** To handle the reading material ACOSS is already receiving and needs to receive in greatly increased quantity in the future, ACOSS requires a Librarian at \$3,000 a year. The Librarian would work in closest collaboration with the relevant departmental and other libraries, so that all material of social welfare relevance would be readily available.
- v. **Three Clerical Staff:** To work efficiently and effectively the professional staff will require at least three clerical/stenographic staff at a total cost of about \$7,500 a year.

It is anticipated that the Secretariat will be established in stages. When fully established salaries and wages of the Secretariat will account for an estimated minimum of \$34,000 a year. A further sum will need to be set aside to enable staff, particularly the Director and the Research and Information Officer to travel in the States and the Territories. Without this, they will be in danger of becoming remote from their constituency.

2. That the Secretariat be established in the national capital.

Increasingly, national bodies are deciding that they should have their headquarters in Canberra. This location avoids interstate rivalries and the danger of over-influence of the State where the headquarters is otherwise located; it provides a reasonably accessible location; it clearly identifies the enterprise as a national activity; it encourages important relationships with other national bodies and with the central offices of government departments; and it is close to the seat of government. Moreover, the Commonwealth Government would appear to welcome and actively encourage this trend. The wide ramifications of a body like ACOSS make it particularly well suited, from a government viewpoint, to be located in Canberra.

3. That the Secretariat be housed in accommodation provided by the Commonwealth Government at a nominal rental of not more than \$1,000 per annum. Accommodation for the ACOSS Secretariat in a building in which other national bodies of social welfare importance could also be housed should encourage improved communication, cooperation and add considerably to the understanding of each other's function and areas of responsibility. The Canadian Welfare Council's building in Ottawa provides an example, and its close proximity to the Canadian Department of Health and Welfare

demonstrates a realistic understanding of the importance of geographic situation in encouraging working relationships. In helping to house the Victorian Council of Social Service, the Victorian State Government has given a lead to the Commonwealth Government in relation to the Australian Council of Social Service.

PROGRAM

The anticipated program of ACOSS in the next three years was then set down, with each item being briefly discussed.

Publications:

There is a desperate shortage of social welfare literature in Australia which for too long has relied on overseas material. Whilst much of this may be relevant for this country, the extent to which this is so cannot be fully evaluated in the absence of comparative material of Australian origin.

ACOSS has already begun to make a contribution to published material, and has a part to play in providing material for use in all States, or as a model for State modification to meet local need. The Council can also act as a centre through which material can be brought to notice and distributed throughout Australia

Regular Publications:

'The Australian Journal of Social Issues'

This Journal, jointly produced with the University of Sydney's Post-Graduate Committee in Social Work Education, has good prospects of expansion. The increasing number of contributors, more geographically and professionally diversified, should stimulate both writing for and reading of the Journal. So too should new features like book reviews and regular reviewing of parliamentary discussions of social questions. ... The Journal is potentially a valuable medium for examining issues and fertilising thinking across professional disciplines. It is fully in accord with ACOSS aims and should be welcomed by government in a democratic society. Given about \$300 per annum through ACOSS to stimulate its growth and circulation, it could become self-supporting by the end of the next triennium, and be firmly established as a national journal of especial interest to social policy-makers.

The 'ACOSS Quarterly'

This is potentially an invaluable inexpensive medium of social welfare communication. It can serve to keep people and organisations across the nation informed about social welfare developments throughout Australia and internationally; about relevant conferences, seminars and publications; about overseas visitors; and finally about ACOSS activities. ...

'International Social Work'

ACOSS will stimulate interest in reading and contributing to this Journal, jointly published by the International Council on Social Welfare, the International Federation of Social Workers, and the International Association of Schools of Social Work.

Proceedings of the National Conferences

The published proceedings of the first five National Conferences of ACOSS

constitute a valuable contribution to the still sparse national social welfare literature. In the next three years, ACOSS will be concerned with the publication and sale of proceedings of the 6th and 7th Conferences.

The Australian National Report to the ICSW

There will be National Reports to prepare for the Manila 1970 International Conference, and the 1972 Conference. These Reports can be brief and superficial, or they can be the occasion of most useful stock-taking in relation to a topic of broad international concern. Since the Report is for extensive international consumption, Australia's image abroad is also at stake. At present the National Report can only be produced through the voluntary labours of generous experts. ACOSS should make available to its National Report Committee at least \$500 to make the work more effective and less onerous on the individuals concerned.

A National Directory of Social Welfare

Planning has already begun on the production at a national level of a directory of the different social welfare services available in Australia. A strengthened Secretariat could well give this task a high priority. The State Councils already publish directories of welfare agencies in their States which are extensively used by government departments, medical practitioners, welfare agencies and members of the public.

The Annual Report

For the effective production and distribution of the ACOSS Annual Report, \$500 a year is necessary. Its brief documentation of the full range of ACOSS activities is a necessary aid in evaluating its progress and in helping people and organisations to become better related to the various programs.

Other Publications

(A variety of other publishing ventures in which ACOSS would be involved were briefly described.)

Meetings of Council and the Executive Committee

It is imperative for the development of truly national programs to have attendance from all States and Territories at the Executive Committee meetings, normally held in February, May, August and November. An estimated \$1,600 a year is required for this, and a further \$400 a year is needed to enable the Chairman to travel between the States on behalf of the Council.

Increased attendance at general Council Meetings especially the Annual Meeting will be encouraged, and the practice of discussing a thought-provoking paper by an expert on a subject of social welfare concern will be continued. At least the travel expenses of these experts will need to be covered, and \$200 a year might be set aside for this purpose.

An Evaluation of the Structure and Function of ACOSS

This evaluation was foreshadowed in the 1967-68 Annual Report and is needed for the reasons given in the first part of this submission. The evaluation is likely to lead to some revision of the Constitution and an extension of membership.

ACOSS Committees

ACOSS has accepted the principle that its Committees which cannot be serviced

from the Council's office shall be adequately serviced by part-time employed assistance. Only in this way can the work of the experts in many fields who give their time and energy to Council affairs be most productive.

The Economic Factors and Social Welfare Committee

... The Committee has instituted the most valuable practice of providing each year a statement to the Commonwealth Minister for Social Services, which incorporates the views of ACOSS members and others on the needed changes and priorities in the social security system.

The Committee will also pursuing an interest in the source of finance for social welfare, especially in relation to other community and governmental commitments; the extent to which social welfare beneficiaries can expect to share in rising productivity and ways of measuring their share; and the relative costs of domiciliary services as an alternative to residential care.

The Committee members will not be able to undertake initial research, collation and digesting of material in areas of its interest. They need to be serviced by a person who can prepare material for their consideration. The proposed Secretariat Research Officer may do this. Alternatively \$1,000 a year may be required to employ part-time assistance.

(The plans and anticipated costs of these other ACOSS committees were also listed: The Committee on Social Effects of Technological Change, Joint Committee on Migrant Welfare: ACOSS/ACFOA, Standing Committee of ICSW, Joint Committee on Social Welfare Education, Consumer Credit Committee, and Committee on Training of Overseas Social Welfare Personnel.)

Future Committees

In addition ... new (committees) are likely to be established and at least some of these will need servicing (requiring at least \$1,000 a year). ... (7 possible subject areas were mentioned – local social welfare services, the structure and function of ACOSS, the health services, helping the development of the State and Territorial councils of social service, fund-raising for voluntary agencies, providing consultation on the management of agencies, and citizen advice bureaux.)

In general it can be anticipated that a number of committees will be providing informed comment on matters of high social welfare priority and identifying important gaps in services.

The National Conference

The Council's biennial conferences are now well established ... These Conferences attract wide representation from all levels of government, professional groups, agency boards and the general public, to inject new ideas through the presentation of papers by experts in various fields; to create opportunities for discussion on matters of broad social welfare concern, and to develop a national viewpoint. In the past the venue has changed from State to State and the Sixth Conference will be the first to be held in Canberra. If the Secretariat is firmly established in the national capital, Canberra may well prove the best regular site for the future development of the National Social Welfare Conference, an important focal point in the social welfare calendar of every major and many minor community groups in the country.

Extending the scope of ACOSS

If an adequate Secretariat is established, it will be possible at a national level for ACOSS to become better related to fields like the ageing, the handicapped, mental health, corrections, youth, migrants, public health. Further, ACOSS can take the initiative in establishing a family and child welfare division and other functional divisions where as yet there is no specialised national coordinating machinery.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Additional to such activities already mentioned, ACOSS, mainly through its Secretariat, will be involved in:-

- planning programs for overseas personnel in the social welfare field. ...
- paying the ICSW affiliation fee of upwards of \$1,000 a year.
- keeping much richer contact with National Committees of ICSW, especially those in the Region, and in the United Kingdom and North America.
- sponsoring a Regional ICSW Seminar, depending on assistance from the Department of External Affairs.
- organising effective National Reports and strong Australian Delegates to the 1970 and 1972 International Conferences of Social Welfare (delegate costs will be about \$3,000).
- participating in ICSW Regional activities and in the work of the ICSW generally
- the provision of \$5,000 a year for work of the Council of Social Service of Papua and development of a National Council for T.P.N.G.

The funds made available by the Commonwealth Government have enabled officers and representatives of ACOSS to participate in recent international forums. Such participation has enabled Australia to begin to accept more fully its international responsibilities in social welfare. The next three years should see a greater assumption of ACOSS responsibility in the international sphere. ...

PROGRAMS STIMULATED BY ACOSS ACTIVITY¹⁰

The stimulation of community thought and the channeling of ideas for the development and improvement of social welfare services is a prime function of social welfare councils, and Councils may well have a role also in helping the community to accept a greater re-distribution of resources in the interests of acceptable standards of social welfare for all citizens.

This is not a task that can be carried out from a national office; it requires a grass-roots approach, using the local community's experience of need within its own area if responsibility for vulnerable groups is to be more widely accepted. To be carried out effectively it will require the strengthening of State councils of social service so that they may in turn develop coordination of social welfare services locally. ... When it is realised that, at the present time, only two of the eight State and Territorial Councils have full-time staff, and some have no paid staff at all, it will be obvious that their resources are inadequate for their task.

... this submission includes a provision for channeling funds to State Councils to assist them to fulfill this task, and also to provide service for ACOSS Committees in a particular State.

¹⁰ This section was an addition to my original draft.

ESTIMATE OF EXPENDITURE

(This provided a summary of the estimated expenditure required in the next three years of ACOSS activity as projected and discussed in the submission. The totals were \$78,250 – 1969/70; \$101, 300 – 1970/71; and \$103, 325 – 1971/72.)

THE POSSIBLE FINANCIAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO ACOSS

The final section of the Submission examined the possible financial resources available to ACOSS in the next three years – from the membership, from associates, from donations, and from a Commonwealth Government grant. Whatever changes occurred in membership fees and associate payments, they were not likely to produce more than a small fraction of the funds needed. Only a small number of donations had been received. 'It is commonly accepted that organisations such as councils of social service can attract little support in competition with emotionally more appealing programs or those directly benefiting the citizen's own community.' Some state councils of social service had had fund-raising drives to help improve the financial position of ACOSS, but the sums raised were relatively small. Further, there was a real danger that funding raising activity will divert already limited personnel resources away from programs the community urgently needed. United funds or community chests did not exist as in North America, and there was a relative absence of wealthy foundations willing to finance special projects.

The program outlined could not be achieved if the matching requirement which operated in the current term was attached to any part of the Commonwealth grant in the next triennium. The grant should reflect its estimate of the worth of ACOSS to Australian social welfare in the next three years and in the future and not be limited by the body's own fund-raising propensities.

Our own State governments give direct non-matching grants to the State councils of social service for their general activities as does the British Treasury to the National Council of Social Service in the United Kingdom and does the Dominion Government to the Canadian Welfare Council of Canada. ...

In view of the annual grants the Federal Government already provides to bodies in the social welfare field like the Australian Council on the Ageing (\$100,000 in 1968–69), the Australian Council for Rehabilitation of Disabled (\$15,000), the Australian Pre-School Association (\$14,900), the Boy Scouts' Association (\$20,000), the Girl Guides' Association (\$16,000), the National Youth Council of Australia (\$12,000), the amount requested is modest. ACOSS's scope and potential for Australia's social welfare is necessarily vastly greater than the sectional concerns which these bodies represent, important though they be.

ACOSS asked for a Commonwealth Government direct grant of \$233,000 – \$61,000 (1969/70), \$89,000 for (1970/71), and \$83,000 (1971/72), to bridge the gap between Expenditure and Income from other sources (shown in an appendix of the Submission), together with the provision of suitable accommodation in Canberra at nominal cost along the lines traced in the Submission.

ACOSS believed the Commonwealth Government would be demonstrating community insight and leadership in the social welfare field if it approved the grants sought in the Submission.

The Government's Response

The response by the Commonwealth Government was disappointing, but not completely unexpected. The yearly grant for the next three years was doubled to \$20,000, with a continued insistence that it be a matching grant. The annual grant for international activities was retained at \$5,000. In 1969/70 ACOSS had to use all of its reserve funds to meet current commitments, and despite an increase in fund-raising could not match the Commonwealth grant. In 1970/71, it could claim the full \$20,000, and had received increased financial support, but it was 'nevertheless, still necessary to ACOSS to restrict many areas of its program due to financial limitations'.¹¹ The financial position of ACOSS in 1971/72 was precarious – \$63 in the general account at the end of the financial year. While there had been a significant increase in income, expenditure had risen at a faster rate because of 'a further marked extension in program and activities', but also because of rising costs in all areas. An increase in the ceiling of the matching grant for 1971/72 was not accepted, so ACOSS was unable to take full advantage of its increased income. The Commonwealth Government announced the grant for 1972–75 would be doubled: the international grant was increased from \$5,000 to \$10,000, and the ceiling of the matching grant from \$20,000 to \$40,000. ACOSS was, however, concerned at the fixing of the ceiling at this level for the later years of the triennium and asked the matter be reviewed again in 1973. 'The rapidity of the growth in the Council's activities, combined with anticipated price increases, will make this review essential'.¹²

7.6.3 ACOSS Conference 1970, Canberra

The 6th conference was held in Canberra in May 1970 and was opened by the Governor-General, Sir Paul Hasluck, who was ACOSS patron. He commended the conference being held in the national capital.

I believe that more and more as we build our national consciousness we will be coming to the national capital from all parts of Australia in order to engage in purely national activities.¹³

The residential and meeting facilities for the conference were provided by the ANU, and its vice-chancellor, Sir Leonard Huxley, was the conference chairman. Professor W.D. (Mick) Borrie, whom I knew well from my doctoral studies at the ANU, and who had been one of my examiners, provided 'skilled counsel' to the conference program committee. The theme of 'Social Welfare in the 1970s' was 'a challenge to recognise the present rapid social, economic and technological changes in Australia and their implications for traditional concepts of welfare'. The program was planned to commence with a consideration of the philosophy and economics of social welfare in the 1970s and to end with reflections about the coordination of Australian man-power

11 Treasurer's Report, Australian Council of Social Service 15th Annual Report 1970–71, p. 31.

12 Treasurer's Report, Australian Council of Social Service 16th Annual Report 1971–72, pp.30–1.

13 Paul Hasluck, 'Opening Address', in Harold Weir (ed), *Social Welfare in the 1970s*, ACOSS, 1970.

resources and welfare priorities.¹⁴ I was responsible for the philosophy paper and Keith Hancock, professor of economics at Flinders University followed with the economics paper. My colleague at UNSW, Spencer Colliver, and Ray Brown, professor of social administration at Flinders University, delivered the concluding papers. In between was a wide range of interesting papers – on new communities and new towns (Tom Brennan, A. M. Ramsay¹⁵), a mining town (J.E. Tonkin), clubs as a social welfare phenomenon (G. T. Caldwell), meeting family health costs (R. B. Scotton¹⁶), the cost of collisions (N. G. Butlin & P. N. Troy), community health programs (B. Hennessey), the role of trade unions in social welfare (J. Miller, K. H. McLeod), trends in higher education (D. S. Anderson, J. Spigelman¹⁷), career choices in law, engineering, medicine and teaching (J. S. Western), criminal deviant behaviour, prevention and treatment of offenders (T. E. F. Hughes¹⁸), the welfare of dependent groups (H. M. Smith), particularly the physically handicapped (G. G. Burniston¹⁹), the aging (B. F. Ford), and broken families (L. J. Tierney²⁰).

Hazel Smith, reader in social work and head of the Department of Social Work at the University of Queensland, had just returned from a strenuous overseas trip. Sadly, she died shortly after the conference. The theme of her paper was the need for more involvement of the people who needed help, more citizen/consumer participation. The movement in this direction had already started but must be extended to the more depressed dependent groups. It picked up the focus of my 1969 Norma Parker Address on the consumer perspective in social welfare.

MY OPENING ADDRESS

A Fantasy Based on Reality

At the outset of my paper on 'The philosophy of social welfare in the 1970s', I said:

14 'Preface' by Harold Weir in the conference proceedings. A director of a section of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Library, he chaired the program committee and edited the proceedings.

15 A. M. Ramsay CBE was the general manager of the South Australian Housing Trust. He was an outstanding public servant, greatly respected by Professor Hugh Stretton, who was deputy chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust 1973–89.

16 Dick Scotton, a research economist, and John Deeble, a political scientist, were the chief architects of medibank, Australia's compulsory health insurance scheme adopted by the Whitlam government.

17 Jim Spigelman's family came from Poland to Australia in 1949. A former president of the students representative council at the University of Sydney, he was currently a research assistant for Gough Whitlam. 1972–75 he was a senior adviser and principal private secretary to the prime minister. He recently retired as chief justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales.

18 Commonwealth attorney-general.

19 George Burniston was now a senior lecturer at UNSW – in the Department of Rehabilitation Medicine. After 15 years in the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service and more recent experience 'in a complex of teaching hospitals', he believed the Commonwealth should no longer be involved directly in the health or medical aspects of rehabilitation, but vocational evaluation and retraining, and job placement could remain the responsibility of the Commonwealth. (I had first met Burniston when he was the principal medical officer in central office of the Commonwealth Department of Social Services.)

20 Reader in charge, Department of Social Studies, University of Melbourne.

One way to cope with a hopelessly large and complex topic in a brief time-span is to retreat into fantasy. Philosophising is concerned with the meaning and significance of things, usually claimed to be important, and as such both analytic and speculative thinking are involved. What I am about to indulge in will have each of these ingredients, the balance being assessed variously by each of you according to your own experience and views on life.

I then told an imagined story based on my understanding of what could be involved in taking social welfare seriously in the Australian context.²¹ This is the story I told:

Let us cast our minds forward to the end of this year. Our Prime Minister, Mr Gortlam,²² has had a brain wave – subsequently called by his press secretary “an important decision reached after extensive consultation with colleagues and advisers”. Ruminating at the Lodge, the Prime Minister is thinking:

The Party is in good shape, I have a sound team of Ministers, our majority in Parliament is secure, and no-one that I know of seems to want my job. The economy is doing nicely. There are a few soft spots – rural industries, labour shortages, overseas investment, and I wish we could do better on price rises if only to keep Bob Hawke out of our hair – but generally things are under control. He’s a good man the Treasurer, although I’ll need to watch him – he and his Department sometimes sound as if they are running the country. Anyway I don’t want my government to be known only for its achievements in managing the economy.

But what else is there? People are beginning to talk about us becoming a great power, but surely not yet, and power for what?

Suddenly the Prime Minister hits upon an idea:

There has been a lot of recent talk, from the Governor General down, about the quality of life in Australia. At the turn of the century we gained a reputation for being a socially progressive nation concerned with the standard of living of the population. My government can regain that reputation. We can afford it. It will give us moral stature abroad as well as at home. Political ideology won’t get in the way; it’s an anathema to the young voters in particular. Our new doctrine – it’s not really new of course – will be, that it’s people that count, not ideologies, institutions, and material things. These are important only to the extent they serve the needs and interests of individual human beings, and we should be concerned about every single person in our society, whatever their personal and moral characteristics may be. This sounds like my old social philosophy lectures, muses the Prime Minister. It also sounds like hopeless idealism. But I wonder if it really is these days? Are we moving as a society into what some of the sociologists are calling a post-industrial phase? Perhaps for the first time in our history we can really be concerned about the good life for everyone, and the good life doesn’t have to be dominated by economic objectives. If the U.S. giant is working towards a comprehensive report on the social progress of the nation, why can’t we? I must get round to reading some of that material, it’s obviously pretty complex. What we seem to need is a top-notch adviser, a Social Welfare Adviser. He can help us to work out a new social welfare philosophy for the nation.

21 The address will be quoted in full. Full references are to be found in the conference proceedings.

22 Obviously a mythical composite of John Gorton and Gough Whitlam.

The Prime Minister on this historic morning in fact mused on for much longer, and had to rush to keep his next appointment, but not before he had noted his ideas. (I call this an historic morning because later Australian historians are to describe it as a watershed, a turning-point in Australian history – why, we will see later.)

The rest of the paper tells of the trials and tribulations of Dr Smith who eventually receives the appointment as Social Welfare Adviser.

“The PM’s idea”, as the project comes to be called in public service and political circles, is delayed initially by what are described as ‘unforeseen difficulties’. In fact, there is a wrangle over whom the Adviser is to advise – the Prime Minister, the Cabinet, the Party, the main government departments involved, the nation at large? Although some see it as ‘a most unfortunate step towards a Presidential system of government’, Dr Smith is eventually appointed to advise the Prime Minister. Further delay also comes from the insistence of the Commonwealth Public Service Board that Smith’s staff should be drawn from the ranks of the public service. He, backed by the Prime Minister, argues that only relevant capacity and experience should count, and this view prevails.

George Smith had been part of the Australian brain-drain. After a distinguished academic career at an Australian university, he gained extensive education in the social sciences at the London School of Economics and at Harvard University. In recent years he has, in a most distinguished fashion, acted as a United Nations social welfare consultant. His personal and intellectual qualities, his experience and his reputation, make him ideal for the Prime Minister’s project. He in turn is greatly attracted by the ambition and vision of the project and by the salary; also it helps his feelings of guilt about having worked away from the land of his birth and upbringing for so long.

Smith has not kept professionally in touch with his homeland, but he is now fascinated by his assignment. He has worked for the U.N. in both advanced Western industrial societies and in developing countries. In the former, as a social welfare consultant he has worked almost exclusively with what they call the social welfare sector, i.e. all those specialised services whose primary aim is to help the social functioning of individual human beings. In the developing countries, his role has inevitably been much broader, social development being closely integrated with all aspects of national development. Dr Smith wonders if the Prime Minister’s assignment will provide him with an integrating opportunity increasingly being talked about in the larger Western industrial societies. He recalls a prediction made back in the 1950s in the seminal book by Wilensky and Lebeaux:

It seems likely that distinctions between welfare and other types of social institutions will become more and more blurred. Under continuing industrialisation all institutions will be oriented toward and evaluated in terms of social welfare aims. The ‘welfare state’ will become the ‘welfare society’, and both will be more reality than epithet.

Perhaps, thinks Dr Smith, I will be in a position to help this process in my native Australia. I had better start with the social welfare sector, however, because I’m sure that is where I will be expected to start, and many no doubt will be expecting me to stay within its confines.

Smith’s first major piece of advice is that living a social welfare philosophy for the

nation in all its parts must be related to the experience of the people of that society. From his own bitter experience as a consultant he has learnt the significance of the words of George Homans that 'society's preaching and its practice are elastically linked. Each pulls the other, and they can never separate altogether'. Dr Smith is determined to achieve cultural relevance, and the Prime Minister and others go along with this because it seems 'practical', but Smith knows better than they, just what is likely to be involved in understanding the cultural complexities in an industrial society of twelve and a quarter million people. He consoles himself with the thought that at least there will be relevant data – not like in those developing countries.

Before moving in to study the social welfare sector, Dr Smith checks with the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics to see what basic official data is available from this source. He is disappointed by the quality and quantity of social statistics and some data from the 1966 Census are still not available. He discovers that the first official survey on disability is dated 1969: it is concerned with one state and was initiated outside government circles. 'What figures do government departments use for their planning? Wonders Dr Smith, and 'What about everyone else interested in census figures – the academics, the economic and social research bodies, the voluntary social agencies and the rest?'

He wonders even more when he learns that the 1971 census does not include information on income, housing finance, housing conditions, life assurance and superannuation, health insurance, method of travel to work, and the availability of water supply. All these items had been included in a pre-test but had been excluded by Cabinet decision on the grounds of 'intrusion into the privacy of the individual'. Smith had read Professor Zelman Cowan's stimulating series of Boyer Lectures on 'The Private Man', but cannot believe there is any connection here. Is this, then, the political arm of government asserting its strength against the bureaucrats, or is this the one industrial society whose government doesn't need up-to-date data to govern effectively, or doesn't the government want general social conditions publicised, or is the data gained in other ways? Dr Smith finds that this last possibility doesn't hold and thinks it unwise to seek the advice of the Prime Minister on the first three possibilities.

*Hoping to obtain an overview of the full dimensions of social welfare services in Australia, George Smith seeks without success a scholarly national book on the subject, or at least a national directory which lists the services. The best he turns up is *The Australian and New Zealand Hospital and Health Services Yearbook*. He does come across a definition of 'social welfare' put forward in the mid-1960s by a body called ACOSS, on the prompting of some ivory-tower academic. This claims that 'social welfare' can be used to refer to:*

All the socially beneficial organisations and policies whose aim is the maintenance or improvement of general social and living standards with regard to income, employment, education, health, housing and recreation, or which are primarily concerned with the social and living standards of particular vulnerable groups in the community.

Dr Smith wonders how much prescription rather than description is involved in the definition. Yet when he examines state directories of social welfare agencies, the compilers appear to have in mind this breadth of scope.

The stated objectives in the constitutions of each of the state councils of social service

and of the Australian Council of Social Service lead the Smith team to believe that these councils will be a most invaluable source of information on overall patterns of service, and will themselves actively demonstrate a range of coordinating patterns.

The first surprise – perhaps shock and disbelief are better descriptions of the reaction – comes when the team discover the one or two staff persons involved in these organisations and their shoe-string budgets. How can they in their wildest dreams service even their member agencies let alone provide active centres for social welfare planning and consultation or broad social planning? Within the painfully limited resources, Dr Smith finds an almost heroic job is being done by a small band of active people in these general social welfare coordinating bodies, but seen against the size of the social welfare industry in the country as a whole, he finds their efforts puny. He wonders why they don't scale down their objectives to make them realistic in terms of their resources. Vicious circles seem to have been strongly established. Agencies, and other so-called coordinating bodies more specialised than the councils of social service, will not become active members of the councils until the councils demonstrate their usefulness to them, and without greater membership commitment and resources, the councils are hamstrung to produce results.

Smith muses on the extent to which 'coordination' seems to have become an empty cliché. When he has asked precisely what is being coordinated and why, people start talking in general slogans – 'We are avoiding overlapping, filling in service gaps, revealing new needs'. He seeks examples of coordinating bodies sponsoring joint planning between agency programs but can find very few.

A major structural weakness in the coordinating bodies which pretend to represent the total social welfare sector is the absence of full and active involvement of government departments. Dr Smith wonders why the councils do not realistically call themselves councils of voluntary social welfare agencies. He sees a general reluctance to call a spade a spade, and ponders if this were done, perhaps there would be greater general awareness of what is the actual community situation.

A further basic difficulty revealed is one deeply rooted in the political and social structure. Smith finds disagreement on the respective roles of a national body like ACOSS and the state councils of social service. He had expected that Commonwealth-State relationships in various aspects of Australian life might have been settling down in a more centralist pattern, but with due recognition being given to functions that can best be performed on a decentralised base.

Another observation that Dr Smith makes is the great extent to which the councils of social service are metropolitan in their focus – the Council of Social Service of Sydney seems to him a more accurate description of the Council of Social Service of New South Wales.

Having been so heavily involved in the voluntary social welfare sector in making their contact with these coordinating bodies, the Smith team decide they must try themselves to gather data directly from the individual voluntary agencies. Bearing in mind his overall assignment, Dr Smith ruthlessly limits the time spent on the voluntary social welfare sector. He gains information only from a tiny sample of the literally thousands of voluntary agencies. He is particularly concerned with the objectives and values being pursued by agencies, and yet time after time agency executives are not accustomed to the notion of administration by objective. He wonders how they measure organisational success, and sees all too often survival and additions to

size of what is called the 'service' as the main actual criteria.

Community control over what are automatically claimed to be community agencies seems to Dr Smith to be quite minimal. In some voluntary fields, government departments require minimal standards for physical facilities, especially when a government subsidy is involved, but nothing more. The Smith team find no available data on board members of voluntary agencies and receive little cooperation when they attempt to gather some. Few of the voluntary agencies seem to see themselves in a system of community services. They are highly self-centred and autonomous-minded, often wanting subsidies from the government and funds from the public, but not outside 'interference'. Federated fund-raising scarcely exists and it seems to be a situation of 'catch as catch can'. Dr Smith recalls a couple of pithy sentences of Martin Rein:

Social service is in many ways the last bastion of free enterprise. At any time that two people come together in the name of good works, they can start a welfare agency and scramble around for funds, personnel, and clients.

Church-sponsored social welfare programs present our team with both some of the most coherent and some of the most incoherent examples of voluntary organisations. In an increasingly secular society (at least in terms of traditional religion), Dr Smith finds many church-based social welfare programs chronically short of resources; others burgeoning on a 'get with the people' philosophy, but unclear in their theological underpinning. A non-denominational lay church movement called New Horizons has encouraged what they call meaningful dialogue between people and groups locked in their narrow, specialised social systems. However, Smith discovers a lack of follow-through in its efforts, rather naïve understanding of the mechanisms of social change, and a suspicion of its work on the part of those without church affiliation.

Being a good social scientist, George Smith wonders about the adequacy of his sample of the voluntary sector and his methodology, particularly because of the indeterminate nature of the 'universe' he is sampling – but he must press on. The Prime Minister has already asked for a work-in-progress report. Smith chews over that word 'progress'. His brief report indicates that the work done so far has been most illuminating, but that the job is likely to take rather longer than originally expected. Privately, he contemplates what kind of illumination politicians really want.

Having coped with the messiest part of the social welfare sector, the Smith team move on to the government sector. Again the focus is especially upon the objectives and underlying values – this time of the large number of government social welfare programs. To Dr Smith's question, 'Why does the department exist?' the stock answer is, 'To administer the Act.' 'Why does the Act exist?' – 'Because a government passed it.' 'What did the government have in mind?' – 'That's not our business.' 'But don't you have to know to administer the Act? What guides you in your making of regulations?'

Smith discovers a widespread absence of explicit policy rationales – at both the political and administrative levels, and in Commonwealth and State social welfare programs. He is aware that objectives in social welfare matters tend to be controversial, are rarely simple to state, and are likely to need revision. However, he knows his organisation theory and remembers the crucial role of goals in providing guide-lines, measures of success, and legitimacy for an organisation's activities, and the dangers especially in large bureaucracies of goal displacement.

Many of the government services appear to the Smith team as closed systems, often

long established, running on stereotyped lines – but described as ‘doing a good job’ by their Minister. Occasionally the team come across a thoughtful person who has not become captive of their employing system and is working to make it more open. This person often has a professional qualification and therefore alternative career opportunities if he is made to leave or chooses to leave.

At a Commonwealth government level, Dr Smith finds the Social Services Department in a fascinating stage of transition. From his reading he had learnt of the high hopes in the 1940s that this Department would provide national, and even international social welfare leadership. He had also learnt of the subsequent dropping away of expectations and aspiration so that the Department became mainly a cheque-paying institution, tied to the Treasury in its policy-making as well as its funding. Now he finds a Department under relatively new leadership trying to recapture some of its earlier social welfare aspiration, but with a set of external relations not yet accustomed to this being seen as a progressive department. A sign of the times is a research project being undertaken by a school of social work on public attitudes and reactions to the Department.

Until the late 1960s, Dr Smith discovers, this Department was completely out of touch with state social welfare departments responsible for relief programs, supplementary to the Commonwealth’s income-security program. Generally, Smith’s team find rather uneasy relations between the social welfare-type departments at both a Commonwealth and State level. This is particularly the case when a department like Immigration through its Integration Section is trying to ensure that needs of a population group, the migrants, are being adequately catered for by each of the various government departments. As far as the team can find out, most departments see progress in the direction of adding more of the same thing, especially to meet population growth, not in the direction of possible reorganisation to be better adapted to the range of needs of individual citizens and families.

One new organisational direction appears to be in the establishment of services available in the locality, in some way connected with local government, but the team find it difficult to obtain clear rationales for this. There is a lot of talk about grass roots community development and accessibility, but how these developments relate to the organisation of federal and state government social welfare services is not very clear.

Dr Smith discovers considerable enmity between state and federal governments and considerable buck-passing. The states claim that especially in their social welfare activities they are starved of funds and yet do not have a substantial independent funding base of their own. The federal government in turn does not undertake a variety of social welfare activities on a national scale because they are said to be state functions. A chronically unresolved situation is revealed, and George Smith wonders about its effects on national morale, political responsibility, and particularly on the quality of many services for John Citizen who is both a citizen of the individual state and of the Commonwealth.

One overwhelming impression the Smith team gain from their studies of the Australian social welfare sector is that the service providers rarely seek their customers’ views on their services. Further, there is little attempt to measure the extent to which those who could benefit from service are actually in receipt of service. Dr Smith muses on a statement made by the American writers Morris and Binstock:

Many people do not know about the existence of social agencies and many of those who do, avoid them because they are uncomfortable with programs so alien to their culture ... The volume of services is by no means commensurate with the volume and variety of identifiable human needs. Only a small proportion of persons with any need, no matter how objectively measured, is actually known to the current service network.

Smith is aware of the theoretical difficulties of talking 'needs' language, but he wonders about the application of this statement to the Australian scene. He has noted a beginning awareness that many Australians, particularly migrant Australians, do not know about what are euphemistically described as 'community services'.

Still within the social welfare sector, Dr Smith and his team consult with the various educational bodies involved in providing professional and other staff for the social welfare agencies. They, in fact, have to resort to a large number of separate consultations. Negotiations are under way to establish an Australian Council of Social Welfare Education, with a secretariat possibly financed mainly by Commonwealth Government funds. Dr Smith learns that this body is likely to have consultative, research and information-providing functions in relation to the total social welfare industry. He becomes keenly aware of the need for this kind of body when he examines a considerable number of training ventures in the non-professional parts of the social welfare industry. Smith finds the social work professionals considering having their own organised section in the new Council, as do various other elements in the industry. Dr Smith sees the potential of the venture if it is adequately staffed. He wonders if here may lie an important means for unlocking the various closed and semi-closed social and thought systems he has been observing in both the government and voluntary sectors of the social welfare industry.

While in the universities examining social work schools, the Smith team also turn their attention to other professional schools and to the state of teaching and research in the social sciences. They are struck by the traditionalism of the university scene, especially in the older professions, although there is a dynamic for change in the knowledge explosion each of the professional schools is trying to cope with. Dr Smith notes the sharp separation and sometimes conflict, between schools in adjacent 'human service' professions like medicine, psychiatry, clinical psychology, social work, law and town planning.

Traditionalism is also apparent in the organisation of the social sciences. One of the oldest universities has only just established a chair in that dangerously new and academically-suspect subject, sociology, and nowhere in the whole country has this subject been established for much more than a decade. No wonder Smith and his team find almost a complete absence of contemporary studies of Australian social value systems. The great weight of North American social science material used in the social science disciplines makes George Smith wonder about the cultural effects of this most pervasive form of cultural and intellectual imperialism. There are signs, especially in the newer universities, of interest in behavioural science, administrative theory, and multi-disciplinary work between the social sciences, but for the most part the Smith team find academics locked in separate discipline career paths, leading further and further away from community relevance, learning more and more about less and less. Generalists are hard to come by and professionally suspect. At least in sociology, however, the challenge is beginning to be thrown down to the social scientist to justify

his activity to others besides his professional peers, and to be explicit about his social values. Dr Smith knows the 'value-free' debate raging strongly on North American campuses and sees the Australian counterpart as derivative and feeble.

Smith is, however, generally impressed by the level of intellectual and professional competence and signs of human concern in the universities, but can find few people whom he would describe as social thinkers. There is one person whose wisdom and insight in social affairs, Smith finds exceptional. This is a man who has spent most of his career teaching and writing about traditional and contemporary social philosophy – wrestling with concepts like 'state', 'justice', 'liberty', 'equality', 'rights', 'obligations', 'democracy', 'law', 'consent', 'authority', 'responsibility', 'order', 'the public', 'the people'. He knows that this is the language of social dissent as well as of social order. He is particularly interested in the interpretation of these concepts in the modern industrial state, and also in the large-scale complex organisations which have become extremely important elements within the structure of such a society. This man's view is that:

The contemporary social philosopher must subject his speculation to the control of theory and empirical knowledge provided by modern sociology.

He also considers,

Sociologists run the risk of talking sad nonsense about society and politics if they are ignorant of the tradition of political knowledge preserved within classical political philosophy.²³

From the universities, Dr Smith and his team move on to the trade union movement (or should I say movements?) and the professional associations. Remembering their reading of Richard Titmuss, the team examines industry in its many ramifications paying special regard to the private social service systems established by employers in the name of 'fringe benefits'; and they examine that other system of social services embedded in the concessions of the taxation system. As usual the data is thin, but there is sufficient to confirm Titmuss-like patterns, running counter to the popular mythology that the poor or the most disadvantaged are the main beneficiaries of the social services.

While in the private profit-making sector of the economy, the Smith team pay regard to those who provide services like health, housing, education and recreation on this basis. As an internationalist, Smith is especially interested in the extent to which Australians see themselves as having social responsibilities abroad. Another key study area is the Australian family – its changing structure and functions. Another is the mass media of communication.

We cannot, however, dwell on all of Dr Smith's peregrinations throughout the Australian society. He and his team work incredibly hard and with consummate skill, often in difficult, and occasionally in hostile social environments.

The Prime Minister in the later stages of the work shows increasing patience. He, in fact, has enough else on his hands without being bothered by this Report. The time comes, however, when the last extension has been sought and the Report must be presented. It has been agreed that it will be a public document. Smith wonders

23 P. H. Partridge, 'Political Philosophy and Political Sociology', *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1965, p. 18.

about an appropriate but catchy title. Words like 'chaotic', 'rudderless', 'irresponsible', 'haphazard', 'disordered', 'disorganised', 'ignorant' keep on asserting themselves, but he realises these are heavily loaded. He mulls over: 'A Fair Share for All', 'Social Justice in Australia', 'Sharing Prosperity', 'It's People Who Count', 'Human Beings in a Modern Industrial Society', 'Unlocking Closed Social Welfare Systems in an Open Society', and the safe but dreary 'Towards a Philosophy of Social Welfare'. In the end the Report bears no title, just the author's name and his brief terms of reference – 'to provide the Prime Minister with a comprehensive report on a social welfare philosophy for the Australian nation'.

By any standards, the Smith Report is a most impressive document. In quantity it runs, together with Appendices, to over 1,000 pages, although there is a 40-page encapsulated version. The Report captures the readers' imagination, but is firmly rooted in an understanding of Australian social structure. It is concerned with charting and controlling directions of social change by collaborative efforts at all levels of social organisation. The society's key basic values and a full range of secondary values are discussed together with the mechanisms available to people to achieve them. The theme is how every individual can find meaning and purpose in life, and special regard is given to the life chances and opportunities of the different population groups. The essential interdependence of the society is stressed and substantial attention is given to ways of avoiding social segregation and stigma. Social labelling comes under the closest scrutiny. The Report discusses the social dangers of static simplistic solutions, especially ones centrally imposed. Cost-benefit analysis receives considerable emphasis as a useful policy-making and policy assessing device, and careful attention is given to considering 'costs and benefits in terms of whose values?'

A masterly section considers the changing social networks within which people live their lives, and the extent to which these give individuals support, meaning and direction to their existence. The subject of crisis points experienced by all of us, as well as the special crises, receives a most perceptive analysis. The Report is especially helpful in its discussion of conflict resolution in the Australian context.

The Prime Minister calls for Dr Smith and warmly congratulates him on his Report – he has read the brief version and hopes shortly to read the full text – but Smith senses he has something on his mind. Two days later, he finds out what it is when he hears a newspaper boy calling out 'Prime Minister resigns'. There has been a revolt in the Cabinet.

Mr Gortlam's successor immediately labels the Smith Report as 'an expensive extravagance with no practical relevance for responsible politicians – it's typical of the ideas of my predecessor'.

A dispirited George Smith leaves Australia soon after for another U. N. assignment – determined in future to keep clear of 'developed' countries. Only a limited number of the Smith Report are printed, and the federal government conveniently tries to forget the exercise.

That, you will be thinking, is surely the end of my extended fantasy. But it is not. Let us back-track for a final moment or two.

Almost wherever they went, the Smith team had left a residue not only of hostility, but of stirred interest, new insight, and a wish to try to be more explicit about social objectives. This ground-swell of interest in social affairs – in his wake, but unknown to Dr Smith – finds its expression in a new national body, the Australian Council

of Social Affairs (known as 'ACSA'). Participants in this organisation come from all sectors of the society and many on its staff are former members of the Smith team.

Soon the new Prime Minister and his Cabinet, and for that matter, all public authorities, have to take notice of the body's existence. The Government Printer is even made to produce the shorter Smith Report in the thousands, and like the British Beveridge Report, it has the distinction of being as an official publication and a best seller.

The objectives of ACSA are worth mentioning, and true to the new George Smith tradition, most of the participants in ACSA take them seriously and use them as operating guide-lines:

1. To provide a centre for analysis and informed discussion of social conditions and social development.
2. To foster community concern about improving the quality of life for all social groups, within a framework of democratic and humanitarian values.
3. To develop social indicators as measures of social development; and to promote data collection in terms of these indicators – these indicators to be concerned at least with comparative standards of well-being related to income and wealth, health, housing, education, employment, recreation, and civil and political rights.
4. To ensure that economic, physical, and social planning activities are balanced.
5. To assist general community authorities to anticipate and regulate social change within the framework of the law and with regard for the public conscience.
6. To encourage the development of national social policies in all major social welfare areas – paying due regard to the claims and responsibilities of local, city, regional, state, national, and international authorities, and the changing nature of national society.
7. To help social welfare organisations improve their services and keep their policies and practices responsive to social needs.
8. To promote the exchange of information and experience amongst organisations and people concerned with the social affairs of the nation, and to keep them informed of social developments in other countries.
9. To help generally in the development of Australia's international social welfare responsibilities.
10. To rely upon an authority derived from sound research, close reasoning, widespread informed discussion, democratic and humanitarian values, and persuasion – respecting the autonomy of existing organisations, and not becoming involved in the direct provision of services.

I'm not sure where I have reached. Perhaps I am into the 1980s; perhaps I'm off this planet. It's high time I returned to May 1970.

7.6.4 ACOSS Follow-up on ICSW Pre-conference Working Party

In August 1970, I was centrally involved in the ICSW conference follow-up in Manila. (See volume 5.) Soon after the Manila conference, ACOSS produced a discussion pamphlet which contained the full report of the pre-conference

working party and my paper on its highlights. Its new executive officer, Joan Brown, a significant contributor in the working party, was keen that it should be widely distributed and discussed in Australia. I was invited to present a paper on 'The Role of Social Welfare in Australian Social Development' at the ACOSS annual meeting in August 1971.

... Three interrelated sets of personal experience have been specially influential in shaping these comments. For some years, my main university teaching responsibility has been in the broad area of social policy and its administration – or what the British call 'Social Administration'. Unfortunately I still only need the fingers of one hand to count others in Australia who have this as their prime teaching and research responsibility. Just where are our Richard Titmusses, our David Donnisons, our David Marshes? The second experience has come from being a member of the ACOSS committee commissioned to review its constitution. Such a review has inevitably raised broad structural-functional questions about Australian society, and the actual and possible place of specifically social welfare activities in this society. The third experience has been an international one.

Almost 12 months ago I had the responsibility of chairing the Pre-Conference Working Party for the XVth ICSW Conference held at Manila. We had the formidable task of producing a report on the Conference theme 'New Strategies for Social Development – Role of Social Welfare'. My colleagues on that occasion came from Australia, Brazil, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Peru, The Philippines, Portugal, Taiwan, United Kingdom, United States, Western Germany, and a number of international agencies. Despite this cultural diversity, we did manage to conceptualize the theme in a way that seemed to make sense to everyone involved. As I am sure you are aware, ACOSS subsequently decided to use our Report, together with my comments which introduced it to the full Conference, as its first Discussion Pamphlet. Today is my chance to help stimulate that discussion in its application to our own society.

I suppose the first observation to make is that as yet the term 'social development' is rarely heard in Australia. In contrast, we are full accustomed to hearing about 'economic development', and most people would have some idea of its various components. Increasingly, 'urban development' and 'urban redevelopment' are terms coming into common Australian use. They are associated with physical planning, with land-use and physical arrangements. These are the things 'the developer' so-called is primarily concerned with. Australians can understand these two classes of 'development'. They are also beginning to understand the physical, biological and aesthetic price they may be paying for much of this so-called 'development'. It is being claimed that the 'quality of life' is being placed in jeopardy by the harmful physical by-products of 'development' now commonly called pollutants. Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, natural beauty – these seem to be what life is supposed to be about. It is rather reminiscent of the mid-nineteenth century British public health debates.

I suggest that as a national society it is high time we in Australia examined the full range of values which give or might give meaning and sense to our lives, and that we more consciously and deliberately try to shape our future in terms of these values. Then perhaps we will have a commonly held concept of social development.

It is conceivable that eventually the values pursued in economic development and in physical urban development will be seen as parts of social development. This is because, on analysis, all values are products of social systems in which people and groups of people are making choices of preference. In our Working Party Report, we talk of integrated development as an international social development goal, and see it as 'a unified, multidimensional process by which otherwise separated physical, economic and social components are brought together as interrelated aspects of the same process'.

It is obvious that the scope of this kind of thinking involves the whole society in all its major institutional arrangements. Acknowledging all the complexities involved, this is trying to make Australia a better society in which to live.

Partly because of the lateness of sociology on the Australian scene, few Australians have systematic knowledge about many important aspects of their own society. The situation is changing, thanks to the work of scholars like Partridge, Borrie, Price and Encel, but it still tends to be sheer guess-work when our policy makers operate in the area of the society's social values. We are flush with senior public servants, professionals and community leaders who still use 'common sense', 'pragmatic', 'practical' strategies, when in fact the 'sense' they should be using is a highly educated, rare one, and the actual effects of their 'practical' strategies on the lives of people are frequently random and unknown. Our educational system generally has not encouraged us to have social insight, and I suspect our social ideals generally are unnecessarily over-generalized, rudimentary, and incoherent.

Just as a starter, I wonder how many secondary schools use a document like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as an example of social ideals and help students to try to understand their possible relevance in Australian society. Are there national guidelines linked with such international ones? How do we assess how we are going as a society, unless we have some goals against which to measure our so-called progress or development? We have goals and measures for economic activity, why not for other activities in which we are engaged? The 'social indicators' discussion in other western societies, as far as I know, has elicited little Australian response, apart from the fine stirring papers of Professor Ray Brown at the last ACOSS Conference and the 1968 Poverty Conference, both held in Canberra.

From what I have been saying, it is obvious that I see the need for a social development perspective to pervade the whole society – at all levels of government and in the non-government sector as well. Despite the tenor of these remarks, I think there are signs of some increase in awareness and social concern – for example, in the trade union movement, in some student bodies, in some professional groups, such as architects, lawyers and psychiatrists. It has, in fact, been predicted by scholars of industrialization that 'distinctions between welfare and other types of social institutions will become more and more blurred. Under continuing industrialization all institutions will be oriented toward and evaluated in terms of social welfare aims'. (Wilensky and Lebeaux)

In the Working Party, we decided at the outset not to concentrate upon the role of social welfare in social development. Rather we first tackled the concept of social development and relevant strategies for it, and only then examined the possible roles of social welfare in such strategies. ... To parallel that approach in this talk, I suppose I should have titled it 'Strategies for Australian Social Development

– Role of Social Welfare’. However, by now I think I will have established the breadth of my view on what I think our ‘social development’ ought to be about. Where, then, does ‘social welfare’ fit?

First, we need to clarify what we have in mind when we use the term ‘social welfare’ in this way. As a working definition, in the Working Party we decided to use the term to refer to all the organized social arrangements outside the family and the market place, which have as their direct and primary objective the well-being of people in a social context. We have in mind the broad range of policies and services which are concerned with various aspects of people’s lives – their income, security, health, housing, education, recreation, cultural traditions, civil rights, and so on.

Despite often brave and some would say pretentious words, in actual practice Australian social welfare organizations have mainly concentrated upon achieving standards of at least minimum well-being for vulnerable groups and have not been greatly involved in the development of optimum social conditions even for their clients, let alone the citizenry at large. The Working Party agreed that this generally tended to be the case throughout the world.

If, then, social development essentially involves social conditions across the whole society, what role can and should the social welfare sector play in its promotion? In our Report, we listed possible social development national goals in the areas of the areas of income and wealth, health, housing, employment, education, recreation, family well-being, civil and political rights, safety, and sense of community. We pursued this with 20-odd possible strategies to achieve these goals and then assessed some of the likely impediments and assets. We saw social welfare as having at least some potential involvement in most of these strategies. In addition, however, we teased out six specific possible roles social welfare could play in promoting social development. I will confine my brief comments to these six.

1. **Influencing National Priorities** – *The social welfare field has access to data on the nature and extent of social need, knowledge of how social needs may be met, the consequences of failing to meet needs and the potential for the enhancement of human well-being and material productivity if needs are met appropriately. The social welfare field can employ this knowledge in influencing national priorities in collaboration with other professional and community groups within the planning process.*

I do not want to belabour the inadequacies of data available through the Australian social welfare sector. Until it improves, both quantitatively and qualitatively, we cannot hope to fulfil the role that this international document prescribes. Just how much of our resources do we spend on meaningful evaluation of our activities in the social welfare sector? There is, of course, the further point that our experience, however evaluated, is still only partial and not representative across the society. We must realise that overgeneralizing from the social welfare sector could in fact damage general social development.

2. **Utilizing the Political Process** – *The success of the field in redirecting national priorities toward social development goals will depend heavily on the capacity of social welfare personnel to utilize the political process effectively. The political*

process in this context includes actions such as education of the public, public statements about desirable policies, lobbying and direct political action.

Many in Australian social welfare are at long last beginning to realise the legitimacy as well as the need to become heavily involved in such processes. Compared with, for example, economic interest groups, social welfare interests have still much to learn. This is clearly evident at federal budget planning time. There are, however, differing views within social welfare on the desirability of this development.

- 3. Interpreting Social Development Goals** – *The extent to which political power groups will redirect resources for social development purposes will be closely related to public understanding of and support for the goals of social development. The social welfare field must play a leading role interpreting them effectively to the general public in a variety of ways and particularly through the use of citizen involvement, the educational system and the mass media.*

As already mentioned, Australian social welfare is operating in a society which has not made explicit its social development goals. Even within its own activities its purposes tend to be implicit and vague. How then can it expect to take the lead in helping to develop and interpret what the nation's social goals ought to be? And yet, some might ask, who else is better equipped?

- 4. Dealing with Areas of Tension** – *The social welfare field has a role to play in identifying areas of potential tension and working constructively with tensions and conflicts in ways which will achieve sound social objectives.*

Australian society has been a comparatively trouble-free society, and this partly explains the relative dearth of expertise in Australian social welfare in handling inter-group and inter-organizational tensions and conflicts. There are now many signs, however, of increasing inter-group tensions which call for community work and management skills. Social work schools are responding to this changed situation but such skills are likely to be in short supply for some time to come, even within the social welfare section itself, let alone available more broadly.

- 5. Working with Related Groups and Professions** – *A responsibility of the social welfare field is to reach out to a variety of related groups and professions with common values and goals, with a view to taking collaborative action toward achieving social development objectives.*

Social welfare claims to be especially concerned with humanistic, humanitarian and moral perspectives on social development. It is evident on the one hand that not everyone, nor every organization within what is called Australian social welfare strongly adheres to these values. On the other hand, there are perhaps increasing numbers of people and organizations, some of them even in commercial activities, who claim strong allegiance to these values. The implications of this in terms of whom we in social welfare work with, and whom we work against, are far-reaching.

The Australian social welfare sector consists of an incredibly wide array of organizations and people whom somehow or other we see as belonging together through supposedly espousing common values. But to what extent do they? The record of so-called co-ordinating bodies in Australian social welfare scarcely

indicates widespread value consensus for community-based action. What we seem to agree upon is that our own autonomy and vested interests must not be affected. I confess that I have the impression that membership of these bodies is often used as a way of preserving institutional and personal territory rather than genuinely working towards community-wide social welfare perspectives. It could well be that we need to think about community-wide social welfare planning bodies with some statutory teeth. Whatever our aspirations may have been, I do not think any of us who have been associated with councils of social service over the years can claim they have become strong active centres of social welfare policy development, designing and changing, from a community perspective, our actual social welfare programs. In fact, how could they? – given the attitudes of their members; the virtual non-membership of large social welfare sectors like health, housing and education; the almost separate developments of councils like those for the ageing and for mental health; the sometimes ambiguous and tentative relationship of councils to statutory bodies; and finally, symptomatic of all the rest, a level of personnel and financial resources sufficient to guarantee survival but not much more.

So far I have avoided talking about a specifically *national* social welfare identification, although this has been implied by talking about the social development goals of Australian society. All of us are members of our national society, as well as of more limited social systems like our individual States, our cities, our shires or municipalities. Because of our increasing economic, social and political interdependence our perception of ourselves as Australians entitled to similar standards of social welfare services wherever we might live is likely to be enhanced. As I see it, we fall very far short of this in many of our social welfare fields at present, and we will not achieve it while we allow our more familiar and manageable state and smaller social system perspectives to predominate.

All of this brings me to the final national role of social welfare suggested by the Working Party.

6. Helping Those in Need of Services – *As part of its more traditional concern for the health and well-being of the handicapped, disadvantaged and dependent groups, social welfare can fill an increasingly important role. It can assist these groups to play a full part in the community as workers and citizens. This will ensure their participation in decisions about the provision of welfare and other social service benefits. Social welfare personnel can act as spokesmen where appropriate for the more inarticulate and deprived sections of the community.*

Social welfare services have an important contribution to make to the physical, mental and social well-being of citizens of all classes who will be subject to the strains of rapid economic and social change.

Even without extending itself into new broader roles, I consider Australian social welfare has an urgent and massive task on its hands to provide a national network of adequate social welfare services. It cannot, however, completely ignore the broad social development changes I mentioned earlier. Yet what is it to do? Its resources are already overstretched in its traditional areas of concern, its own house is far from in order – it is still struggling to achieve community, rather than agency perspectives, on its particular social problem areas, and national perspectives, let

alone standards, are only slowly emerging. Let me be frank about it, I do not think Australian social welfare is in a condition to take responsible leadership in broad Australian social development. Perhaps the best we can hope for is that when eventually the spreading social development perspective reaches the social welfare sector of our society, we will measure up under close scrutiny. It is not uncommon now in the United States for many of the existing social welfare services to be listed among the major impediments to that society's social development. Can we say with confidence that this would not be the case here? I know of a number of social welfare programs where the real point of the service appears to lie in the lives and satisfactions of the service providers and sponsors rather than in the lives of those whom we call service recipients. I believe the path of morally justifiable social development lies in the direction of balancing the claims and interests of all the people involved on both sides of the service transactions. If social welfare planning ignores or short changes either side, it is open to moral challenge. However, this is still only talking about specifically social welfare activities.

I again want to remind you that social development as conceived in this talk is concerned with the basic institutional arrangements of our society. The social development league is the big time, the big league. It is, and must be, the league in which government operates.

Last week, Mrs Edna Chamberlain, the Federal President of the Australian Association of Social Workers, called upon the Commonwealth Government to consider convening 'a national conference on social development objectives for Australia in the 1970s, ensuring participation of a very broad cross-section of all professions and wide varieties of community groups'. This is what government should be about – taking leadership and accepting political responsibility for the broad direction of our society, in fullest collaboration and consultation with the members of our society. The short-fall in performance is painfully obvious at present. And this is one reason why group after group – in social welfare and outside it – is flexing its muscles and wanting to take on society as a whole. Many of our aspirations need to be cut down to size, not to restrict our social concern or our enthusiasm, but to enable us to operate more effectively in the complex, inter-dependent society in which we live.²⁴

This address gives some indication of the widespread social unrest, in Australia and elsewhere, before the Whitlam government's advent in December 1972.

7.6.5 Revising the ACOSS Constitution

The constitution under which ACOSS operated in the 1960s, became operative in June 1959, when the council changed from 'Australian Council of Social Welfare', its original name adopted in 1955. (A pre-existing organisation, composed of state councils of social service, had agreed to give up its title to the wider body.) The stated purpose of the Council was:

To provide an organisation in which all fields of social welfare in Australia and

24 R.J. Lawrence, 'The Role of Social Welfare in Australian Social Development', an address to the annual meeting of ACOSS, 1971.

its Trust Territories may be represented by bringing together in association State councils of social service, national social welfare organisations and appropriate Commonwealth statutory bodies.

By 1966, six amendments had been made to the constitution. Further amendments were referred to the constitution committee located in Adelaide. However, before any further alterations were made, the ACOSS executive decided in 1968 that a study should be made 'as to whether the Constitution was effective in allowing the Council to undertake the role now seen to be appropriate, and that as a first step the views of member bodies should be sought'. In August 1969, Council asked a constitution review committee to consider this material and other material relevant to the Council's role and future development, and make recommendations on what form of constitution would best enable the Council to develop effectively.

The initial composition of this committee was: outgoing executive members – W. C. Langshaw and Monsignor J. F. McCosker;²⁵ incoming executive members – Judith Green, Dr Adrian Paul, and Elizabeth Ward; other members – A. W. King, Professor R. J. Lawrence, and Spencer Colliver; and ex officio – chairman, hon. solicitor, and executive officer. It was seen as appropriate that the chairman, Major-General Roy Gordon, should chair the committee, but he declined and the responsibility passed to Judith Green. She was an ACOSS vice-chairman (New South Wales), who succeeded Roy Gordon in August 1971 as ACOSS chairman. George Shipp, a political scientist from UNSW, and talented younger Australians, Jim Spigelman and Peter Collins, contributed to the early work of the committee. Both Hope Clayton and then Joan Brown from mid-1970, provided excellent executive support for the work of the committee.

In August 1970, Judith Green provided Council with an interim written report from the constitution committee.²⁶ The committee had met 9 times since February 1970, and in addition a sub-committee of the main committee had met 5 times. On the basis of:

- material provided by state council and member agencies;
- a wide range of material from related bodies in other countries;²⁷
- the characteristics of Australian society;²⁸ and
- discussion of the 'ACOSS Idea' – consideration of the present and future role of ACOSS,

The committee had concluded that there was a vital need for an organisation or organisations whose objectives would be directed to two major areas:

25 The minutes of our meetings do not record him as ever attending.

26 Judith Green, 'Interim Report of the Constitution Committee to all members of Council', August 1970.

27 The constitutions of the Canadian Welfare Council, the Netherlands National Council of Social Welfare and British Standing Conference of Councils of Social Service were of particular interest.

28 Through Allan King, the AMP Society provided the committee with a detailed statement on economic aspects. George Shipp made his contribution mainly on political aspects. We used a chapter on demography by Reg Appleyard in the new edition of *Australian Society*, to help inform us on demographic aspects.

A. An organisation broadly representative of the major sectors of Australian society, which would provide a centre for data collection, analysis and informed discussion of national social conditions and social development; and B. An organisation of social welfare agencies which would be concerned to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of social welfare services.

The committee had considered at length whether it was feasible to adapt or 'patch' the present ACOSS structure to serve these objectives effectively. It had come to three conclusions. 1. With increasing membership, it was no longer feasible to govern the organisation effectively by a six-monthly council directly representing all members. The committee was therefore recommending fairly extensive changes in the structure of the organisation. This was considered necessary even if ACOSS continued to carry out its present functions. It was even more essential if the above objectives of A and B were to be carried out. 2. It was not though wise to attempt to carry out both sets of objectives (A and B) within one organisation. The differences in possible membership, in sources of finance, and in desirable structure all tended to create serious problems in a common organisation. It was considered likely that in a combined organisation, the aims of one would take second place to the other, or both sets of functions would be carried out inadequately. 3. The committee therefore recommended that objectives A and B should be carried out by two separate organisations.

The committee proposed the Australian Council of Social Service Agencies (ACOSSA) to carry out objective B, and the Australian Council of Social Affairs (ACSA) to carry out objective A. The proposed change of name from the present ACOSS was considered important so as to stress the agency base of the organisation and its duty to service the needs of its member agencies, to assist in evaluating agency programs and to encourage a more satisfactory intermeshing of agency programs. It was noted, however, that the name ACOSS was becoming known and recognisable and any change would lose this initial advantage.

The interim report described the committee's recommended objects, membership and structure of the two organisations. ACOSSA would have two main aims: 1. To improve the effectiveness and efficiency of social welfare services at a national level by means of 8 listed objectives; and 2. To take the initiative to establish a body called the Australian Council of Social Affairs (ACSA), which would be broadly representative of the major sections of Australian society and would provide a centre of data collection, analysis and informed discussion of national social conditions and social development, and continue as a participant in ACSA once it was established. ACSA would promote the social development of the nation by means of 7 proposed objectives.²⁹ ACOSSA would call together a group of about 25 designated organisations to discuss the formation of ACSA. This group would elect a steering committee, who would consider the appropriate structure for ACSA and determine its future constitution.

²⁹ See p. 328.

Some suggested designated organisations were listed alphabetically.³⁰

Our interim report concluded with:

If such extensive reorganisation is to take place, it is clearly desirable that all member organisations should have ample opportunity to discuss the proposals. The committee considers it desirable, in addition to the usual methods, to organise a seminar to discuss the proposals for both organisations. However, the immediate need is to circulate all State Councils and Member Agencies to obtain their views on these proposals.

At the council meeting of ACOSS in August 1970, it was decided this interim report be referred to state councils and member agencies for full discussion, with comments to the constitution committee by the end of November. If there was substantial agreement the committee was asked to formulate a constitution embodying the present proposals. If no agreement was reached, the committee was asked to formulate fresh proposals. Progress was to be reported at the next council meeting in February 1971.

When the committee reported to this meeting, only 8 replies from the 34 members had been received! The response was disappointing (to put it mildly), both numerically and in the amount of detail in each reply. With few exceptions, comment had concentrated on the proposed ACOSS/ACSA division without much comment of the structural changes proposed in the existing ACOSS. The majority of the opinion expressed (6 out of 8) did not endorse the committee's suggestion of two organisations. The committee was still convinced of the vital importance of the ACSA-type functions to the Australian society and believed ACOSS should give serious consideration to taking the initiative in establishing the body. However, it now decided to concentrate on obtaining a fuller expression of opinion from all ACOSS members on its proposals for changing the present ACOSS constitution. The major proposal of two organisations had diverted attention from these.³¹

At its meeting in March 1971, the committee received correspondence from QCOSS and noted that 'for the first time the functional division idea had been grasped'. QCOSS had appointed a sub-committee who had given the committee's interim report a great deal of thought:

We would like to express our appreciation for the amount of work that has been put into the Interim Report, especially for the way the Committee has analysed the various functions of ACOSS in relation to the needs of the Australian social welfare field. It was felt, however, that it would be a pity if ACOSS were to be reduced in its functions, particularly at this stage when the concept of ACOSS and its role in the social welfare field is changing, and is becoming broader and more forward looking.

30 Agriculture representative, ANZAAS committee for social responsibility in science, architects –town planning branch, Australian Association of Social Workers, Australian College of Education, ACOSSA, Australian Council of Churches, Australian Council of Trade Unions, Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations, Australian Medical Association, Australian Institute of Political Science, Australian Institute of Urban Studies, Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Manufacturers, Economic Society of Australia and New Zealand, Law Council of Australia, National Health and Medical Research Council, Social Science Research Council, Sociologists Association.

31 J. Green, 'Constitution Committee Report to Council', 12/2/71.

We agree generally with the Committee that there is a need for the kind of proposals set out in the interim report, but would like to see the two approaches subsumed under ACOSS as one organisation.

We propose that the new ACOSS would have two departments or divisions-

- (a) a department concerned with the service aspects and
- (b) a department concerned with the broader aspects of Australian social welfare, such as those functions projected by the Committee for the proposed Australian Council of Social Affairs.

ACOSS could continue to exist under its present name or with a new name, and might eventually have more than two divisions – each with considerable autonomy – ACOSS administration exercising a coordinating function between the divisions or departments.

Our Sub-Committee was not in favour of the proposal for two separated organisations because it was felt that any fragmentation means some duplication of costs, time, and other resources and creates in itself the difficulty of relating these two fields.³²

For this March meeting, Joan Brown had prepared an excellent draft document to make a fresh attempt to obtain expressions of opinion from all the membership on the proposed structural changes to the ACOSS constitution. Each member organisation was to be asked to give its views on the provided sheets on five major structural questions – objects, membership, congress of members, board of governors, and executive committee. Each sheet listed the relevant proposals and the current situation under the present constitution. It was decided the reply date should be by the end of May. There would be no chance of implementing the new constitution in August 1971. Roy Gordon attended the March meeting and thanked us on behalf of council for the work and energy we had put into the consideration of this vital subject. At our meeting on 8 June, only a limited number of returns had been received. The committee decided that while it would like to find some means of obtaining a greater expression of opinion, it could not go on sitting indefinitely. It would finalise its report for the August council meeting and it would be up to the council to take the next steps. Meanwhile, all who had not replied would be recirculated, with follow-up telephone calls if necessary, results would be collated and circulated to the committee by the end of June, our next meeting would be in mid-July, and time would be set aside at the August council meeting for discussion of the committee's report. 'Professor R. J. Lawrence will attend and enlarge on the report and answer questions.'

On 15 July, we decided on our final report after consideration of the replies received by then from the almost 50% of the members who had responded to the questionnaire. The final report was a tribute to Joan Brown's professional skills. It set down our final proposals, showing clearly when they had been amended in the light comments received, and giving reasons when proposals received were not acted upon by the committee.

³² Letter, Eric Gough to Miss J. C. Brown, executive officer, ACOSS, 16/11/70.

The New Constitution

In October 1972, ACOSS adopted a new constitution, which came into full force in August 1973. The ACOSS 1972/73 annual report stated:

This will, we hope give us an effective form of government through a smaller Board of Governors while at the same time, by removing restrictions on those who can be nominated to the Board and by the activities of an Annual Congress of Members, ensuring that ACOSS remains responsive to community wishes and needs.³³

ACOSS now had 15 objectives in its constitution:

- Carrying out programs designed to contribute to the elimination of poverty and the promotion of the well-being of disadvantaged and vulnerable individuals and groups.
- Promoting consultation and cooperation amongst non-government organisations and government authorities involved in social welfare activities
- Stimulating interest in, and providing information on, social welfare activities in Australia and other countries
- Providing a forum to discuss common problems in a spirit of mutual understanding.
- Encouraging education and training for social welfare personnel.
- Providing advice on social welfare services, both between and within services.
- Carrying out services to develop social welfare organisations.
- Promoting citizen participation in social welfare.
- Promoting and undertaking research into social welfare problems and services, either at the request of non-government or government authorities, or on its own initiative.
- Encouraging the development of national social policies in major social welfare areas – paying due regard to the claims and responsibilities of local, city, regional, state, national, and international authorities, and to the changing nature of the national society.
- Undertaking at national level or at other levels action which appears to be in the best interests of social welfare in Australia.
- Participating in the development of social welfare in Australia's Trust Territories by cooperation with appropriate organisations within those Territories.
- Participating in the development of international social welfare particularly through membership of the International Council on Social Welfare.

The unchanged general composition of ACOSS was basically two sets of member organisations – councils of social service and national organisations. In addition were individual and organisational associates. A new provision for affiliated organisations, which had hoped to attract government organisations involved in furthering social welfare, had almost no subsequent takers.

The new annual congress of members consisted of delegates appointed

³³ Australian Council of Social Service, *17th Annual Report 1972–73*, p. 6.

biennially – two from each national organisation, 6 each from NCOSS and VCOSS, 4 each from QCOSS, SACOSS, and WACOSS, and 2 each from the councils of social service in Tasmania, the ACT, Northern Territory, and Trust Territories. The congress of members elected the president and other elected members of the board of governors, had the power to change the constitution, and had the right to comment, criticise or make recommendations on past, present or future programs of the council and on matters of council policy.

ACOSS was now managed by a board of governors meeting at least twice in each year. It consisted of a president and 16 other persons. Each state or territory council of social service was entitled to fill a seat on the board. The other 8 seats were filled by election at the congress of members. This replaced the previous unwieldy governance structure in which each national member organisation could have a representative, together with state and territory councils of social service. The president and members of the board of governors were eligible for re-election for a second consecutive term.

As a social policy scholar, a participant in ACOSS and state council of social service activities, and as an active member of the ACOSS constitution review committee, I was very aware of the difficulty of trying to combine a number of functions in the one organisation – acting as a peak coordinating body for the nation's voluntary welfare agencies, as federal organisation of the state councils of social service, as a national coordinating forum for social welfare policy discussion, and as spokesperson for the most disadvantaged members of the Australian community. In addition, its tiny financial resources made the effective performance of its functions problematic and substantial government subsidy could put in jeopardy its autonomy.³⁴ The ACSA idea made considerable societal sense, and I, in fact, was the one on the constitution sub-committee who prepared the original draft of a possible ACSA constitution. It was, however, unrealistic for us to think that it would win the interest and support of the ACOSS membership without a lot of preparatory discussion, and that would have taken time and effort away from many more apparently pressing concerns.

7.6.6 A Proposed National Inquiry into Social Welfare

In May 1972, ACOSS published a pamphlet calling for a national inquiry into social welfare.³⁵ The approach in the pamphlet had the general approval of council, comment had been sought by members, and I was part of a small group who finalised the document prepared by Joan Brown. Joan said, 'Sorry to ask you to do yet another job, but I rely on your known interest in this issue!!'³⁶ I, in fact, wrote the final version of the suggested terms of reference for the inquiry.

In the pamphlet, the term 'social welfare' was used in its broadest sense to mean all the social organisations and policies whose aim is the maintenance and enhancement of general social and living conditions including income,

34 John Lawrence, *Social Policy Research: 25 Years of a National Research Centre*, Social Policy Research Centre, University of New South Wales, 2006, p. 11.

35 *A National Inquiry Into Social Welfare*, prepared and published by the Australian Council of Social Service, May 1972.

36 Letter, Joan Brown to John Lawrence, 8/3/72.

employment, education, health, housing and recreation. It also includes the more traditional form of a prime concern with the social and living conditions of particular community groups, usually vulnerable ones. Six developmental stages in the structure of social welfare in Australia were distinguished. 1. A state-voluntary partnership – 19th century. 2. The entry of the Commonwealth into social welfare – 1900–1952. 3. The Commonwealth and personal services 1944 – the present. 4. The Commonwealth and voluntary agencies 1954 – the present. 5. Local government and social welfare – the 1960s. 6. Private enterprise and social welfare – post war period.

Why an inquiry? The last broadly-based review of the structure and content of social welfare at the national level was in the 1940s. 'In the ensuing quarter century we have seen a marked change in attitudes towards the provision of social welfare services, an enormous growth in expenditure, an increasingly confused pattern of service delivery and a steadily developing complexity in service structures. A number of areas needed close examination. 1. The values and goals of social welfare policy. 2. Allocation of financial resources. 3. Confusion in service delivery. 4. Who should provide the services? A national inquiry was needed to examine relationships between departments, between levels of government and between the statutory and voluntary sector. 'The kind of inquiry we are envisaging is not a matter of Government alone, but of all concerned Australians. If we are to consider what kind of society we are to live in, then all Australians have a right at least to be aware of the discussions, and where desired, to participate in them at various levels. ... Social welfare services are no longer directed only at the poor. They are essentially a matter of concern for the whole community.' It was essential that machinery for public discussion and participation is provided.

Who should conduct the inquiry?

The task we are suggesting will be a long, complex and difficult one. We do not think it is a task for a committee of either House or even a Joint Parliamentary Committee. It is inevitable that from time to time party political issues or the prospect of an election will intervene and distort or hamper the inquiry. Nor is it a task for one man or woman alone. The issues are too complex and the skills required too diverse.

We believe the appointment of a Royal Commission is needed, including upon it those with skills and knowledge from the Commonwealth, State and Local Government and Voluntary Agencies fields (though not acting as representatives), experts in Social Welfare and user and citizen members. The Commission should be given ample research and secretarial assistance and allowed adequate time to complete its task. Expert task forces may also be necessary to provide assistance to the Commission's work.

Such a Commission could command the respect of governments, of the voluntary sector and of the public generally and this will be essential if all levels of government and society generally are to cooperate in helping it to reach worthwhile conclusions.

The Commission's terms of reference should be as broad and open as possible and should include the following:

1. To consider, on the best evidence available, what social values appear to be important in contemporary Australian society and are likely to have continuing relevance in the foreseeable future. This should include consideration of widely shared values and of distinctive value systems of population groups, such as Aborigines and other ethnic groups and religious minorities.
2. In the light of Australian social values, to consider what are desirable national social goals for the foreseeable future.
3. In the light of these values and social goals –
 - (a) To examine current social welfare policies and services, including stated and implied priorities and methods of service provision.
 - (b) To recommend community priorities for social welfare policies and services and appropriate machinery for regular review of priorities.
 - (c) To recommend in broad terms appropriate social welfare functions for Commonwealth, State and Local Governments, Voluntary Agencies and Private Enterprise.
 - (d) To consider the desirability and practicability of increasing client and citizen participation in Australia's social welfare policy making and service provision and make appropriate recommendations.
4. To make specific recommendations for reshaping social welfare policies and services, and methods of service provision, required to implement recommendations under 3b, c, and d.
5. In carrying out the inquiry, to promote all appropriate means, maximum participation and discussion.

On 17 August, 1972, I wrote to the editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*:

On 4th August, under the misleading heading 'Poverty Inquiry', your paper had a brief paragraph stating that a Federal Labor Government would hold a public national inquiry into social welfare within 3 months of taking office. Now the present Federal Government has decided that it will hold an inquiry into poverty in Australia and the inquiry is expected to be well under way before the elections. Its terms of reference are apparently to be announced next week. (SMH 16th August)

I wish to point out the important difference in focus between a national 'poverty' inquiry and a national 'social welfare' inquiry, and to urge that the latter not the former is badly needed in this country. A social welfare inquiry would incorporate all the concerns of a poverty inquiry, but would place these in a broad social welfare framework. Overseas thinking, especially in developed industrial nations, emphasises that questions of equitable distribution of 'goods' and burdens can only be dealt with by examining the life styles and life opportunities of all the society's citizens. A 'poverty', rather than a 'social rights and responsibilities' and a 'social justice' focus, smacks of 19th century thinking. It focuses attention on particular groups of disadvantaged people, and not on the general social systems in which they live. Moreover, it is likely to add to the difficulties of their present social conditions the stigma of being labelled 'the poor'.

(The SMH letters editor removed the sentences in italics.)

I wish, therefore, to commend to the present Federal Government, to other citizens, to the churches, and to your newspaper, that a national social welfare inquiry not a poverty inquiry be established. The Commonwealth Joint Parliamentary

Inquiry on Social Security during World War II was our last!

Many informed people in the social welfare field have been urging such an inquiry for some time. To my knowledge, by far the best case for it has been presented in a document prepared by the Australian Council of Social Service. That body, which is in a better position than any other in Australia to have an overview of our social welfare conditions and our social service structures, has recommended the establishment of a Royal Commission, whose terms of reference might include the following:

(See above)

A social welfare inquiry like this would be a major national undertaking extending over a considerable period and requiring commissioned studies. It would be essentially about the quality of the social life to be experienced by all the citizens of our society.

When the Whitlam Labor government won office in December 1972, it inherited the Henderson poverty inquiry, appointed in the dying stages of the MacMahon government. It did not press ahead with the recommended inevitably long-term national social welfare inquiry. Early in 1973, Henderson wished the government to expand the terms of reference of his inquiry to cover education and poverty, law and poverty, health and poverty, and selected economic aspects of poverty, but the Government appointed separate commissioners for each of these areas and each reported separately and later than Henderson. A great deal of useful work was done by the poverty commissioners and by other parallel social inquiries but the process and outcome was, in fact, a social welfare dog's breakfast!

7.6.7 ACOSS Evidence to the Poverty Inquiry

The 1972–73 annual report of ACOSS gives a brief account of its work in connection with the poverty inquiry:

The ACOSS evidence to (the poverty inquiry) covered a wide area of broad social policy and of policies in particular areas, which together must be considered in formulating Anti-Poverty policies in Australia. The ACOSS Poverty Inquiry Committee met first in October 1972 under the Chairmanship of Professor Noel Drane.³⁷ It established first a definition of poverty, 'as a life condition created by a constellation of deprivation factors which together result in a standard of living *significantly* below that acceptable for and by the community'.

This definition not only formed a basis for our work, but was accepted by a number of other organisations for their submissions, reflecting the very wide dissatisfaction with poverty definitions based on minimum income levels alone.

Over 100 people on sub-committees, committees of member organisations and as individuals involved themselves actively in the preparation of the ACOSS evidence and the 362 page submission containing a wealth of detail about poverty in Australia, is an outstanding record of their work.

In order to make the best use of this, the submission was not only sent to the

³⁷ He was a professor of economics at Macquarie University.

Poverty Inquiry, but was published for sale under the title 'Poverty – The ACOSS Evidence'. The attention commanding cover, designed at Long Bay Gaol contributes to its impact.

The ACOSS Evidence, opens up a large number of subjects on which further work is needed. Already groups within and outside ACOSS have begun to use it as a basis for study and action and its value as a social document has already been established.³⁸

I was a member of the ACOSS poverty inquiry committee, and Joan Brown and I represented ACOSS at public hearings of the inquiry. The committee's substantial report to the Poverty Commission reflected the work of a number of specialised working groups. I was active in the national values and goals committee. Its orienting work was used at the outset of the committee's report, immediately after sections on the definition of poverty and what it meant to be in poverty.

VALUES

The assumption underlying the holding of the national Poverty Inquiry is that the existence of people in poverty in Australian society is a bad thing, and that Australian society should do something about it. Value judgements are clearly involved – first, in passing judgements on the life conditions covered by the concept of 'poverty', and second, in passing judgements on what ought to be done to change the situation. At both stages, facts and values are interwoven. At the first stage, what definition of 'poverty' is chosen, and what 'facts' are gathered and from whom, will depend heavily on the value screens of the investigator and of those providing the data. Once the data is in, what are judged to be desirable and undesirable aspects of the social conditions revealed will again depend heavily on the value screen of who is doing the judging. At the second stage – of making recommendations to change undesirable social conditions – values play an even more obvious role, but facts need also to be strongly present if prescribed changes are to be feasible. There will, of course, be a crucial third stage when the government and others decide how to act on the basis of the Report. Again, the values of the decision-makers will be of paramount importance.

As in other modern countries, the institutions and values of Australian society are under challenge and can no longer be taken for granted. The present generation of Australians are being expected to be more explicit about their values – about what are Australian life styles and what they should be. The contemporary 'quality of life' discussion, while it is often within a limited view of what constitutes 'life', is basically a discussion about the values for present-day and future Australians. *It is hoped that in line with this current climate, the Poverty Inquiry will give full and direct consideration to 'value' questions.*

What are 'Values'?

Australians, like other human beings, are not indifferent to the world they live in. They have values or objectives in terms of which they make choices and behave in characteristic ways.

38 Australian Council of Social Service, *17th Annual Report 1972–73*, p. 8.

The term 'value' is commonly used in two senses. One refers to a specific evaluation of an object. The other refers to criteria, or standards, in terms of which specific evaluations are made. The second usage sees values as conceptions either of the desirable ('positive' values) or of the undesirable ('negative values' or 'disvalues').

The existence of values of individual Australians and cultural values of Australian society can be verified by such complementary methods as:

- Taking note of what people say their values are. (People can to some extent tell what values they hold, although such testimony is not fully accurate or complete.)
- Inferring values from things which have a capacity to arouse emotions.
- Observing what people pay attention to.
- Studying what is left unsaid. (Things taken for granted in a culture are often of fundamental importance in that culture.)
- Systematically studying people's choices when they are confronted with alternatives.
- Observing the things that are rewarded and the things that are punished.

We ourselves have made a number of value statements and value assumptions. We base what we have done on a basic moral belief in the dignity and worth of every individual and his/her right to social justice. (Various policies and practices of concern were cited ...)

... We accept that our values are not necessarily shared by all, but we urge that an explicit discussion of values underlying the evidence given to the Poverty Inquiry is an essential part of the process of formulating both feasible and just, anti-poverty policies.

This material sent to the main committee was understandably not in the committee's final report:

Following are a series of propositions about values, which are useful in assessing the evidence collected for this Report and its recommendations:

- Values are not all held with equal intensity. They may be put in a hierarchy depending on the importance attached to each.
- The same value may be in some circumstances seen as an end in itself, in other circumstances a means to some other end.
- Declared values may or may not be the same as operational values. The latter are those that are actually present as revealed by the various empirical tests mentioned.
- Values are inevitably related to the conditions people experience, and they change through time as conditions change. The level and strength of people's value aspirations are to a great extent social products.
- Values are not discrete or isolated, but tend to occur in systems. They are, in other words, interdependent, arranged in a pattern and subject to mutual variation. People's lives are built around a whole constellation of values.
- A single important value may take precedence over other less important attainable values if the former can be achieved only at the expense of the latter.
- Realisation of an important value, for example, education, health, or employment, may open up whole new realms of value for a person.

- While behaviour may not always be consistent with values held, possession of values results in strain towards consistent choice of certain types of behaviour whenever alternatives are offered.
- A dominant value is determined by the extensiveness of the value in the total activity of the system – personal, group, or societal; its duration; the intensity with which the value is sought or maintained; and in groups and cultures, the prestige of the value carriers.

(These were propositions that had come from my own reading, teaching and research on values.)

7.6.8 ACOSS Board Member 1973–77

Under the new constitution, in August 1973, the newly-constituted ACOSS Congress of Members elected, for two-year terms, David Scott as president and eight persons to the Board of Governors, additional to the eight members appointed by the eight councils of social service. Any person could stand for election as president or board member. David Scott was director of the Brotherhood of St Laurence and president of VCOSS; earlier, he was first director of Community Aid Abroad. He had represented VCOSS on the council since 1971 and was a member of the ACOSS executive.

The eight board members in seats filled by state and territory councils were: Harold Weir (ACT), Judith Green (NSW), Bruce Alcorn (NT), C. R. Gilbert (Q), Barbara Garrett (SA), R. W. Young (Tas), Walter Lippmann (Vic), and Mrs M. O. Stephenson (WA). The eight people elected to open seats were: Don Crawford (superintendent, Minda home, SA; Churchill fellow, 1968; representative of Australian Association for the Mentally Retarded on previous ACOSS council); Murray Geddes (Department of Urban and Regional Development; representative of AASW on previous ACOSS council and member of ACOSS executive); Lawrie Hayes (a social worker with Brisbane Life Line centre; active in QCOSS); Mrs Shirley Horne (treasurer, and member of ACOSS executive); Mrs A. Heading (school teacher; national president, Association of Civilian Widows); Professor John Lawrence;³⁹ Dr Adrian Paul (AMA representative on previous ACOSS council and member of ACOSS executive); and Chris O'Connell (Department of Urban and Regional Development; represented Australian Union of Students on previous ACOSS council).

My first year on the ACOSS board was Joan Brown's last as secretary-general, and David Scott's first year as president. Shirley Horne's treasurer's report for that year referred to the very substantial increase in the Australian government grant, the availability of project grants from the Poverty Inquiry and the Social Welfare Commission, and the increase in income from publications and other sources. The results were evident in the annual report for the year. However, sharply escalating costs had led to a deficit at the end of the year. The treasurer expressed special appreciation for the work of Joan Brown. She had shown an outstanding capacity, not only in guiding the general work of

39 The statement on my candidature (not prepared by me) included: 'He has been particularly generous in the way he has made himself available in an advisory capacity to the ACOSS staff at all times'.

the council, but also in financial management, establishing program budgeting and exercising careful oversight of its operation.⁴⁰

In his first report as ACOSS president, David Scott identified four common features in ACOSS programs: a central commitment to human rights and to means of making these effective; an over-riding concern for the least powerful in the community, the poor and the socially disadvantaged; a belief in the right of all, including the least powerful to participate in decision making which affects their lives, and as a concomitant, the rejection of paternalism as a basis for policy; following logically from this a belief in the right to information which will enable effective participation.

The ACOSS Board, a very varied group of men and women, has proved an effective working group. Debate at meetings is informed, often forceful, but always friendly, and finally decisive. At the same time participation by ACOSS members in the development of ACOSS programs has been particularly good this year.

Although the organisation was functioning well, a study group was examining the role and functioning of national and state councils of social service and the relationships between them. Establishing relationships with the new regional councils of social development under the Australian Assistance Plan (a Whitlam government initiative) was now included in the discussion.⁴¹

The Australian Assistance Plan – Structural and Process Issues

Early in 1974, the secretary-general produced for the membership and many others 'Regional Structures and Strategies'. This was a background paper which reviewed and analysed available information on regionalism in Australia and some of the trends which were emerging. I was an active member with Joan Brown in a small committee⁴² which in April 1974 provided comments mainly on the AAP discussion paper no. 1 (August 1973), but also made reference to the AAP progress report (January 1974) and the 1972–3 annual report of the Social Welfare Commission.⁴³ The material upon which our comments were based came from multiple sources. This had provided 'access to a range of thinking about the AAP within the social welfare sector' which needed to be taken into account. Our paper concluded with these observations about the community process:

The speed of the introduction and the pilot stage implementation of the Australian Assistance Plan has we are aware been dictated partly by the political situation. However, political realism does not necessarily lead to good community processes. The introduction of a new 'power base' into the present system is presumably intended to lead to a shift in power and resources and the same time put the established system under pressure to function more effectively for the Community.

40 Australian Council of Social Service, *18th Annual Report 1973–74*, p. 34.

41 Australian Council of Social Service, *18th Annual Report 1973–74*, pp.5–6.

42 The committee included Pam Rutledge (Manly Warringah coordinating committee) and Greg Mills (chairman of the ACOSS housing and regional development committee).

43 The Social Welfare Commission was initially responsible for the AAP, but by 1975 the running of it was to be handed over to the Department of Social Security.

Inevitably there will be resistance to this process which needs time to work through. Some of the resistance will be legitimate and it is important not to lump all resisters together as people clinging to power and outdated methods, for the sake of their own survival.

In order to help groups and organisations to adapt to change, we need a much greater flow of information and discussion material of the kind we have recommended in this paper and we need to ensure that more direct work is done with State level organisations both Statutory and Voluntary to help them find ways to ensure the Community benefits from the Plan and to identify those for whom regionalising is inappropriate.

If this task is to be completed by the 1975 Budget Session, then we must 'compensate' for the lack of adequate time for normal community processes to operate, by investing additional resources to speed up the process of change.⁴⁴

The AAP did not survive the demise of the Whitlam government. Evaluations were undertaken of the AAP experiences in the various states, but they were not feeding back into an ongoing national development. Hopes for a new era of collaborative regionally-based social planning with extensive community involvement, but within a national framework, were dashed. The political and structural naivety of trying to effect rapid social change in the Australian social welfare system had not been realised. Community social workers, like Joan Brown, who understood community social welfare structures and processes, were in short supply. Social work schools were belatedly addressing the need, but obviously could not quickly produce large numbers of community workers for the new regional councils for social development, and the many other community jobs which would benefit from their professional knowledge and skills. Inevitably short courses and lower-level training became available to fill the void.

A Participatory ACOSS National Conference, Hobart, 1974

Not surprisingly, the theme for the 8th ACOSS national conference, in Hobart 19–24 May, 1974, was 'Action for Social Change – Whose Responsibility?' Some 350 people from all states and territories attended. The booked accommodation was swamped by the numbers. The annual report (written by Joan Brown) observed:

ACOSS conferences have changed greatly since the early (and looking back) rather placid welfare type conferences. They now tend to be very controversial and a high standard of participation is demanded by those attending. Whereas the majority of participants used to be female and from welfare agencies, the 1974 conference had a slight majority of male attenders and almost half came from other than social work and welfare. The result of all these changes was a hotly argumentative week of lectures, panel discussions, workshops, side meetings and late night get-togethers. ... By the time the conference was staged, participatory action was

44 Australian Council of Social Service, 'Australian Assistance Plan: Comments on Discussion Paper No. 1 Australian Council of Social Service, *18th Annual Report 1973–74* (August 1973), 9th April, 1974, pp. 17–8.

well under way in many areas and groups were already feeling the frustrations of tokenism in consultation, and the many other barriers to true participation. The conference became part of the argument.

For the first time a small but significant group of low income representatives was present at the Conference (assisted by ACOSS). In size, this representation must be regarded as a mere token presence, but it is step in the right direction and we hope that participation in greater numbers can be ensured in the future.⁴⁵

A New Secretary-General

I was disappointed Joan Brown was not continuing as secretary-general, particularly in the midst of all the excitement, chaos and now unravelling of Whitlam government initiatives. She told me, however, that she had made her contribution and was ready to move on; in the times ahead, ACOSS would need a different kind of secretary-general. In May, 1975, Joan McClintock reported staying with Joan Brown in Canada during her overseas leave. Joan had completed a study on retirement policies in Canada for the Canadian Council of Social development, and was now program director – health, for the CCSD.

Canadian community social worker Ed Pennington succeeded Joan Brown in August 1974, as the ACOSS secretary-general. David Scott described his appointment in these terms:

His professional education and work experience in community organisation and social planning make him well qualified for the ACOSS position at a time when we are in the midst of significant changes in social policies and organisation.

For the past four years, Edward Pennington has been executive Director of the Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton, Ontario. This position has involved him in preparation of submissions to committees of enquiry and the establishment of a central information service; pioneering community development activities with low-income citizen groups and tenant organisations; the investigation of a wide range of social issues and the establishment of a volunteer bureau.

Edward Pennington is a Master of Social Work from the University of British Columbia. He is aged 35, married with three children. We welcome him to Australia and to ACOSS.⁴⁶

The appointment seemed a reasonable one, although Ed Pennington's experience had apparently only been at the provincial level in Canada, and it would obviously take time for a non-Australian to understand the Australian social welfare scene, and built the necessary community and professional networks he would need to be effective.

In the president's report in the 1974–75 annual report, David Scott expressed ACOSS's thanks and appreciation to Ed Pennington, 'who so quickly adapted to the Australian scene and is providing efficient, sensitive leadership'. His

45 Australian Council of Social Service, *18th Annual Report 1973–74* (August 1973), 9th April, 1974, pp. 24–5.

46 Australian Council of Social Service, *18th Annual Report 1973–74*, p. 7.

thoughtful statement in his first annual report indicated this,⁴⁷ and he must have been particularly gratified when this annual report received an award from the Australian Institute of Management for distinguished achievement in annual reporting. A helpful innovation was 'An ACOSS Overview' immediately following the opening statements by the president and the secretary-general. The overview of objectives, structure, program, resources, and administration, finished with a section on relationships. A major challenge was to develop and maintain effective working relationships over a long period of time with individuals, and groups, throughout Australia who were 'constituents' and 'publics' of ACOSS.

The first ever meeting of ACOSS and state and territory councils of social service was held 7–8 February, 1975, in Melbourne. The main issues discussed were a finance formula of state and territory councils, role and functions of councils of social service, liaison between ACOSS and the state and territory councils, and relationships with regional councils of social development and their membership in state councils of social service. Initial guidelines for respective functioning were set and it was resolved such meetings should take place on a more regular basis. Attempts were also being made to form worthwhile relationships with national member organisations on new committees and for ad hoc consultations on particular concerns.⁴⁸ In May, 1975, the ACOSS office was relocated from 99 Liverpool Street to larger and more suitable premises at 190 Cumberland street, Sydney.

I was on sabbatical in the UK during the first few months of Ed Pennington's time as secretary-general, and it seemed from the ACOSS material I received that the organisation was still striving to develop in the midst of all the internal and external pressures. With mounting unemployment and monetary inflation (so-called 'stagflation'), reduced confidence in the Whitlam government, and disillusionment with many of the so-called 'social reform' initiatives, specifically social welfare organisations were operating in an increasingly uncertain and difficult environment. A restructured ACOSS finance committee in 1974/75 sought ways to increase its income, and prepared 'Agenda for Action', the ACOSS 1975/76 budget submission to the minister for social security and his department, 'a full and frank description of the situation of all the councils of social service'.⁴⁹

In moving the adoption of the 19th annual report, 1974–75, at the ACOSS annual meeting, I asked what is 'a social welfare interest' in our kind of society? It is where the well-being of people is the primary concern. To give effect to this interest, a multitude of specialised policies and agencies existed – specialised according to which people they concentrated on; what aspects of their lives: health, housing, education, employment, recreation, family relationships, etc; how they helped people in these aspects – finance, help in kind, counselling, information giving, help to get organised, help to get political leverage; under what auspices they operated – different levels of government; non-government

47 Australian Council of Social Service, *19th Annual Report 1974–75*, pp. 4–7.

48 Australian Council of Social Service, *19th Annual Report 1974–75*, p. 11.

49 Australian Council of Social Service, *19th Annual Report 1974–75*, p. 9.

– churches, citizen groups, mutual help groups. In Australia, there was no national description of all these organised services. Most of us, including governments, knew only parts of this system of social welfare services produced by the needs of a modern, urban, industrial society. Directories of social service agencies gave *some* idea at a state level.

ACOSS is the only body in Australia concerned with over-viewing the community's social welfare networks. In viewing the 19th annual report it has done a remarkable job, considering its resources – which are peanuts compared with the expenditures of the major specialised social welfare interests.

A measure of the extent the specialised social welfare organisations are willing to see their concerns in a broad community frame of reference is given by their tangible support of ACOSS at a national level, and the councils of social service at a state level.

I see ACOSS as providing our national society with an ongoing arena where all the various more specialised service organisations, government and non-government, together with concerned citizens, can raise and thrash out social policy issues.

I would ask those who would maintain ACOSS at a chronically low level of support, where else in our society is occurring the ongoing opportunity for open, community-based social policy debate?

I have a model of a national democratic society having a large number of social policy debates and decision-making centres, but included amongst these must be at least one national centre which is not tied to one or other of the more specialised social welfare concerns, whether they be government or non-government in character.⁵⁰

Funding Uncertainty and a Shock Resignation

The Commonwealth grant to ACOSS, announced in August 1975, was 'a devastating \$90,000', with nothing for the state and territory councils. \$475,000 had been anticipated! The grant for 1974/75 had been \$175,000. On top of this, David Scott informed board members on 28 August, 1975, that Ed Pennington had resigned as secretary-general 'in view of the extraordinary financial situation of ACOSS'. Ed had taken the decision 'with great personal and professional anguish'. However, he believed the short and long-term objectives of the organisation would be assisted by this action. 'My only consolation is a sense of professional pride that I have done everything within my capabilities within the year to help strengthen the role of ACOSS in Australia'. Ed would continue to assist ACOSS until his departure for Canada with his family, expected later in September.⁵¹

A campaign for reinstatement of a level of funding based on the previous year's grant with an allowance for inflation was ultimately successful, with the Whitlam government making a partial reinstatement and the subsequent Fraser government approving an additional grant. Eventually the total

50 'Remarks by R.J.L. in moving the adoption of the 19th annual report, 1974–75, of ACOSS'. Personal archives.

51 Letter, David Scott to all board members, 28/8/75.

Commonwealth funding for 1975/76 was \$210,000. The campaign to at least restore the funding level of the previous year made members of parliament, government departments, voluntary agencies, and the public, more aware of the functions and importance of ACOSS and the state and territory councils of social service.⁵²

As part of the campaign, in September 1975 I wrote to the editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*:

In an editorial on August 30, 1975, you state 'the sooner the Government can bring itself to look long and hard at the whole problem (of bringing sense and clarity into the present social welfare maze) – not just individual parts of it – the better.'

In May 1972, in a widely distributed document the Australian Council of Social Service put the case for a broad-gauge national social welfare inquiry. In an editorial headed 'First Things First', on August 22, 1972, you acknowledged such an inquiry might do a great deal of good, but it was essentially a long-term project: and you asked can we afford to wait as long as that? 3 years and many specialised committees of inquiry later, the wisdom of ACOSS's original suggestion is becoming painfully apparent. A great deal of useful specialised work has been done, but as a nation we are scarcely nearer a more coherent set of social welfare arrangements, and now in the face of serious economic difficulties and mounting disillusionment with the national government, a rare major opportunity of overall social welfare reform may well have been lost.

One of the present ironies is that the role of ACOSS and of associated state councils of social service, is apparently so little understood or accepted by the present federal cabinet that it has cut ACOSS's subsidy from \$175,000 to \$90,000. The recent Senate Estimates Committee debate indicates the relevant Minister, Senator Wheedon, is at least reconsidering the situation. In Australian social welfare expenditure, ACOSS's proposed subsidy is incredibly small, yet no other body is potentially so well placed to provide independent discussion and comment on our nation's social welfare policies and services. The Australian Government's Social Welfare Commission is no full alternative to ACOSS. It has not the agency and concerned citizen base of ACOSS, it has a problem in relating effectively to major parts of the social welfare system, and is apparently under threat of extinction.

A full-scale national social welfare inquiry, instituted in 1972, would perhaps by now have clearly established our society's need for a body like ACOSS and would have ensured a level of financial support adequate for its tasks. I hope the national government can find sufficient additional funds to sustain ACOSS at least at a much more realistic level of functioning. We will all be culpable if at a later stage it is discovered that our society badly needs an ACOSS-like body and yet it has been allowed to wither away from relative neglect by the national government.

At the time of Ed Pennington's resignation, David Scott wrote:

The staff feel very deeply about Ed's resignation and it is no exaggeration to say they are shocked by it; however, they appreciate that everyone's main concern must be to ensure that ACOSS continues to do its work effectively and sensitively

52 Australian Council of Social Service, *20th Annual Report 1975–76*, pp. 9, 4.

and they will do everything possible to ensure this.⁵³

In his farewell message to board members, Ed Pennington wrote:

I appreciated the privilege of working with ACOSS during the past year. ... My main wish is that ultimately there will be recognition to the need for ACOSS as a strong, national social policy organisation which will be more than the sum of its parts.

I am sure you will give your utmost cooperation to Joan McCintock who will be Acting Secretary-General after my departure on October 3rd.⁵⁴

ACOSS, was in fact very fortunate to have the deputy secretary-general Joan McClintock willing to serve as the acting director-general for an extended period – until the appointment of Ian Yates in July 1976. Ian came from SACOSS. Unlike his four predecessors in the job (Hope Clayton, Joan Brown, Ed Pennington, and Joan McClintock), he was not professionally qualified in social work, but had a political science background with a strong policy orientation. For most of the year due to staff cuts, Joan McClintock had the assistance of only two policy officers. One of these, Genevieve Rankin a UNSW social work graduate, was an able assistant in the overall development of ACOSS, as well as having policy officer work. As indicated in the 1975/76 annual report, ACOSS still managed to address many social issues during this troubled transitional period, thanks to ‘the skill and commitment of the small ACOSS staff, the many committee members and volunteers and the close working relationships that developed between ACOSS and the State Councils’. Joan McClintock had sound judgement, and was well known and widely accepted in social welfare networks throughout the nation.

The 1975–77 Board

With a long-term commitment to the development of ACOSS as a significant institution in Australia’s social welfare infra-structure and as a board member, I felt special concern for what was happening to the organisation. After my initial two years on the board, I agreed to be nominated in August 1975 for another two years. 21 people were candidates for the eight elected positions on the Board of Governors to be chosen by the ACOSS Congress. Ed Pennington provided half-page statements on each of the candidates and the directions they saw ACOSS should take. In mine, I nominated four directions: greater effectiveness in actual policy change rather than just talking and writing about it; helping to establish guidelines of responsibility for national, state and more local action; using ACOSS’s scarce resources on clear priorities; and taking more responsibility for international, especially regional social welfare concerns.⁵⁵

New elected people on the board were John Brigg (assistant secretary, Department of Capital Territory; interested in new town problems and AAP strategy); Bruce Buchanan (experience in QCOSS; the new ACOSS treasurer);

53 Letter, David Scott to all board members, 28/8/75.

54 Letter, Ed Pennington to board members, 1973–75/1975–77, 2/8/75.

55 Australian Council of Social Service, ‘Biographical Details for Board Nominations’, August 19, 1975.

Laki Jayasuriya (professor and head, Department of Social Work, University of WA; migrant issues; comparative social welfare in southern Asian region; WA evaluator of AAP); Colin Menzies (executive officer, inner Sydney Regional Council for Social Development; experience in urban planning projects; active in NCOSS); and Mrs Ethel Pearce (national president of Parents Without Partners; recent visit to USA and Canada; interested in consumer groups being a useful 'voice' in the national welfare scene through ACOSS). Four of us on the former board were re-elected – Donald Crawford, Murray Geddes, Shirley Horne and John Lawrence. Some able new candidates, including Richard Chisholm, Michael Court, Jim Davidson, John Davoren and John Deeble, had not been successful. Five of the eight nominees of the state and territory councils on the 1975–77 board had served on the previous board – Judith Green, Mary Keller, John Byrne, Barbara Garrett, Walter Lippmann, and Mrs Stephenson.

David Scott reported 1975/76 as an extremely difficult year for ACOSS and the state and territory councils. The annual report for the year described the many issues taken up by ACOSS 'at a time when social policies and priorities were under constant review and change, before, during and after the 1975 Elections'. The attitude of ACOSS to the changes under way would be 'determined largely by the extent to which they assist or are detrimental to the interests of the large numbers of Australians who are in poverty or on low incomes and who do not have ready access to essential health and welfare services'. ACOSS, with a constituency of some 2,000 health and welfare agencies through the state and territory councils, was in a unique position for policy development and review reflecting the views and concerns of client groups and organisations directly involved in providing services – provided it had the necessary resources.⁵⁶

Ian Yates, the new ACOSS secretary-general, prepared a useful discussion paper on ACOSS structure and method for the August Congress in 1976. It first highlighted recent effective restructuring of SACOSS, the state council of social service from which he came. Flexible task forces were now operating instead of policy standing committees, and individual members of the executive committee (the governing body) meeting monthly were now directing or co-directing and being responsible for seven units into which the council's activities were divided. The new structure was 'thematically focused and action-based'. He, of course, recognised that ACOSS related to 8 diverse councils of social service, that it related to diverse national members themselves with diverse state structures and methods, that it was spatially fragmented without adequate resources to adequately compensate for this, and that its board met only 3 of 4 times a year. A number of propositions and alternatives for ACOSS were put forward for consideration.⁵⁷

The ACOSS board meeting on 29 August set up a task force consisting of Barbara Spalding (VCOSS), John Brigg and John Lawrence, to report by 15 October, on matters raised in the secretary-general's paper. This group to

56 Australian Council of Social Service, *20th Annual Report 1975–76*, pp. 4–5.

57 Ian Yates, 'ACOSS 1975 – Some Questions of Structure and Method', 1976 Congress Paper No. 6.

consider ACOSS structures met together with staff members Ian Yates, Joan McClintock and Genevieve Rankin in the ACOSS office on 1 October. We had the benefit of papers from John Brigg (chairman of the group) and Murray Geddes. Murray, a member of the executive of ACOSS since 1973, raised many matters of concern. Several active participants in ACOSS, who had contributed 'considerable energies and interests to its growth', had expressed to him 'growing concern on the need to help improve the organisation's principles of operation, efficiency, and effectiveness. My own consideration of such issues has me almost to the point of setting a deadline after which I would withdraw my involvement with ACOSS if there were no improvement'.⁵⁸

I was asked to prepare the report of the task force on the basis of our wide-ranging discussion on 1 October:

BOARD TASK FORCE ON ACOSS ORGANISATION

Following is a report, for circulation to National Member Agencies and Board members, prior to the Board's next meeting in mid-November.

Assumptions

1. ACOSS should be exemplary in its own organisation –
 - Because of the community importance of attaining its ends.
 - Because it cannot retain credibility or support if it is not effective and efficient in achieving its stated ends.
 - Because its claimed social welfare concerns imply organisational expertise and capacity.
2. At least some parts of the current call for review of ACOSS functioning is soundly based. Various concerns have been expressed:
 - The functioning of the Board. (Members not sufficiently active between Board meetings, in Board meetings, in ACOSS committees, etc.)
 - The functioning of the Congress of Members. (The role of Congress delegates in their organisation, their role between Congress meetings, their identification with ACOSS purposes, etc.. The ability of Congress 'to comment, criticise or make recommendations on past, present or future programs of the Council and on matters of Council policy' – clause 6J of the Constitution.)
 - Board and Congress decisions taken without regard to resource implications.
 - The relationship of 'COSS Movement' meetings to the Board.
 - Inactive committees.
 - Limited committee membership.
 - Disbanding or holding in abeyance the work of earlier committees, and/or sub-committees.
 - Isolation of committees from the ACOSS office.
 - Lack of clear lines of accountability.
 - Too much responsibility left with the secretariat – for policy matters, for nominations for elected offices, etc..
 - Inadequate consultation with relevant expertise.
 - Very limited secretarial resources – manpower and money – to service ACOSS activities.

⁵⁸ Letter, Murray Geddes to John Brigg, chairman, ACOSS task force on committees.

- Lack of regular review of tasks, structures, and resources.
- Tasks not completed within reasonable timetables.
- Lack of ability to effect social change.

(These are drawn from the Secretary-General's paper 16/8/76, a statement by Murray Geddes to the Task Force, the secretariat, and some others who had been involved in ACOSS structures.)

3. Very limited financial resources and the scope and complexity of the goals sought through ACOSS can reasonably explain present organisational difficulties. Yet these same conditions call for more explicit organisation, so that a full range of resources is tapped and they are used as beneficially as possible.
4. ACOSS is soundly organised if
 - It has stated goals which it takes seriously.
 - It periodically establishes stated objectives for the organisation's activities, which relate to one or more of the organisation's goals and are within the capacity of the organisation to achieve.
 - It has structures and procedures, which can best achieve the goals and objectives.
 - It gains and utilises sufficient resources (financial, manpower, and know-how) to achieve its objectives.
 - It achieves a maximum of membership committed to ACOSS goals and objectives.

Decisions About ACOSS Structures

Taking the above assumptions into account, the Task Force has prepared the attached schema which cover each of the structures of ACOSS –

- The Board
- The Executive of the Board
- A Board Task Force
- The Congress of Members
- A Standing Committee
- A Sub-Committee of a Standing Committee
- A Task Force of a Standing Committee
- The Secretariat

The purpose is to identify for the Board and the ACOSS membership key decision points in each of these structures. The listed matters for decision are:

- The objectives being pursued.
- The composition of the structure (leadership and membership).
- The resources used (financial, manpower; inside and outside ACOSS).
- The communication network involved (inside and outside ACOSS), including lines of accountability.

For each of these are listed the relevant decision-makers, the criteria which they might be expected to consider in making their decisions, and the time elements and timetable involved.

If agreement on such statements of expectations can be achieved and can be adhered to, ACOSS functioning would be considerably improved.

A Handbook on ACOSS Organisation and Procedures?

These statements could be part of a handbook on ACOSS organisation and

procedures. This handbook would help all ACOSS participants to know who is expected to do what, when, and according to what criteria. This would strengthen accountability, increase effectiveness and efficiency, and help interested people to gain an over-view of the organisation and the way it is organised to meet its responsibilities. Such a handbook would need to be kept operational and to be regularly reviewed for necessary revisions.

The Substantive Concerns of the Structures?

The attached schema does not prescribe what should be the substantive concerns of ACOSS structures. They merely help to define an acceptable organisational system which will effectively and efficiently service the substantive concerns of the organisation. The Task Force considers that the present substantive concerns of ACOSS should be reviewed by applying the proposed schema, once we are agreed on the various schema. There is an especially urgent need to examine the areas of substantive concern covered by the existing ACOSS Standing Committee system.⁵⁹

Our report systematically addressed organisational issues which could not be ignored if ACOSS was to fulfil its claimed mission, and under Ian Yates the organisation began to address some of its organisational shortcomings, but with even fewer financial resources available the process was inevitably delayed. Only two board meetings and two executive meetings could be held in 1976/77!

In fact, 1976/77 turned out to be an even worse year than 1975/76 financially. The Fraser government cut its grant by \$60,000 to \$150,000, with no federal money provided for the state and territory councils of social service. Money from special (mainly government) projects fell from a peak of \$79,913 in 1975/76 to \$18,537, in the following year, and ACOSS overall income reduced from \$371,333 in 1975/76 to \$257,752 in 1976/77.

It was scarcely surprising that in his annual report of that year, his last as ACOSS president, David Scott chose to focus on what was not achieved as a result of the capriciousness in financial support over recent years. 'The increasing need for and demands upon ACOSS, set against diminishing resources for its work, have created a great deal of frustration and despair'. It had not been possible to make grants to any of the state and territory councils of social service in 1976-77, and this had led to a weakening of the Australia-wide COSS network, 'especially in the communication of ideas, dissemination of social welfare information, identification of patterns of need, and coordination of COSS services and responses to Government initiatives and inquiries. Several of the councils were severely curtailed in their activities and survived the year only on a part-time basis. For almost half the year, the ACOSS secretariat had only one policy officer and support staff positions had also been cut. Staff workloads were extreme, and in addition staff time was taken up in searching for additional funds. ACOSS had been unable to monitor the effects of Medibank on low-income and minority groups; had been unable to provide even a part-time policy officer in the housing area, despite it being a crisis area for many low-income families; had reduced consultancy and technical

59 'Board Task Force on ACOSS Organisation', October, 1976.

assistance to self-help and minority groups; had reduced capacity to respond to government committees of inquiry; had not been able to follow through on the issue of unemployment, despite it being the issue of greatest concern to congress members; had been unable to initiate a study of the role and function of the non-government sector in social welfare and its relationship to government services (perhaps our greatest failure); had been hampered by inability to provide information about the non-government sector to the Bailey Task Force, and the Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration; and it had failed to disseminate, as well as collect information, experience and ideas, across the social development sphere.

ACOSS's International Responsibilities

One of objects of ACOSS, as stated in its 1972 constitution, was 'Participating in the development of international social welfare particularly through membership of the International Council on Social Welfare'.⁶⁰ This was, in fact a major reason for its establishment. ACOSS was intended to be part of the developing world-wide ICSW network, addressing social welfare concerns globally. As has already been indicated, and will later be fully covered,⁶¹ my own international professional involvements made me especially aware of this part of ACOSS's responsibilities.

Amidst all her other responsibilities during her four years as secretary-general, Joan Brown made a notable Australian contribution to the work of ICSW at its biennial conferences – Manila (1970), The Hague (1972), and Nairobi (1974), and at a series of meetings of the Asian and Western Pacific Region of the ICSW – in mid-1971, and in August/September, 1973.⁶²

Australia sent a delegation of 20 to the Manila conference. It was led by Leon Stubbings (secretary-general of the Australian Red Cross), deputy chairman of ACOSS and region assistant treasurer of ICSW, a member of the ICSW executive. Joan Brown's contribution to the pre-conference working party for the Manila conference, and her subsequent follow-up in Australia, has already been mentioned. 22 participants were in the Australian delegation at The Hague conference, but only one was from the Commonwealth public service, despite the theme 'Developing Social Policy, in Conditions of Rapid Social Change'. At The Hague, Joan Brown was elected as one of the Asia and Pacific representatives on the ICSW executive committee. Leon Stubbings' term of office as assistant treasurer-general had expired after eight years. He also resigned from chairing the Victoria-based ACOSS committee on ICSW.

60 See p. 339.

61 See volumes 4 and 5.

62 She was chief rapporteur for a regional working party on councils of social service in Singapore in 1971; and in August/September 1973, chief rapporteur for an experts meeting on standards and legislation for social welfare services convened by ECAFE and ICSW; chairman of a commission and author of its report to a regional conference in Korea on standards of social welfare, attended by 360 delegates from 18 countries; represented Australia at a meeting in Korea of representatives of councils of social service from 16 countries; and acted as rapporteur in a subsequent 5-day meeting in Tokyo to examine the Nairobi conference theme and its application to the region. Australian Council of Social Service, *20th Annual Report 1971-72*, p. 22; Council of Social Service, *18th Annual Report 1973-74*, pp. 26-7.

David Scott and Joan Brown were the Australian delegates to the ICSW committee of representatives at the 1974 Nairobi conference, with Ed Pennington attending as an official observer. These three also attended meetings of the regional advisory board. Australia had 19 of the 2,000 delegates attending the conference, whose theme was 'Development and Participation – Operational Implication for Social Welfare'. In his summary and review of the conference, Charles Schottland praised the Australian national report. It stated unequivocal commitment to the philosophy that participation of people in decisions that directly affect them is a right. 'This clear assertion is in contrast to the vague generalities which frequently surround the subject of participation'.⁶³

In 1975/76, with severely limited funds, ACOSS could send only one delegate to the ICSW regional conferences (1975, 1976) and could not afford to send a representative to the 18th ICSW conference in Puerto Rico in 1976. Fortunately its president David Scott attended on his own behalf. On his return, he reported on the conference to the ACOSS congress and recommended as a matter of priority, the re-establishment of an international committee which had been allowed to lapse. The subsequent board meeting established a working party to report on the committee's terms of reference. David Scott emphasised the very strong feeling that ACOSS was not living up to its international responsibilities, and neither was the Australian government in this sector.

Members of the working party were Leon Stubbings (chair), David Cox, professor Verl Lewis, Professor John Lawrence, Michael Sullivan, Helen Shelton, Fay Lewis, Louise Arnold, and president David Scott and secretary-general Ian Yates (ex-officio). Draft terms of reference drawn up by Leon Stubbings and David Scott were circulated. At a meeting in Red Cross House, Flinders Street, Melbourne, on 1 December,⁶⁴ after considerable discussion which focused on an amended version which I put forward, the following terms of reference for the ACOSS international committee were agreed on unanimously.

To advise and assist the Board of Governors in the following functions –

1. To enunciate Australia's international responsibilities both actual and desirable, in the field of social welfare and social development, both world-wide and in the Asian and Western Pacific Region.
2. To encourage actively both government and non-government agencies to carry out their international responsibilities, and to develop greater community awareness of these responsibilities.
3. To determine and develop the role of ACOSS in helping to carry out these responsibilities, particularly by participating in the work of the ICSW and its Asian and Pacific Regional Office.
4. To encourage informed Australian participation in the ICSW and other relevant International and Regional Conferences.

63 Council of Social Service, *19th Annual Report 1974–75*, pp. 33–4.

64 What follows is based on the minutes of that meeting.

5. To study the themes and working papers for the ICSW and other relevant Conferences as they are received by ACOSS and recommend appropriate ACOSS action.
6. To study recommendations for the ICSW and other relevant International and Regional Conferences and recommend appropriate ACOSS action.
7. To establish close relationship in Australia with representatives of Australian members of the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) and the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW).
8. To liaise with any other organisation relevant to the social welfare and social development of other countries, including with the Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA). This includes the strengthening of contacts with the national member committees of the ICSW in the Asian and Western Pacific Region through the ICSW Regional Office.
9. To increase Australian awareness of social welfare and social development in the Asian and Western Pacific Region by the systematic collection and dissemination of information on social conditions, policies and programmes in this Region.
10. To recommend for appropriate action ACOSS projects that would benefit social welfare and social development within the Asian and Western Pacific Region.

(Note – ‘Appropriate action’ here would include seeking support of governments and other bodies in funding and providing personnel and other resources for such projects. The approved project may be undertaken by ACOSS itself or by another appropriate organisation, government or non-government.)

The working party also recommended –

- That the international committee have the same membership as the working party, with Professor John Lawrence as chairman, and that Sugata Dasgupta⁶⁵ should be added to its membership. (Although some members were drawn from international organisations, they were nominated as individuals not as representatives of their organisations.)
- That it meet in Melbourne for the time being, since the majority of the members were Melbourne-based. (Two were based in Sydney and two in Canberra.)
- That resources be provided for a full-day meeting in late January. No specific request for future resources was made, although international activity should be ‘accorded as high a priority as possible in current circumstances’.

It was agreed that, subject to adequate financial assistance (approaches had been made to the Commonwealth government and the Victorian minister for social welfare), high priority should be given to Australia hosting the 1979 ICSW regional conference. This had been proposed at the Puerto Rico ICSW conference.

The working party then considered and commented on the nine international resolutions from the 1976 ACOSS congress:

65 Previously director, Gandhian Institute in India, and now on the staff of the School of Social Work at the University of Queensland.

- (a) That the ACOSS International Committee be reconstituted. (Done.)
- (b) That a renewed approach be made to the Federal Government for the re-establishment of a specific grant to ACOSS for developing international responsibilities in the Social Welfare field particularly in the work of the ICSW. (Not feasible for 1976/77. A submission for 1977/78 to be considered at the January meeting as a matter of priority. The general ACOSS submission will be forwarded in February 1977.)
- (c) That special projects, to be recommended by ACOSS, be financed in the social welfare area in the Asian and Pacific regions through ADAA. (No possibility in 1976/77, the Committee to consider proposals for inclusion in the 1977/78 Commonwealth Budget. ... Strengthening the Regional Office was probably the highest priority of all. ...)
- (d) That, as one of the richest countries in the Asian Region, Australia needs to take a more active role in the Region and that ACOSS should seek Government support to host the 1979 Regional Conference. (First section incorporated in Terms of Reference, latter section done.)
- (e) That ACOSS Secretary-General should participate in the 1977 Regional Conference, Tehran, Iran. (Agreed this should be given priority.)
- (f) That ACOSS deplores the very limited Australian participation in significant developments in the social welfare field in the Pacific area and the lack of systematic tabulation of information thereon. That the International Committee be asked to provide this service. (Incorporated in Terms of Reference.)
- (g) That ACOSS welcomes the development of a Council of Social Service in Papua New Guinea and seeks to establish links with that Council. (... would be of value someone going there to develop contacts and assess the situation. Invite director of the PNG Department of Social Development to visit ACOSS, and meet incidental expenses, during a visit to Australia for a conference in April, 1977.)
- (h) That Congress recognises that Australia has an international moral responsibility for constructive programmes for the settlement of refugees from various parts of the world including Cyprus, Lebanon, Indo-China and Timor.
- (i) Congress supports efforts urging the Federal Government to develop a firm and positive policy towards acceptance and settlement in Australia of an annual intake of at least 5,000 refugees. (This issue has been taken up by the ACOSS Migrant Issues Committee and international agencies in a meeting with the Prime Minister. David Cox agreed to collect further information on the issue.)

All of the recommendations were accepted at the board meeting 9–11 December, except that Sugata Dasgupta would have to be a corresponding member because of lack of funds.

At the first meeting of the formally-constituted international committee on 20th January, 1977, it was recommended that as a matter of policy ACOSS should be represented at regional ICSW conferences, by at least the president or another senior representative, and the secretary-general. A proposed 1979 regional conference in Melbourne was considered. Once Commonwealth

and state funding had been confirmed, a conference steering committee consisting of John Lawrence, Joan McClintock (deputy secretary-general) and a Melbourne member, would be established, working in close consultation with VCOSS. Inter-country adoptions had been under discussion in the parliament and ACFOA was planning to hold a seminar on the issue, with possible help from ACOSS. Helen Shelton reported on the current orientation and concerns of the Australian development assistance agency (ADAA). David Scott, John Lawrence and Helen Shelton would prepare a case for assistance to the ICSW regional office.

In its report to the board, the working party had said it was aware that the recommended terms of reference were very broad, but it believed they provided the appropriate scope of concern for ACOSS in the international field. If accepted, the international committee would work out its strategies for beginning to work in each area. Accordingly, at the January meeting, we addressed each of the ten terms of reference, allocating responsibilities and deciding what could be practicably handled with current limited resources. In our discussion of a proposed earmarked international grant in the ACOSS government submission for 1977/78, we agreed that various costings should be increased – reports from \$1,000 to \$2,000, the contribution to the regional office from \$2,000 to \$5,000, and salaries from \$3,500 to \$11,000. (The original estimate had included only the secretary-general's time, and it was agreed that the submission should include a half-time policy officer (\$6,000) and supporting secretarial time (\$1,500). The final submission would be determined by the ACOSS executive in the context of the overall ACOSS submission.

David Scott raised the difficulty of dealing with ICSW matters by the committee, meeting infrequently. It was agreed that they should continue to be handled by David and the secretary-general, with a report at each meeting on main issues arising.⁶⁶

In May, the secretary-general finally produced the minutes of our January meeting. He apologised because of other priorities, but was particularly concerned about not monitoring or following up the committee's business overall. 'The Secretary-General is very much the slave of general ACOSS priorities, and at the moment the International Committee is not amongst the highest'. He had acted on various priority issues within the international area (e.g. Commonwealth grant, 1979 conference submission and follow-up, Tehran, adoption conference, etc), it was just not possible to follow through the committee's work. The ACOSS executive felt some other arrangement had to be made.⁶⁷

In fact, only brief notes were kept of our two next meetings – a full meeting in Melbourne at the Brotherhood of St Laurence on 22 June, and a meeting of half the committee in Canberra on 7 September.⁶⁸ Various matters – the Tehran ICSW conference, the 1979 regional conference, the 1978 Jerusalem conference, ADAB, ACOSS and ACFOA links – but clearly the achievement

66 Minutes, Meeting of the International Committee, Red Cross House, Melbourne, 20 January.

67 Letter, Ian Yates to International Committee 10/5/77.

68 Notes on Meetings of the International Committee, on 22 June, 1977, the Brotherhood of St Laurence, Fitzroy; and on 7 September, 1977, at the ANU, Canberra.

was falling far short of our brief under our terms of reference. The 1976–77 ACOSS annual report claimed:

ACOSS is acutely aware of its responsibility to provide a greater flow of information within Australia about both the needs and developments in the social development sphere internationally, as well as share Australia's experience with other members of ICSW. Plans are in hand for these responsibilities to be more adequately fulfilled in 1977–78.⁶⁹

The ACOSS funding submission for 1977–78 had requested a government grant to enable it to fulfil its international responsibilities, but no special provision was made by the government in its grant to ACOSS for the year. This restricted the work of the international committee, including making a financial contribution or providing other resources to assist work of ICSW in the region. The committee was now called the international policy coordinating committee, with David Scott and myself as co-convenors. Discussions with ADAB continued on a possible government grant to the work of the ICSW regional office in strengthening the non-government social welfare infrastructure in the region. The committee's main responsibility during that year and the following financial year was preparation for the ICSW regional social welfare conference to be held in Melbourne in September, 1979. In May 1978, ACOSS was advised that the Commonwealth government would provide \$25,000 towards the organisation of this conference, the first ICSW conference to be held in Australia.⁷⁰

A record 36 Australians attended the ICSW 50th anniversary conference in Jerusalem in August 1978. I had made a contribution to the ICSW anniversary monograph.⁷¹ As co-convenors of the ACOSS international coordinating committee, David Scott in Melbourne, and I in Sydney chaired preliminary meetings for participants. David Scott was by now a very significant figure in the ICSW and made an important contribution in Jerusalem.⁷² I greatly appreciated joining with him and Walter Lippmann on two tours provided by courtesy of the Histadrut,⁷³ when we were in Israel. Both David and Ian Yates were on the program committee for the 1980 Hong Kong ICSW conference.

The ICSW regional conference in Melbourne in August 1979, was attended by about 200 participants from 20 countries, with about 100 from Australia. The theme was 'Shaping the future for our children', a contribution to the International Year of the Child in the region. Peter Travers, who had succeeded David Scott as ACOSS president in 1977, chaired the program planning committee. I was on the planning committee for a joint IFSW Asia/ARASWE seminar, held in association with the regional conference in Melbourne. Its topic was 'Diversity and social justice: the role of social work and social work education', and I contributed a paper.⁷⁴

69 Australian Council of Social Service, *21st Annual Report 1976–77*, p. 32.

70 Australian Council of Social Service, *22nd Annual Report 1977–78*, p. 32.

71 See Vol. 5, pp. 18, 27.

72 See Vol. 5, pp. 295–8, 301.

73 See Vol. 5, pp. 180–3.

74 See Vol. 5, p. 211.

I succeeded Judith Green in 1976, when she vacated the role of deputy president therefore becoming a member of the ACOSS executive. This made me even more acutely aware of the widening gap between our community responsibilities and available resources – of course, not just in relation to our international work, but generally. After careful thought, I agreed in mid-1977 to nominate for the ACOSS presidency, not least because of my international credentials. The other candidate was Father Peter Travers, director of the Catholic Family Welfare Bureau in Adelaide since 1972,⁷⁵ and chairman of the South Australian government's Consultative Committee on Social Welfare. Not surprisingly, given the composition of the ACOSS congress of members and the shift away from national initiatives and federal funding in the Fraser government, the voluntary agency, state-based candidate rather than the academic was elected.

Apart from continuing in the ACOSS international committee for a period, any other work directly with ACOSS ceased, although I certainly maintained an interest in its activities. Its successive presidents from 1977 to its 50th anniversary in 2006 were: Peter Travers 1977–9, Murray Geddes 1979–81, Bruce McKenzie 1981–85, Julian Disney 1985–89, Merle Mitchell 1989–93, Robert Fitzgerald 1993–97, Michael Raper 1997–2001, Andrew McCallum 2001–05, and Lin Hatfield Dodds 2005–6. In November 1979, secretary-general Ian Yates took six months leave without pay to relieve the serious financial situation and subsequently resigned. The ever-dependable Joan McClintock was again in the role 1980–83. Subsequent ACOSS directors (the changed name for the chief executive) were: Colin Menzies, Mark Lyons 1985–89, Garth Noweland-Forman⁷⁶ 1989–94, Betty Hounslow 1994–2001, Megan Mitchell 2001–2004, and Andrew Johnson 2005–6. For the 50th anniversary, each of the above presidents (apart from Bruce McKenzie) provided their reflections on ACOSS.⁷⁷ Andrew McCallum referred to the perennial question which had dogged most presidents, 'Should we move to Canberra?' It has never happened.

Over time the organisation has maintained its advocacy of the interests of low and disadvantaged Australians and contributed to national social policy debates. The broader social welfare agenda with which I had been associated became less and less feasible in the essentially liberal political climate which has prevailed.

75 Like his predecessors, from Father Luke Roberts (1948–60) onwards, he was an ordained minister and qualified in social work. He had a master of social administration degree from Flinders University where he returned as a teacher and researcher in the early 1980s after a doctorate at Oxford. (One of my practical social work placements had been with Father Roberts ('Robbie') in 1953 when I was at the University of Adelaide.)

76 He was one of our social work graduates from the UNSW.

77 'Celebrating 50 Years of ACOSS', *Impact Magazine*, Australian Council of Social Service, 269 Elizabeth Street, Sydney, 2010.

7.7 First Australian Child Care Conference 1972

Marking its 50th anniversary as the coordinating body of non-government child welfare agencies in Victoria, the Children's Welfare Association of Victoria took the initiative,

- To bring together interested people from the various fields of child welfare in all States of Australia for a National Conference on the health, education and welfare of children, aged 0 – 16 years, who are disadvantaged or socially vulnerable.
- To consider better cooperation of child welfare bodies on a national level and the need for a national policy on child welfare.

This resulted in the first Australian Child Care Conference, held in the halls of residence of Monash University, Melbourne, 20–25 February. The conference council and organising committee invited me to be their guest at the conference and to act as editor and coordinator of the conference proceedings. In her letter of invitation, May Angliss (president of the Child Welfare Association of Victoria) sent me details of the conference planning.

In brief, it will be both an educational and national policy making conference, and its proceedings will doubtless become resource teaching material in Universities and (other) institutions of higher learning.

My Council would be delighted if you are able to accept my invitation as I am sure that you will not only help the Conference attain its aims, but would uniquely give child welfare on the national scale the impetus it dearly needs.¹

Although it was a rather difficult time to attend the conference because of my involvement in university admission procedures, I accepted the invitation to attend and edit the proceedings. I was then asked if I would be willing to link the editing task with that of being the final speaker, summing up the conference.² I was very reluctant to accept any further conference responsibilities. What was expected of the final speaker?

A full-scale summing up of the whole Conference at its end would require the person to have studied the papers together with the discussion reports from the various sessions. This is a large, time consuming and difficult task, which I don't think I am in a position to undertake. In any case perhaps it should be more appropriately undertaken by someone who has had leadership in planning the content of the program. If, however, you are asking someone at the end to make some final comments and give his impressions, rather than attempt a synoptic summary, then perhaps I could tackle it.³

Study group participants at the conference were individually invited to take part in 12 representative groups of about 10–12 persons. These groups met throughout the conference after plenary sessions and produced reports on their discussions. In addition, were delegates and agency representatives who

1 Letter, May Angliss to Professor J. Lawrence, 27/10/71.

2 Letter, May Angliss to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 29/11/71.

3 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to May Angliss, 9/12/71.

could attend all sessions with speakers, and various other organised activities.

A prelude to the conference was a barbecue at 5.30pm on Sunday, 20 February, at 'Cruden Farm', the home of Dame Elizabeth Murdoch, giving opportunity for conference participants, speakers and executives to meet informally. The conference was under the patronage of the governor-general Sir Paul Hasluck, and was opened by the state governor, Sir Rohan Delacombe.

An outstanding world authority on child welfare, Joseph Reid, came to Australia to contribute to the conference. Joseph Reid MSW was the executive director of the Child Welfare League of America, and deputy president of the International Union for Child Welfare, Geneva. In his opening address, 'A National Policy on Child Welfare', he said that the United States and possibly Australia did not give high priority to expenditures to protect families and children. More effort was made to protect animals from abuse than children. He pointed to a dangerous lack of day care facilities, homemaker services and family counselling services. This lack resulted in unnecessary family break-ups, and unnecessary public expenditures for institutional care and foster care. Joseph Reid commended the development of an Australian national coordinating body for family and child welfare. He also called for more study and research of social welfare programs to test their value. In a later session, he was the speaker on 'Day Care – an Essential Service for the Family', and at the conference dinner, his topic was 'How a National Association of Children's Agencies has Influenced Services for Children'.

In the evening of Monday, 21 February, Len Tierney spoke on 'Child Welfare in Retrospect'.⁴ The ensuing pattern of topics and speakers took this form:

- Disadvantaged Children and the Nature of Social Vulnerability – Sociological Aspects
 - Harold Throssell (School of Social Work, University of Queensland)

Concurrent Sessions:

 - The effect of cultural deprivation on the education of children – Mr. A. T. Hird
 - Social vulnerability of children before birth – Dr W. Rickards
 - Special problems of aboriginal children – Mrs Sally White
- Disadvantaged Children and the Nature of Social Vulnerability – Psychological Aspects
 - J. Katz (assoc. prof. in child psychiatry, Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children, Sydney)
- Service Delivery – Conditions and Integration of Services
 - Ian Cox (director, Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs, South Australia)

Concurrent Sessions on Service Delivery and Special Techniques:

 - Residential Care – Miss E. Bennett
 - Fostering and Adoption – Sister Mary Agatha
 - Prevention – Mrs Catherine King

4 Reader-in-charge, Department of Social Studies, University of Melbourne; author of *Children Who Need Help*, a survey of child welfare policy and administration in Victoria.

- Services and Special Techniques
 - W.C.Langshaw (under sec. & director, Dept. of Child Welfare & Social Welfare, NSW)
 - Concurrent Sessions on Service Delivery and Special Techniques:
 - Services to the family at home – Miss Betty Vaughan
 - Special services for schools
 - Special techniques with the anti-social child – Dr Elizabeth Wann
- Goals and Guidelines in Child Welfare
 - Adam Jamrozik (school of Social Sciences, Flinders University, South Australia)
- National Organisation and Co-ordination in Child Welfare
 - A. Spencer Colliver (senior lecturer, School of Social Work, UNSW, Sydney)
 - Consecutive Session
 - The role of the Children's Welfare Association of Victoria – Rev. Canon N.G. Molloy
 - The aims and functions of a national association as seen by ACOSS – Miss Judith Green
 - A national association – Lt. Col. G. G. Carpenter
- Planning for the Future
 - Concurrent Sessions
 - Research and practice – Dr Alan Stoller
 - Government and voluntary cooperation – Mrs A. Mackinnon
 - Financial considerations – Mrs A. V. Horne

At the last plenary session, on Friday afternoon, 25 February, I presented 'A Review of the Conference and the Way Ahead'.

My family had the pleasure of 'looking after' Joe Reid when he was briefly in Sydney after the conference. Joe thoroughly enjoyed going with us to watch our son David rowing in a schools' four race. He was excellent company. Subsequently he sought my involvement in the International Union for Child Welfare, but I had to decline because of other commitments.

With the assistance of Mrs Lynn Bayley, the conference secretary, I received typed copies of the discussion group and plenary session reports, and completed my set of final typed copies of conference papers for editing the proceedings. By the end of March, I had completed my editing and had sent clear instructions for typing the final manuscript in Melbourne. 'It is important that publication occur as soon as possible. ... An attractive cover can do wonders in 'lifting' the appearance of typed material. I have numbered the items under 'Views from the Conference's 12 Study Groups' to enable people to identify quickly and use individual issues. ... I 'm sorry I am not at hand to check proofs when they are ready, but I have every confidence this will be done thoroughly and efficiently.'⁵

On 7 April, I was invited to be guest speaker speaking about the conference at the diamond jubilee dinner of the Child Welfare Association of Victoria

5 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Lyn Bailey, 28/3/72.

during child care week 18–23 June. Unfortunately I was unable to accept. The Association was ‘deeply grateful’ for my editing of the conference proceedings and thanked me ‘most sincerely for doing this mammoth task and for executing the work so expeditiously.’⁶ In October, I received a further letter from the president of the association, May Angliss:

At their last meeting members of the Executive Committee recorded their grateful thanks and appreciation for your editing of the Report of the Conference Proceedings – *Australian Children 1972 – The Welfare Spectrum*.

Members are delighted with the manner in which you have assembled the addresses and the views from the Conference study groups. We are all of the opinion that the Report will be a valuable reference book as well as a source of topics for discussion groups.

Please accept our warmest thanks and appreciation for your invaluable contribution to the Australian Child Care Conference and to the Association.

With every good wish, and kind regards from your friends in Victoria.⁷

6 Letter, May Angliss to John Lawrence, 7/4/72.

7 Letter, May Angliss to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 16/10/72.

7.8 Relating to the Medical Profession and Beyond

In the 1970s, I gave the opening address and participated in three significant medically-sponsored conferences. As will be evident, the content of this material was addressed far more widely than to those attending these occasions.

7.8.1 Service to People in the 1970s

At the University of Western Australia in Perth in February 1970, I spoke on 'Service to People in the 1970s', to a meeting called by the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners – Western Australia Faculty. This was immediately followed by 'Medicine and Related Professions', prepared for a seminar on 'The Doctor in Society, 1970–1980', organised by the combined medical colleges, in association with the Australian Medical Association. (I was at the time federal president of the Australian Association of Social Workers.) I suggested specific questions for participants to discuss at the conclusion of each of the presentations. These two papers were subsequently published in *The Australian Medical Journal*, with editorial comment that some AMA members may not like what I had to say!

First, I want to share with you a global perspective. How many are we? In 1930, the estimated total for the human species was 2,070 million; it was half as much again just 30 years later, in 1960, and by now, we are well above the 3,500 million mark. (Borrie, 1961)

Many things have made us increasingly aware of the extensive existence of the human species outside of our own national borders – things like World Wars and more limited wars, the United Nations, international agencies, modern communication and travel, the threat of nuclear weapons, the migration program, the impact of other national economies on our own, and so on. Not only are we aware of the people of other nations, but there are evident attempts to develop a supra-national moral order. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides guidelines for the development of such an order. It offers what it calls 'a standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations'. (Preamble, 1948).

The moral dilemmas of people wishing to serve, or to help other people are difficult enough within their own national boundaries. They are all the more difficult when the helping process traverses the national, legal, political, cultural and economic boundaries of the national groups into which mankind is divided, and when men¹ feel greater solidarity with their fellow nationals than with any sort of extra-national social order of human beings.

I am obviously starting in very deep water, but no one with a concern for people can realistically avoid at least some consideration of the desperate need to develop more strongly effective patterns of moral obligation that extend across national boundaries. We must persuade our governments and our voluntary organisations to strengthen their international activity in the direction of creating more satisfying life conditions for men generally, not just in our own relatively prosperous society.

1 It was obvious that this referred to men and women. This language of that day now, of course, grates with the current reader.

The 1970s are likely to see further strengthening of overseas interests in our own society, not primarily for our own good but because our society's natural and cultural resources promise profitable investment. Working out who actually benefits from this investment and who should benefit is a complex technical and moral task. In the recent heady excitement of discovering the enormous economic potential of our country, what thought is given to the distribution of the resultant wealth? It won't automatically distribute itself in ways that benefit mankind in general. Who is actually cashing in both here and abroad, and are not the gross inequalities of material wealth within nations as well as between them, being further extended? The edge of this question is blunted in the industrial societies because their rate of economic growth allows almost everyone to be materially better off despite its uneven distribution.

To what extent are human affairs being increasingly controlled by large-scale international corporations whose technical know-how and financial resources give them great power over the lives of others? What are the moral attitudes of their managers, and even if some of them are interested in some kind of 'human service' ethic, do they know local circumstances sufficiently well to use their power in a morally responsible fashion?

The individual mind boggles at the size and complexity of the matters I have raised. The moral dimension of life – that is, people's duties and obligations to each other as people – is a difficult enough concept when applied to a pluralistic, modern industrial society. It is an incredibly difficult concept to apply to all the societies of mankind, and yet because these are now becoming interlocked and in contact with each other, international and extra-national moral questions are difficult to avoid for people with moral attitudes.

Moral attitudes require a genuine concern for the well-being of others, and a willingness to identify and balance competing interests, a willingness to justify a course of action in these terms and not just in terms of personal prudence or gain, or the gain of sectional groups. Cost-benefit analysis is emerging as a useful analytic tool to help contemporary decision-making. It becomes a tool for moral decision-making when costs and benefits observed or predicted are seen in terms of the lives of the all the human beings affected, rather than in other terms.

I think it is accurate to say that at least some of the present social unrest, especially amongst the better educated younger generation, comes from a genuine moral concern about the state of our society and of the world generally. How to translate this expressed concern into action which will produce a more just society is the next much more difficult step. To do this requires sustained collaborative effort, agreement on objectives, a sound working knowledge of the existing social arrangements, political power, and an ability to enlist the cooperation and endorsement of those people about whom the most moral concern is expressed – the aged, the physically and mentally handicapped, the acute and chronically sick, one-parent families, large families on low incomes, migrants, legal offenders. In comparative terms, these and other specially vulnerable groups in our society are seen as receiving a raw deal.

These traditionally are the people treated as rather fringe members of society, because they are less economically independent than the rest of the society or because their behaviour marks them as deviant in other ways. They are typically

seen as suitable objects of charity or voluntary welfare services. In fact in Australia, we still know remarkably little about the size and characteristics of our vulnerable groups. This in itself reflects the social status and relative powerlessness of these people. Who wants to know what life is like for them? It is likely to be politically embarrassing, anyway.

I would like to think that during the 1970s the basic digging into the nature of our society that the Governor General recently urged us to do will give special attention to the life conditions of our more vulnerable citizens. We easily forget that they are you or me – given another span of years, or an accident, or a change of luck, or different parentage – or taking us just as we are.

I believe, however, that we need to do some basic thinking about the role of community services in helping *all* our citizens to lead more satisfying and useful lives. If we really want services which help people to lead more satisfying lives, we need to examine their life careers discovering the critical decision-making points, and deciding how services of different kinds might be made available and be made of benefit at these times.

The educated, articulate, and middle class person can find his way around sections of the urban industrial environment with some skill, partly because he knows how to track down specialist help and can use it, especially in money matters. However, even he often will demonstrate ineffective and inefficient personal and family decision-making. Australian formal education systems still appear to be almost unbelievably irrelevant in preparing people for the various social roles they will be expected to perform in the course of their lifetime. The focus is still heavily upon didactic teaching in academic subject areas, rather than on individual and group decision-making and problem solving in relation to the various social tasks of modern man.

How do people learn when to seek help, where to seek it, and what part they might play in the course of using it? How do they learn about the social processes, many of them essentially political in character, which produce community policies and services – and not only learn about them, but learn how to participate in them? Modern man joins or is in contact with a tremendous array of organisations. In the words of Robert Park, 'What a man belongs to constitutes most of his life career and all of his obituary.' The urban life in particular provides not only the opportunity for formal associations to multiply, but also the need. Special interests can only become effective if deliberately organised. I wonder how much our schools prepare our future citizens to participate effectively within and amongst this mass of formal organisations that are now characteristic of our social landscape.

In some schools, a proportion of the pupils have experience of participation in voluntary associations through so-called extra-curricula activities. This is surely inadequate. What I am talking about is central to living in our kind of society. It should not be seen as a fringe activity for a privileged and motivated few. It should receive careful educational discussion geared to the stage of learning of the students, and should include the full range of formal organisations, both government and non-government. The fact is that all of us have to come to terms with working and living in and through formal organisations. Do we continue virtually to ignore their existence in our educational programs (although ironically such programs would not be possible without formal organisation)? Or do we help young people to

understand, to the best of their ability, the scope and nature of these organisations, the role they play in a mass industrial society, and how they affect the lives of every citizen. As a general subject area, there is now a considerable literature, but it suffers from at least three defects. First, little of it is Australian (a common story in the social sciences); second, most of it concentrates upon the functioning of a single organisation or type of organisation like a hospital, a firm, or a school, rather than upon the way in which organisations are interrelated; and third, the focus is heavily upon managerial roles rather than upon the roles of the consumers of the organisation's goods or services.

I wish to extend what I have been saying a step further into tertiary education, which only covers a small proportion of our young population. The tertiary student has still the possibility of a general education about the formal organisations of his society. But only a tiny number will actually learn about them – in recently established Sociology courses. For students undertaking professional courses like medicine, teaching, law, architecture, town planning, and social work, the situation is interesting. I suspect that still in most professional practice courses, the overwhelming emphasis is upon developing the technical competence of the professional practitioner, within the ethical safeguards laid down by the profession – and technical competence is seen mainly in terms of direct work with a specific client. And yet it is obvious that the actual work role of the professional, even say in single private medical practice, involves him in organising his work, his receptionist, his office, his links with laboratory services, hospitals, and the rest in ways that should benefit *all* his clients. His over-all professional performance depends considerably upon his handling of these organisational questions. Professional education needs to recognise that this is an integral part of practice, with possibly just as much effect on the well-being of clients or patients as more narrowly defined professional skills. In other words setting up and operating in a system of service requires specific education.

Increasingly, of course, professionals are employed in large-scale organised systems of service, and they have a crucial role in keeping the organisation focused upon service to the customer. Modern organisations need the skills and knowledge of the professionals, but professionals do not fit comfortably into bureaucratic structures. One of the major strengths of professionalism is the tradition of independent, but disciplined judgement that the professional brings. He rarely becomes completely 'a company man', or 'just a public servant'. At least within the formal ethics of his vocational group, there is a service norm to the whole community. Professionals are privileged. They enjoy high status and rewards, their education has been heavily subsidised from public funds, and they enjoy a large measure of freedom, partly because others have not the technical ability to challenge their work.

I believe that the 1970s could see at least some professional groups under challenge. The increasingly specialised and technical nature of our society places greater power in the hands of these specialised groups. If they use this patently for self-interest and pay little regard to their community service ethic, they are likely to find themselves under moral and political challenge. As I see it, one of the problems that faces professional groups in Australia is that they need to be much better educated than they are at present in the ethical, organisational and political aspects of their work, in what some might describe as the sociology and morality of their profession. These matters, quite as much as the technical aspects of the

profession's work, have a major bearing upon the quantity and quality of service available to people.

I would recommend that the education of each profession should include solid learning, not indoctrination, about the organisation of the profession and its professional practice, and where these fit into the social structure of our society. The economics and politics of the profession's work and its relationship to other professional and work groups surely should receive explicit critical attention. Further, its ethics should be learned as an integral part of its dynamic decision-making not only in individual situations, but also in relation to the wider community. Modern work in the social sciences and in moral and political philosophy could help professional groups to be less amateurish and more morally justified in their work. The professional person, properly called, must be concerned with the ends to be pursued. He is not just a technician placing his technical competence at the service of whoever is willing to pay the bill.

If I am right in this, then I think each professional group has to consider its actual and potential impact on the broader society within which it functions. It will especially need some of its members to receive specialised preparation for policy and administrative roles. Within the social work profession, for example, at long last we are beginning to realise that if the profession concentrates on social casework alone, it can on analysis be justly accused of harming the very values for which it stands. Unless the direct helping of individuals and their families goes along with professional social workers also intervening in social processes at the community, and at the organisational, and at the broad, societal levels, the profession can be seen as a suppressant to needed social reform.

Of course in a free society it is one thing to recognise the need to have members in your profession working at different levels of social organisation – the interpersonal, the community, the administrative, and the societal. It is quite another to achieve this. Each profession has its own set of problems in trying to relate itself more effectively to the complex national society within which we live. But each must accept some collective responsibility for the distribution and place of its members in the social structure. The profession's educational bodies, its employers (where it is not in private practice), and its professional association or associations, all share this responsibility. Each profession must accept the fact that it can only give maximum service to people in a modern industrial society by understanding and fully coming to terms with the organisational features of such a society.

Making professional groups more socially responsible and responsive is no easy task either from within or from outside the profession. Vested interests in existing patterns are often strong, and there is fear that the profession may lose ground vis-à-vis other professional groups, or it may lose substantial control over its affairs, or sub-groups within the profession may lose prestige. Because professionals feel that so much is at stake, change in which they are involved is rarely trouble-free. Competition and conflict are the norms.

Popular government may resort to coercion in making professional groups more socially responsible, but it usually tries to avoid a heavy reliance on coercion. A deadlock may occur, but the government's legitimacy begins to be undermined if it is not coping with a problem which a large number of citizens regard as urgent. The present unresolved instance of the medical profession's fees comes to mind.

A political scientist, Robert A. Dahl, has suggested (Dahl, 1963, pp. 77–92) seven conditions which favour peaceful adjustment of conflicts. With some adaptation, they provide insight into the possibility of peaceful resolution of conflicts apparent in the relationships between governments and the professions, between professions, and within the one profession. Dahl's seven conditions are as follows:

1. The likelihood of peaceful adjustment to a conflict is increased if there exist institutional arrangements that encourage consultation, negotiation, the exploration of alternatives, and the search for mutually beneficial solutions. Conversely, the prospects of a deadlock and coercion are increased if institutional arrangements severely inhibit such activities.
2. The larger the area of agreement among different participants on what would constitute a desirable solution, the better the chances of a peaceful adjustment.
3. The more that conflicts are cumulative, the less likely is peaceful adjustment. (Dahl comments that in a pluralistic pattern conflicts tend to be non-cumulative. People who are in conflict over one issue are not necessarily in opposite camps when the next issue comes up.)
4. The greater the economic 'surplus' in a society over and above subsistence needs, the greater the likelihood of peaceful adjustment. Conversely, the greater the 'deficit', the greater the likelihood of coercion.
5. The extent to which peaceful adjustment or coercion is used depends on past experience. The more satisfied people are with the results of past trials, the more likely they are to repeat the same methods. Conversely, the more dissatisfied they are with the results of past trials, the less likely they are to repeat the same methods.
6. The closer the parties in conflict approach equality in potential coercive power (as they perceive their situation), the greater the likelihood of peaceful adjustment.
7. Individuals vary in their psychological dispositions towards peaceful adjustment, deadlock, and coercion. Hence the likelihood of peaceful adjustment depends on the personality characteristics of individuals who influence the decisions of the various parties in conflict.

To resolve as much as possible in a peaceful fashion our inevitable social conflicts is one of the major challenges of the 1970s. Most of us wish to keep violence, widespread coercion, and civil strife to a minimum, not only because they are in no way intrinsically desirable, but also because they constitute a threat to our democratic political system.

Such a political system has been defined as one in which the opportunity to participate in decisions is widely shared among all adult citizens – in contrast to a dictatorship in which the opportunity to participate in decisions is restricted to a few. (Dahl, 1963, p. 8)

I don't want you to interpret my emphasis on the broader administrative and policy roles of the professionals as a sell-out on democratic values. I want them in these positions to make community decision-making in their areas of professional competence more realistic and better informed, not to take away, in the name of superior expertise and technical skill, the right of the rest of the community to participate in such decisions. They should, in other words, be servicing public

decision-making, not making all the decisions themselves. Understanding of the political system under which professions and the rest of society operate surely must be part of the professional's basic education.

The following words of Karl Popper are worth remembering here:

The holistic planner overlooks the fact that it is easy to centralise power but impossible to centralise all that knowledge which is distributed over many individual minds, and whose centralisation would be necessary for the wise wielding of centralised power. ... Unable to ascertain what is in the minds of so many individuals, he must try to control and stereotype interests and beliefs by education and propaganda. But this attempt to exercise power over minds must destroy the last possibility of finding out what people really think, for it is clearly incompatible with free thought, especially critical thought. Ultimately, it must destroy knowledge; and the greater the gain in power, the greater will be the loss of knowledge. (Popper, 1957, pp. 89, 90.)

It has become fashionable in some medical circles to speak of 'treating the whole man', and so-called 'total care' programs are talked about and sometimes apparently set up. This looks like the acme of service to people, a wonderful humanitarian ideal. But is it? In the name of preventive medicine, especially preventive psychiatry, the medical umbrella sounds as if it is being extended to cover all problem aspects of living in contemporary society, and the much-quoted W.H.O. definition of 'health' has helped the process – 'a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity'.

This is a highly pretentious claim open to political, technical, and moral challenge, and it is time it was recognised as such. It is, of course, very much to the credit of the medical profession that they have recognised what the patients have always known, that there is much more to their lives than their present illness, and their physical and mental health. But why, even if it were possible, should all the other aspects of their lives now be made subservient to their health needs? Or what relevant education have doctors to assume any sort of authority in these other aspects of life, or to assume leadership of a team which may have members – social workers, teachers and others – who have the relevant expertise and professional safeguards for working with at least some of the other aspects of contemporary living. The more medicine moves away from a concentration upon the diagnosis and treatment of physical illness and obvious psychotic mental illness, the more controversial and questionable its activities become. Even when dealing with what are clearly recognised as medical problems and medical responsibility, it is increasingly under challenge to work in genuine collaboration with other specialist groups who bear responsibility for dealing with other important aspects of people's lives.

It is, of course, true that some medically trained men later acquire a great deal of learning and skill in the area of another profession. But they usually do this at the cost of not keeping up-to-date in their original profession, and they provide misleading models that are not really medical at all. Especially in the mental health field, professional fields overlap. In some places they cannot even be identified, and this is seen as a virtue. I personally do not think this bears close analysis in terms of adequacy of service to patients. Specialisation and division of labour, especially amongst relatively highly paid and differently educated professionals, surely makes sense – provided someone has the organisational skills to place different professionals in a system of service which can stay client – oriented. Too often, I

fear, the actual service will reflect the status differentials and conflicts between the members of the professional 'team', with various aspects of the patient's life being pawns in the game. And the patient is there to be 'treated', not to adjudicate over his own affairs.

I will be frank – I do not like 'treatment', 'therapy' or 'illness' language, except when carefully applied to specifiable and agreed medical conditions. New professions like social work and clinical psychology have, I think somewhat blindly, copied this medical terminology. The extension of the sick role (Susser and Watson, 1962, pp. 292–3) into large areas of personal and social functioning is a most serious matter. I believe it encourages illegitimately patterns of dependency on professional help, and at the same time makes people acutely aware that there will never be enough professionals for all the so-called 'illness' around them.

I agree with David Mechanic when he says:

We ... should not fall prey to the pervasive ideology perpetrated by psychodynamic psychiatry that man is fragile and is very susceptible to breakdown under stress. Although too much stress can be damaging to a person's social development, mastery of the environment often results from practice and experience in dealing with difficult circumstances. To insulate persons from events that encourage the development of new skills and the opportunity to practice them undermines their capacity to deal with adversity and in the long run may be conducive to social and psychological breakdown. A sense of competence and self-esteem is important for successful social and psychological functioning, and we would do well to nurture these qualities. (Mechanic, 1969, p. 151)

Educational and skill acquisition models, rather than medical, or social 'treatment' models offer possibilities in which increasing numbers of professional people are showing interest (Mechanic, 1969, pp. 108–116), and they allow the extensive use of non-professional labour.

In this paper on service to people in the 1970s, I am stressing services which help people to acquire skill in their personal and social decision-making. One important aspect of this is information about services, and here I want to put in a special plea for locally available citizen information centres.

At present what have we? Most of us in the social welfare services know about and use directories of social agencies usually prepared by councils of social service, but these are little more than expanded telephone directories, and I suspect are unknown by many doctors, clergymen, teachers, policemen – let alone by the general public. The running stream of 'personal help' phone-up radio programs and the spate of 'hot-line and personal help' columns in the popular press are another avenue of information of one kind or another, and are an obvious source of interest and /or entertainment, especially for the house-bound during the day. We can turn to our friends or relatives or our work-mates, but they are as likely to be as ignorant as we are. Some of us may even be so bold as to approach a Member of Parliament. The fact is that acquiring accurate, up-to-date knowledge about community resources in our kind of society requires extensive knowledge, skill, resources and organisation quite beyond the capacity of individual citizens or groups of citizens.

I think a strong case can be made for developing a national network of citizen information centres, so that every Australian in his locality has such a centre available for consultation. I believe that professional social work knowledge and skills are crucial to designing and controlling the whole system of service but that it

can effectively use large numbers of other staff both paid and voluntary. The Centre should as far as possible limit itself to making known what is available in the local, metropolitan, state, and national communities for a citizen with a particular inquiry. I think it is best not described as an *advice* centre or bureau, although I realise there is the British example of this terminology (Ruston, 1966, pp. 73–80) and a few local Australian examples, notably here in Perth and in Adelaide. Care must be taken that these Centres do not become pedlars of advice, especially of the home-spun variety available from fellow citizens.

The establishment of these information centres would be a legitimate expenditure of national government funds. I fear, however, that the federal government would insist upon some matching funding arrangement with the States and/or municipal government, with the likely consequences of uneven service in favour of the better off areas of the community.

Achieving fullest cooperation on the part of the community – on the one hand as providers of information on services, and on the other as users of the centres' information – would require that the centres be seen not just as another government department, subject to political control. A possible auspice would be the councils of social service in each state and the Australian Council of Social Service. These have by far the broadest community base of any existing organisation, even though they are at present very short of resources to fulfil their community functions. Given adequate funds, each of the state councils could establish an information centres department, which would coordinate the work of the local information centres, and the whole system could be under the guidance and surveillance of an information centres department of the Australian Council of Social Service.

At a recent Citizenship Convention, the Minister for Immigration, Mr. Lynch, mentioned that the Commonwealth Government was giving some thought to the subject of information centres. I hope the Government consults widely before acting, because otherwise it could ruin an important service idea. At present, it is quite misleading to describe many of our services as community services, because only a small fraction of the community knows about them. This is a major reason why any version of community need for service which comes only from the existing service givers is usually a considerable underestimate.

Finally, let's get service to people into perspective, by remembering typical decisions people make in the course of their lives. How hard to work at getting educated? When to leave home? Where to work? Whom to marry? Where to live? What sort of house? What birth control method? When to have children? How many? How to rear the children? What school? What friends? What to buy? On what terms? What and where to invest? What insurance covers? How to spend leisure time? What holidays? When to call the doctor? When to use a lawyer? What organisations to join? What responsibility for other family members, especially aged parents? How to vote? What to do about Church and Sunday School? When to retire? And so on.

This is our common lot, especially in a free society. This is a person's perspective on life, wherever he is placed in the social structure. We may continue to muddle along, making some decisions by default, using whatever conventional wisdom comes our way, and basing decisions on inadequate and wrong information. Or we may retreat into new states of dependency where we meekly accept what our

political, administrative, or professional overlords tell us to do. Or we may accept the fact that life in our kind of society gives the opportunity for personal responsibility and personal fulfilment of a kind undreamed of in harsher, less affluent, and more convention-bound times.

The opportunity, range, and adequacy of personal and family decision-making must become the focus of concern of our community services, otherwise whom are we serving? Ours is not a small traditional society, with accepted customary solutions available to life's problems. Ours is a changing modern industrial society in which successful living is a complex individual art requiring knowledge and judgement, particularly in the area of using with discrimination the multitude of specialised services that constitute so much of our social environment. Each of us needs help in order to know the options and possible outcomes relative to our circumstances. But most of us don't want our choice to be made for us, even in the name of 'service'. It is always a salutary question to ask, 'Whose interests and values are actually being served by what we choose to call 'service'?

REFERENCES

- Borrie, W. D. (1961), *The Crowding World*, The Boyer Lectures.
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).
- Dahl, Robert A. (1963), *Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
- Popper, K. (1957), *The Poverty of Historicism*.
- Susser, M. W., and Watson, W. (1962), *Sociology in Medicine*. London, Oxford University Press.
- Mechanic, David (1969), *Mental Health and Social Policy*, Englewoods Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
- Ruston, G. W. 1966), 'Citizen's Advice Bureaux', in Lawrence, R. J. (ed), *Community Service: Citizens and Social Welfare Organisations*, Melbourne, F. W. Cheshire.

Questions arising from this paper:

1. What international responsibilities does your professional group accept and act on?
2. How does the public participate in the service you are providing? Are you satisfied with things as they are? On what are you basing your opinion?
3. What do you think of the view that professionals should be better educated in the ethical, organisational and political aspects of their world? Should they have to justify their work to the community at large?
4. In a free society, how can a profession reorganise itself, including the distribution of its work-force, to meet changing community needs?
5. Is the peaceful resolution of social conflicts desirable? What part can professionals play in such conflict resolution?
6. Where do you place 'health' in the hierarchy of values? Why?
7. What are the likely benefits and the likely costs connected with the suggested network of citizen information centres?
8. The opportunity, range, and adequacy of personal and family decision-making must become the focus of concern of our community services, otherwise whom are we serving? Do you agree with the first part of the sentence, and whom, apart from the clients and patients, might we be serving?

7.8.2 Medicine and Related Professions

'Medicine' here means an organised work group, called a profession, the medical profession. 'Related professions' means other organised work groups which have professional characteristics and which in one way or another are related to the medical profession. 'Work' is normally done for a living, that is, for payment. 'Professional work' is high-status work, with the medical profession enjoying the highest social status in society – followed, I might mention, by university professors.

Many occupational groups now have professional aspirations (*AJSI*, 1:3,1963). Occupational groups become more professionalised as they acquire specific features such as the following: (i) tertiary-level education, which includes acquiring typical knowledge, skills and values relevant to the group's work; (ii) a code of ethics which defines responsible work behaviour and which includes a community service ethic; (iii) a professional association, or associations, which accept collective responsibility for the maintenance and development of the group's work.

Most writers on professionalism emphasise intellectual technique and the responsibility arising from its use. The professional person is expected to be not only technically competent, but also impersonal and objective (he avoids emotional involvement) and impartial (he gives the service irrespective of his personal feelings); and to be motivated by an ideal of service (which means a devotion to the client's rather than his own interests) (*Wilensky and Lebeaux*, 1965). The more professionalised an occupation, the more its members will demonstrate technical competence and adherence to those standards of behaviour which are considered to be professional. A professional occupation is a colleague group ideally equal in status and enforcing common norms in their relations with clients. In a modern industrial society there is a push towards professionalism because: (i) specialisation is accepted; (ii) tertiary service 'industries' become possible and necessary; (iii) 'science' has prestige, and occupational groups seek a 'scientific' basis for their work; (iv) professionalism provides an occupation group with power and autonomy over both its own members and the client public; (v) the professional label is prestigious, and the established professions provide an aspiration model; (vi) the professions have high status, especially, of course, the medical profession, which is consistently at the top of the status heap; (vii) the lifetime earnings and security of the professional are high; (viii) professional work offers a high degree of job interest and job satisfaction (*Wilensky and Lebeaux*, 1965).

Wilensky and Lebeaux have suggested a number of norms which govern colleague relations within a profession.

1. Do what you can to maintain professional authority and professional standards of work (this means reluctance to criticise or rank qualified colleagues; criticism of less trained practitioners, and self-regulation of workload to maintain standards).
2. Do not air professional problems, complaints, and mistakes publicly.
3. Be aware of the limited competence of your specialty within the profession; honor the claims of other specialties; and be ready to refer clients to a more competent colleague.

These norms regulate internal competition, build the solidarity of the group in its

relations with outsiders, and enhance the success of the jurisdictional claims which any profession may stake out.

The sociology of professions have tended to see a profession in these ways – to see it as a relatively homogeneous community whose members share identity, values, definition of role, and interests.

On close analysis, however, all highly professionalised occupations are what Bucher and Strauss (1961) have called ‘a loose amalgamation of segments which are in movement’. They have suggested a ‘process’ model for studying professions, which they claim measures up better against actuality, and which at least needs to supplement, if not replace, the homogeneous, static model. I want to share with you their ‘process’ model.

Using medicine as an example, Bucher and Strauss pay full regard to the organised structure of the profession, but go on to say:

... we should also recognise the great divergency of enterprise and endeavour that mask the profession: the cleavages that exist along with the division of labor; and the intellectual and specialist movements that occur within the broad rubric called ‘organised medicine’.

Any doctor would tend to agree that his long-term objective is better care of the patient. But this, according to our authors, is a misrepresentation of the actual values and organisation of activity undertaken by various segments of the profession.

Within the profession, specialties divide and subdivide, each claiming a particular mission; its members trying to stake out a particular area of the general stream of medicine as theirs. New missions contend with traditional missions. There is a pervasive split between research missions and clinical practice.

A great variety of tasks are performed in the name of the profession. Different segments of the profession will have different views on what the profession should be doing, how much should be organised, and which tasks are most important.

Again, there are divisions amongst the members of the profession in their methodology and technique. These differences cut across specialty and even professional lines. They are often based on fundamental disagreements on the nature of the reality they are dealing with. Bucher and Strauss (1961) comment that in psychiatry the conflict over the biological versus psychological basis of mental illness continues to produce men who speak almost totally different languages, and recently the situation has been further complicated by the rise of the social science perspective on mental illness.

Again, professional segments are involved in sets of client relationships that are distinctive to their particular segment. There is no one idealised doctor-patient relationship. Each professional segments works out norms relevant to its mission and specialty. In medicine, the doctor-patient relationship can range from the most highly elaborated involvement of some psychiatrists in a family situation, to pathologists and radiologists who have little or no contact with patients, but still, of course, have a relationship to them.

Again, professional segments are important in thinking realistically about colleague relationships. The term ‘colleague’ may be used for all members of the professional occupation. A notion of circles of collegueship is more meaningful, however, within each circle being people who hold common ideas on the ends

served by their work, and attitudes and problems centering on it. Identification with a professional segment directs relationships within a profession, but it also strongly influences relations with neighbouring and allied occupations. Bucher and Strauss suggest the term 'alliances' for these relations. Such alliances can indicate that a segment of a profession has more in common with people in a neighbouring occupation than with their fellow professionals.

Finally, is there really unity of 'interests' (in the sense of fate) amongst people in the same profession? Study reveals that interests diverge; they run along different lines and they are often in direct conflict. Conflicts of interest between segments and emerging segments occur most frequently in gaining a proper foothold in institutions, in recruitment, and in relations with the outside. The unity presented by the profession to the lay public is spurious.

Segments within the profession are more or less continually undergoing change. They come and they go, according to theoretical and technological change, the institutional conditions of their work, their relationship to other segments, and occupations, and the changing generations of practitioners. It is obvious that segments will at any one point be in different phases of development.

It is claimed by our authors that the movement of segments within a profession can fruitfully be analysed as social movements. This analysis would examine their origin, recruitment, leadership, the development of organisational apparatus, ideologies, and tactics. The following points would need to be recognised, however, that: (i) professional movements occur within institutional arrangements, and a large part of the activity of segments is a power struggle for the possession of them of some kind of place within them; (ii) the fates of segments are closely intertwined; they are possibly more interdependent and responsive to one another than are other kinds of movements; (iii) the leaders are men who recognise status within the field, operate from positions of relative institutional power, and command the sources of institutional recruitment; (iv) some segments are sufficiently organised and coherent to be seen as social movements.

In a serious examination of the relationship of medicine to other professions, I think both these levels of analysis must be borne in mind. The general over-all professional model that we started with has relevance for examining public stereotypes, and questions of the general community status of the total occupational group. However, for a realistic examination of the present and future working relationships between members of the medical profession and members of other professional groups, the second 'process' segmentation model seems particularly relevant. It highlights the importance of asking: 'Which parts of the medical profession are relating, and in what ways, to which parts of other organised professional groups? And where do these parts fit into the ever-changing pattern of their own organised profession?' These are matters for continuing detailed empirical study. They have a crucial effect on the nature, quality, and distribution of service to the public. In a previous paper (Lawrence, 1970), I called for professional education to give far more attention to the understanding of these kinds of factors in contemporary professional practice.

Think for a moment, of some of the professional groups, or aspiring professional groups, that different segments of the medical profession relate to: dentistry, nursing, physiotherapy, pharmacy, optometry, chiropody, medical laboratory technology, radiography, dietetics, health inspection, infant welfare, surgical technology, hospital

administration, occupational therapy, psychology, social work, architecture, law, the church, and teaching. These occupations vary widely in terms of their total work force, the numbers in training, and the length of the training. Many members of these occupations are university educated; others receive their training at technical colleges, at special centres, or by in-service arrangements. Some of the occupations, and not necessarily the largest, or those requiring the highest standard of education, are protected by the requirement of legal registration to practice (Last, 1963).

It is obvious that generalising about the diverse sets of relationships in which different segments of the medical profession are involved is hazardous. I can only suggest a few of the factors which are likely to influence the nature of these relationships; I shall give some special attention to relationships with my own profession of social work.

The prestige of the doctor makes the relationships clear and unambiguous when authoritative medical dictates are seen as warranted. The doctor is meant to be in medical control, and services are put at the disposal of his control. Some of the aspiring professional groups find themselves classified as paramedical or ancillary medical services. 'Ancillary' means subservient or subordinate. These groups are virtually putting their technical expertise at the disposal of the medical profession. Their lot is to work under the general medical direction on what are seen as medical problems. Working out effective relationships with the paramedical groups as they become more numerous, better and more technically educated, and stronger aspirants for independent professional status will not, I suspect, be a trouble-free process.

Social work is sometimes classified as a paramedical service, especially by doctors. Some social workers may be willing to place the disposal of the medical profession social work knowledge and skills to accomplish medically defined ends. In these instances, they are properly called paramedical and cannot expect to have full professional status granted to them. Most professionally educated social workers would insist that much more than a person's medical condition should determine that nature of the service he receives, and also that the patient himself should have some say in the matter. In other words, the doctor's traditional professional authority is being challenged by a relatively new, university-educated profession, in the name of the patient's well-being.

Different strategies are open to the medical profession in the face of this challenge.

1. They can rid themselves of this troublesome group by staying out of contact with them.
2. If they recognise the part played by social factors in medical conditions, they may support the recruitment and training of their own welfare staff in order that medical control may extend to the social aspects of people's lives. These personnel would be properly called paramedical.
3. They can try to do the social work as well as the medical job themselves, but still, of course, in the name of medicine, for this preserves status and power. They may try to modify the medical curriculum to include some education for the social work task. Or they may merely pre-empt it on the grounds that they are well educated, and anyway it does not require any particular knowledge or

skill, just experience; they get away with this, by an illegitimate use by themselves or by others, of their authority derived from being a doctor. From what I know, the nature of the career of the medical student, the medical curriculum, and the life of most doctors, all tend to preclude them from extensive social experience and knowledge of the humanities and social sciences. This raises serious questions about their competence or right to any special authority in social affairs. The medical profession's tendency to try to absorb within its own authority structure any aspect of life its members become interested in, is a source of concern and annoyance outside the medical profession.

4. They may incorporate a social worker as a member of what is called a 'professional team', but still retain control by insisting that the doctor be the head of the team. It is not clear, however, why a team of professionals properly called needs a permanent head. For example, when such a team is providing professional help to a family which team agrees primarily needs social work intervention, but practically no medical intervention, why should the representative of medical intervention be the head of the team in this case? This leads to the fifth possible strategy.
5. The medical profession can enter into genuine collaborative interprofessional relationships, respecting the areas of expertise and competence of the emerging social work profession.

There exist examples of all five of these strategies in coping with the challenge of the relatively new professional group to which I belong. I hope, for the sake of the public we are meant to be serving, that strategy five predominates. We need to recognise our interdependence not by the totalitarian solution of incorporation into one authority framework, medical or any other, but by recognising the need for balancing professional interests against each other in the service of the public. The overwhelming strength of the medical profession makes this a difficult task.

The interprofessional relationships are affected by numerous factors: the length and nature of the education and training of the professions involved, their sex composition, their age composition, the socio-economic background of professional recruits, different social status, differences in level of intelligence, the numbers involved in the relationships, the nature and range of contacts, differences in public images, knowledge of each other, different values held by professional members, the different economic and institutional bases of their practice.

The idea of this seminar, and my invitation to participate in it, are pointers that doctors are increasingly aware of a need to examine critically where they fit into our changing society. Because of people's feelings about the medical profession – ranging through admiration, warm affection, envy, cynicism, and straight hostility – this is not an easy task. All of us in professional work, however, have to get better at open discussion and joint decision-making, not just with our own professional peers, but with other professionals and community groups.

REFERENCES

- 'The Professions in Australia', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 1:3, 1963.
 Bucher, R., and Strauss, A. (1961), 'Professions in Process', *American Journal of Sociology*, 66:325; reprinted in Vollmer, H. M., and Mills, D. L. (eds) (1966), *Professionalisation*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 185.

- Last, J. M. (1963), 'Communication Difficulties and Community Health Services', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 1: 4.
- Lawrence, R. J. (1970), 'Service to People in the 1970s', *The Medical Journal of Australia*, 2: 1205.
- Wilensky, H. L., and Lebeaux, C. N. (1965), *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*, Free Press, New York: 285, 303.

Questions arising from this paper:

1. Is your own occupational group highly professionalised in terms of the criteria mentioned?
2. Does your profession have segments? How do these segments relate to each other? With whom does the segment of segments to which you belong make outside alliances?
3. Which of the five possible strategies suggested that the medical profession adopts towards the social work profession, do you think is the most justifiable? Which arrangement would you personally prefer to work in? Which arrangement would the public prefer?
4. 'Interprofessional relationships are affected by numerous factors (see above). Which of these factors do you think are the most influential in the interprofessional relationships you know?

7.8.3 Professional Responsibility – 1972 Squibb Academic Lecture to Psychiatrists

I was invited by the Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists to deliver The Squibb Academic lecture to its annual congress, held in Hobart in October, 1972. Before the congress, I shared my lecture on professional responsibility with David Maddison, at his home in Mosman. He had given the Squibb lecture in the previous year. David had been appointed professor of psychiatry at the University of Sydney in 1962, and, remarkable for a psychiatrist,² had become dean of the Faculty of Medicine in 1972. We had values and interests in common, and I think I owed the invitation to give the lecture to him. Trained as a physician and psychiatrist, including a year at Harvard in 1964, he sought ways of humanising medicine and medical education and realised the importance of the social sciences in his mission. A child prodigy pianist, he retained his passion for music throughout his life. (In 1974, he became foundation dean of medicine at Newcastle University, where he 'pioneered community-connected, problem-based learning and new structures of admission, and elevated the teaching of communication skills to an essential element of the curriculum'.³ He successfully recruited my future colleague Tony Vinson as professor of behavioural science to be part of this innovative venture. My brother Jim seriously considered the possibility of joining Maddison as a professor of medicine before deciding on a chair at the University of Sydney.

2 See David Maddison, 'The Psychiatrist in the Dean's Office', *Medical Journal of Australia*. 1976, 2: 609–613.

3 See on the internet, Mellor, Lise (2008) *Maddison, David Clarkson*, faculty of medicine online museum and archive, University of Sydney.

Stephen Leeder, one of the Maddison pioneers, later became professor of public health and community medicine at the University of Sydney, and is a good friend and colleague of my brother. Through Jim, I have come to know and appreciate him.)

Professional Responsibility in a Changing World⁴

In this lecture I am going to reflect on the nature of professional responsibility in the modern world. I will be making a basic assumption that the professional person is making choices, that he has a capacity to make reasonable decisions. Is this itself reasonable?

We attribute responsibility to a person when he assumes he has the ability to make up his own mind rationally on what to do and is free to do it. In our ordinary judgements of moral responsibility, and in courts of law, certain 'excusing conditions' will either entirely or partially free a person from being held responsible for his behaviour – conditions like unavoidable ignorance, mistake of fact, infancy, insanity, irresistible duress, strong temptation, or provocation. If these conditions are not present, we assume a person is responsible for his actions. (Downie, 1971, pp. 55–62; Benn and Peters, 1959, p. 191)

Scientific knowledge can specify parameters within which human decision-making occurs. At the most, however, it gives only necessary, not sufficient explanations of human actions. Sufficient explanations need to refer to man's capacity to follow rules, to take steps seen as necessary to reach some sort of objective, his ability to see the point of something. In fact most of our explanations of human behaviour are couched in terms of a purposive rule-following model, not in causal terms which is the language of science. Seeking, finding and giving reasons for acting one way rather than another, is a typically human activity. (Benn and Peters, 1959, pp. 196–210)

If our actions are seen to affect other people, we are likely to be called to justify them. This is essentially a demand for moral justification. In so-called liberal democratic societies, actions will only be considered 'right' or 'genuinely moral', if the supporting reasons have taken impartially into account the needs and interests of all people likely to be affected by the action. (Benn and Peters, 1959, pp. 30–56; Downie, 1971, pp. 25–54)

The kinds of needs and interests which all men are seen to share have been set down in very general terms in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 'Every individual and every organ of society' was enjoined in that document to promote respect for these rights and to work for their 'effective recognition and observance'. This Declaration was an act of exhortation, placing faith in man's capacity for purposive, rule-following behaviour, for good rather than evil ends. It is a salutary reminder for the specialist of the range of things human beings value and provides a checklist in assessing social conditions in any particular society. (Raphael, 1967).

John Plamenatz (1960), in a strongly argued article, had no doubt about human beings' capacity for goal-directed behaviour, and draws attention to modern man's need for a practical philosophy:

He lives in a changing society, and he is socially mobile in that society: he is not

⁴ This was subsequently published in *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 1973, 7 (1).

exposed to change which is so slow that he cannot perceive it. He lives in a society where men strive deliberately to change their institutions. If he is not to feel lost in society, he needs to be able to take his bearings in it; which involves more than understanding what society is like and how it is changing. It also involves having a coherent set of values and knowing how to use them to estimate what is happening; it involves having a practical philosophy, which cannot, in the modern world, be adequate unless it is also a social and political philosophy.

Plamenatz asserts,

With the decay of religion and metaphysics there has gone a depreciation of the practical philosophies so long connected with them ... Man today, much more than in the past, ... must *make* himself at home in the world, for he can no longer be at home in it merely by conforming to the conventions and acquiring the prejudices of his station in society. Indeed, he no longer has a station, as his ancestors did.

In this discussion of professional responsibility, I am focusing attention upon a particular sort of modern man, the professional man. I will be examining some of the factors which he might be expected to take into account in *making* his way as a professional person, in living a practical philosophy which makes personal and public sense. A person 'on the make' is usually frowned upon because his ambition overrides the interests of others but at least such a person is seen to be self-conscious and self-directing.

Making and justifying his role is increasingly the common lot of the modern professional. The professional who cannot, or will not, give a contemporary and acceptable rationale for his role is likely to be under challenge – from members of adjacent professions, from members of emerging professional and semi-professional groups, from work groups, over whom the professional claims authority (for example, para-medical groups, like physiotherapists and occupational therapists, or para-social work groups like welfare officers and case-aids), from actual clients, from potential clients, from people connected with clients, from administrators employing professionals, from governments, from people who finance the professionals' services other than the clients themselves, from social and biological scientists and other researchers. And it does not stop there.

There are, in addition, the challenges from colleagues within one's own profession, and these are perhaps the most difficult to avoid because all other challenges can be parried by claims that they come from people who do not, and cannot really understand what is involved in being say a physician, a psychiatrist, a lawyer, or a social worker. Emphasis on the mystique and esoteric knowledge on which professional life is based helps to protect a profession from external scrutiny but not from internal challenges.

Until fairly recently, the sociology of professions has tended to see a profession as a relatively homogeneous community whose members share identity, values, definitions of role, and interests. However, closer analysis has now revealed that the unit presented by a profession to the lay public is spurious. Bucher and Strauss (1961) see all highly professionalised occupations as 'a loose amalgamation of segments which are in movement'. Within the organised structure of, for example, the medical profession, they point to great divergency of enterprise and endeavour.

They see the movements of segments within a profession as being like social movements, which can be examined in terms of their origin, recruitment, leadership, the development of organisational apparatus, ideologies, and tactics. A segment in a profession can, in fact, have more in common with people in a neighbouring occupation than with their co-professionals. (See Lawrence, 1971) I perhaps should add that differential analysis between professions, as well as within them, has recently been urged on sociologists by Turner and Hodge. They consider the time ripe for an attempt to match theoretical models of 'professions' more closely with empirical findings. Until now, sociologists have tended towards a unitary conception of profession, yet studies show each profession deviating in particular ways. (Turner and Hodge, 1970, p. 25)

However defined, it is clear that professions and professionals are an increasingly important part of the modern social landscape, and partly because this is the case, are being expected to justify their place in it. According to Talcott Parsons (1968, p. 536), 'the development and increasing strategic importance of the professions probably constitute the most important change that has occurred in the occupational system of modern societies'.

As I see it, Australian professional groups are increasingly finding themselves under moral and political challenge. Yet they tend not to be well educated in the ethical, organisation and political aspects of their work, in what some might describe as the sociology and morality of their profession. These matters, quite as much as the technical aspects of the profession's work, have a major bearing upon the quantity and quality of service available to people in a modern industrial society.

My view is that education of each profession should include solid learning, not indoctrination, about the organisation of the profession and its professional practice, and where these fit into the social structure of our society. The economics and politics of the profession's work and its relationship to other professional and work groups should receive explicit critical attention. Further, its ethics should be learned as an integral part of its dynamic decision-making not only in individual situations, but also in relation to the wider community. Modern work in the social sciences and in moral and political philosophy could help professional groups to be less amateurish and more morally justified in their work. The professional person, properly called, must be concerned with the ends to be pursued. He is not just a technician placing his technical competence at the service of whoever is willing to pay the bill. (Lawrence, 1970)

This all amounts to a profession itself monitoring and being able to justify its position in the broader society, not leaving this to its critics, hostile or friendly, well-informed or ill-informed.

Implicit in what I have been saying so far is the assumption, referred to at the beginning, that people, especially professional people, are responsible for their actions, in the sense that they have the ability to make up their own minds on what to do on a basis of reasons. I realise this may be a dangerous tack to take amongst a group of psychiatrists who, compared with other human beings, encounter more than their fair share of rationalisation as psychological defence mechanism and of bizarre behaviour without apparent sense. I would remind you that I am talking about actions done wittingly, not things that just happen to people like sneezes, knee jerks, sudden bursts of emotion, or obsessional behaviour.

Not uncommonly behaviour is classified as 'irrational' because we do not know, or understand, or agree with the reasons for it. Often what is labelled as 'irrational' has strong social class overtones. In portraying the world of poor persons in the United States, Ben H. Bagdikian (1964) has said:

There is a culture of poverty that perpetuates itself inside its own geography behind a border that separates the despairing from the hopeful. It provides an enclave for refugees from the world of success ... duchies of deprivation ... From the outside, the inhabitants seem hostile and irrational. But from within, the culture is sensible and inevitable ... Middle class assumptions of common sense and social responsibility often make no sense to the poor. What is prudent for the well-fed may be irresponsible for the poor ... For the poor the future is demonstrably treacherous. Self-denial brings them not the reward of evenly distributed joy but the punishment of permanent loss.

Only if professional people are seen to be responsible in the primary sense so far referred to of being relatively free decision-making agents can they be held to be responsible in other senses. What are these other senses of 'responsibility'?

First, a person can be seen as *responsible to*, or accountable to, another person or group. This means he is expected to explain and justify what has been done. Second, he can also be said to be *responsible for* something, that is, that it is his task or role to deal with it. Here we could talk about his *responsibilities*. Third, a reliable or conscientious person can be described as being 'responsible' or 'having a sense of responsibility'. And fourth, a person can be responsible for something, in the sense that he *causes it* to happen. Here he may or may not have wittingly caused it to happen. (Downie, 1971, pp. 55–6)

In the remainder of this lecture I am going to use these interconnected usages of 'responsibility' to discuss the justification of actions of individual professionals and of a profession as a collectivity.

We, of course, frequently personify collectivities, talking about them as if they have wills and other personal characteristics, and in law a collectivity like a professional association has a legal personality in terms of which it is held legally responsible. Any collectivity like a profession can only be held morally responsible, however, through its individual members. Downie (1971, p. 92) suggests that individual moral responsibility is involved in corporate responsibility in three main ways. First, the rights and duties of roles which constitute the collectivity, in this case the profession, have been created, developed, or maintained by the decisions of individuals. Second, the decision to join and retain individual membership in a profession is an individual one. And third, an individual can bring various moral qualities of his own to his performance of his role as a member of the profession.

I will be spending most of my remaining time on discussing professional people being responsible *to* someone *for* something, and causing things to happen. But first some comment on professional people as 'responsible people' in the sense of their being reliable and conscientious. Here what we seem to have in mind are character traits, not only behaviour in the performance of a particular role. A person with 'a sense of responsibility' is someone you can trust to do the right thing whatever the circumstances. In an earlier age when 'the right thing' tended to be decreed by custom, you knew where you stood in relation to the person. You perhaps confided

in your local doctor or your local clergyman seeing him as a responsible person, a man of integrity, whom as an educated man you assumed to 'know the score' on far more than just medical or theological matters. The limited number, elite education, social class, family traditions and stability of world outlook of the professionals of yester-year contrast with conditions in contemporary society.

You cannot, of course, turn back the clock, and in any case the heavy class bias of the earlier professional system would be currently unacceptable. However, to function effectively and to warrant his community power and status the modern professional has to be seen as a person of integrity and trustworthy at least within the confines of his professional role. Many would argue that only if he is a trustworthy person is he likely to be a trustworthy professional.

Systems of professional socialisation, through example, exhortation, and sanction, can develop people's 'sense of responsibility', but to the extent that basic personality characteristics are involved, recruiting people with appropriate personality potential may be just as important as the professional socialisation process itself. Screening of professional recruits on personality as well as academic grounds is a controversial and difficult exercise.

My view on this is that every effort should be made to convey to potential recruits and their parents the kind of work and responsibilities involved in each profession, now and in the foreseeable future. Each profession needs a systematic up-to-date campaign carried out through all the schools, the media, the professional schools, the professional association, summer work programs, and the like. Such a campaign has the two-fold purpose of tapping all the potential, and deterring on the basis of some knowledge those thought by themselves or others to be unsuitable for the particular career. Many professions because they easily fill their university quotas wrongly neglect such recruitment activity. It is especially important when an occupational group is relatively new, or consists overwhelmingly of one sex, or has new patterns of education and career prospects, or is associated with out-of-date stereotypes – such as social work being only a woman's occupation and only concerned with social casework and not with social group work, community work, and policy and administrative roles.

I do not favour trying formally to screen people on personality grounds at the point of intake into a professional course. However, where a student's personality characteristics lead to poor performance in what we in our school call his field education subjects, he should fail just as in any other subject. The focus is then, however, on his performance in real life situations matched against criteria of professional behaviour; his personality per se is not being assessed.

'Having' or 'developing a sense of responsibility' is not, of course, only shaped by personality characteristics. The social circumstances of the student for a profession can be powerful influences. Although the educators expect of students the learning of the reliable and conscientious, or 'responsible' behaviour, which they see as typifying the professional person, the student usually has other commitments and claims to his attention – like taking on other adult roles additional to the work role. In the words of Olesen and Whittaker (1970, p. 186),

Professional socialisation ... (is) only one of many strands with which the individual is dealing in becoming adult, among which are acquiring mature values, defining

and acting our sex roles, learning norms which guide adult behaviour, shaping and sharpening understanding of social and life goals.

Although the pattern may be changing to some extent, the female student for a profession will often be at least as interested in the not too distant role of wife and mother as in a professional career. In addition, there are students who are under great financial strain and who therefore cannot give the same degree of personal commitment to their professional education as those comfortably placed. For some of these, 'getting a ticket' to enable you to earn a good salary is a prime motivation. If the context of professional education is too large and impersonal, individual attitudes may not be basically changed. Learning and spooning up what the educators want sufficient to get through a course rather than integrating the knowledge, skills and values in one's own behaviour patterns is not professional education worthy of the name. It is to be guilty of a confidence trick not always easy to detect – at least at the point of graduation. And yet this may be unfair to the individuals concerned. There may well be in our society, as has been observed in the United States, severe culture discontinuities between the failure of parents and schools to socialise children for responsibility and the later abrupt demands of the society for mature, responsible behaviour. (Olesen and Whittaker, 1970, p. 188)

The two core characteristics of an occupation called a profession, 'a prolonged specialised training in a body of abstract knowledge, and a collectivity or service orientation' (Goode, 1960, p. 903) refer to the acquisition and use of rare knowledge in socially responsible ways. We expect the professional 'to keep up with his field', and not only this but also to add to its knowledge, which includes monitoring and developing new technology. If he is going to have the status and rewards of an expert, then he should earn them. But the matter is far from simple. Turner and Hodge (1970, pp. 26–7) comment:

The degree of substantive technique and theory requisite for carrying out of professional or semi-professional activities is a fundamental yet highly contentious aspect of occupational analysis. The question of what passes for knowledge in any society or social group at a given time, and the current means of establishing various forms of knowledge has been a perennial theme of intellectual inquiry.

They go on to point out that,

Claims to knowledge and skills are usually very closely linked to claims to some degree of monopoly over occupational activities, and both of these aspects may be intrinsically related to problems of the external recognition and organisation of the 'profession'.

In seeking and justifying its charter, a professional group advances many grounds – the possession of esoteric knowledge and high skill, the performance of tasks of high social value, the image of community service and dedication, the denial of competitive claims (Turner and Hodge, 1970, p. 28). The politicking and negotiation for public recognition centres around validating or invalidating such grounds.

My own profession has recently been involved in New South Wales in asserting its charter for community work, in competition with psychiatrists, and in asserting its charter for social casework, in competition with 'community nurses' (AASW, 1972).

In each instance, the social work case was argued in terms of superior relevant knowledge and skills.

A typical feature in the development of a professional charter is to separate out those tasks which can perhaps be done under professional supervision but which do not require elaborate, prolonged education. Established professions tend to get related to their functions para – or supporting staff, both technical and other – as a matter both of functional differentiation and spreading the effects of scarce professional labour. This involves the professionals in devising and operating in systems of service, and in being explicit about respective areas of competence, including the claimed special place of the indigenous non-professional (Sobey, 1970). The process is a troubled one which can lead to intergenerational conflict when it is based upon a profession up-grading and changing its basic education. Older practitioners may not be willing or able to assume the new responsibilities and relinquish tasks now seen to be non-professional in nature.

Without external recognition of its claimed charter, a profession cannot, of course, function. There are, in fact, many 'publics' in contact with members of the profession. Not only are there 'clients' of different types, whom I will discuss in a moment, but there are also likely to be co-workers outside the occupational group, who are either necessarily or incidentally implicated; other occupational associations, which may be either complementary or competitive; government bodies taking a direct legislative and /or administrative part in the regulation of occupational activities; educational and training institutions; and other individuals, groups and organisations, who collectively might be labelled the general public, but who will have sectional interests and differential knowledge of the occupation. (Turner and Hodge, 1970, p. 30)

Who are and should be a profession's clients, and to what extent is the profession actually accountable to them, and with respect to what? A generation or so ago perhaps these were relatively simple questions. In today's increased social complexity and its moral and political climate, they are far from simple.

Professionals claim in their area of competence to give a service to their clients superior to any other and in fact try to claim monopoly. The claimed monopoly is breached to the extent that potential clients do not know about the service, they cannot get access to it, because it is geographically or financially inaccessible, they do not recognise professional competence, or they believe that non-professional services are at least adequate if not superior to professional services.

The more successful an occupational group in getting its services recognised as being valuable, the more the question of its equitable distribution across the population is likely to be raised, and this is especially the case when a large amount of public funds have subsidised education and training for the occupation in question. Traditional professional services in, for example, medicine and law, are being challenged for their skewed distribution in the population – skewed in favour of the prosperous middle classes. Old formulas of charity medicine, connected with honorary systems, and means-tested legal aid schemes, which have paid some regard to the social maldistribution of service are under political scrutiny and fire. Increasingly a profession is being asked to justify whom it is actually serving under its claim of community service.

For example, in his Academic Lecture to the College last year, David Maddison (1972, p. 32) commented:

The private practice of psychiatry continues to grow at an almost exponential rate, providing an excellent service in all probability to an important segment of the population of those who are definably ill, but contributing little to psychiatric education, virtually nothing to psychiatric research, and probably a decreasing amount to hospital and community psychiatry.

And he referred to the inverse care law, which is that the availability of good medical care tends to vary inversely with the need for it in the population.

In the United States, not only psychiatry has been accused of concentrating upon a limited section of the mentally ill population (Maddison, 1966), but social work, which has always claimed special concern for society's most disadvantaged groups, has been accused of forsaking the poor (Cloward and Epstein, 1965). The recent emphasis on 'community psychiatry' covers a variety of concerns and claims (Dunham, 1965; Barclay, 1968), not all of them very sensible in my view. But the concern under this rubric for making psychiatric services evenly available right across the mentally ill population and for adapting professional technology to people's needs and not vice versa, can be matched by similar concerns in other human service fields. It is being seen as a matter of the rights of a citizen to have available relevant professional and other services. In a modern industrial society we are accustomed to the notion of 'public utilities', a range of basic services available to everyone. The idea is being extended into what are called 'social utilities', human services available throughout the community as a matter of right, and not just charity or according to the vagaries of a private commercial enterprise. (Kahn, 1969, pp. 176-191; Howard, 1969, 74)

The so-called 'revolution of rising expectation' on the part of the populace at large (Howard, 1969, pp. 44-53) is forcing democratically elected governments to be concerned with the availability of valued services. Depending on the government's political complexion what is seen as a desirable mix between government, voluntary, and private enterprise services will vary.

It is now commonly said that health services are too important to be left to doctors, especially when so many of them use 'the socialist bogey' as a substitute for coming to grips with the relevant organisational, economic, and moral issues. Interpreting under modern circumstances the Hippocratic ideal of never withholding treatment is a difficult task, involving doctors and those responsible for medical services in far more than just narrowly medical decisions. Bernard Shaw saw this in 'The Doctor's Dilemma', written in 1906:

My laboratory, my staff, and myself are working at full pressure. We are doing our utmost. The treatment is a new one. It takes time, means, and skill; and there is not enough for another case. Our ten cases are already chosen cases. Do you understand what I mean by chosen? ... In every single one of those ten cases I have had to consider, not only whether the man could be saved, but whether he was worth saving. There were fifty cases to choose from; and forty had to be condemned to death. (Quoted in Nokes, 1967, p. 25)

To try to reach the population at large, organised systems of service are essential. There is a mounting literature on the functioning of professionals in bureaucracies. Some professionals, like school teachers and social workers, are employed largely

in bureaucratic organisations. This, together with their high proportion of female members, makes Etzioni (1969) classify them as semi-professions as distinct from the fully-fledged professions. But increasing numbers of the latter are also becoming salaried employees in large bureaucratic organisations.

Many writers have seen bureaucracy as detrimental to professional standards and values. The limiting administrative structure of the bureaucracy is seen as restricting the professional's freedom and makes him dependent on the organisation which, in turn controls him and inhibits the application of his knowledge and skills. G. Harries-Jenkins (1970, pp. 53-4) has described the professional in a bureaucracy as participating in 'two distinct, irreconcilable systems'. He is a member of two institutions – the profession and the organisation. Each of these attempts to control his occupational activities. The 'verticle' structure of the bureaucratic organisation and the 'horizontal' structure of the profession provide contrasting approaches to the organisation of complex tasks.

Recent writers have begun to modify this picture to some extent. Bucher and Stelling have, for example, shown that professionals typically build their own role in an organisation rather than fit into pre-set roles. They suggest that a language of political process – emphasising negotiation and shifting alliances – is more relevant to understanding what goes on in organisations which employ professionals, than is the language of social structure. It also seems that the extent to which organisations in general, especially modern ones, are highly bureaucratised has been exaggerated. (Bucher and Stelling, 1969)

Further, a recent study by Gloria Engel (1969) has discovered that it is not bureaucracy per se but the degree of bureaucracy that is seen to limit professional autonomy in the client-professional relationship. She found that a moderately bureaucratic setting provides more professional autonomy for the physician than either a non-bureaucratic or a highly bureaucratic setting. This is because of having ready access to various facilities typically available in the complex organisation.

Professions can make the use of large-scale organisational resources more congruent to their purposes if some of their own number specialise in policy and administrative roles. The administration of health services, of education services, and of welfare services are increasingly being seen as professional tasks, requiring more than general administrative experience or just experience in clinical medicine, or classroom teaching, or social casework. To describe doctors, teachers and social workers who take on these administrative and policy roles as 'having left practice' seems to me an increasingly outmoded and unsatisfactory way of conceptualizing the situation. To the extent that they are using in their decisions a common knowledge and value base with their co-professionals, and they have relevant education in management, they are as much professional practitioners as are the older high-status, one-to-one variety. Because of the effects of their decisions, they may in fact individually be more important. For all the reasons I have been mentioning, the professions can no longer afford to neglect the broader aspects of social organisation.

In a lively British book, sociologist Peter Nokes (1967) has examined the nature of the professional task in such occupations as schoolteaching, mental hospital psychiatry, and prison and borstal work – what he calls 'welfare professions' operating in an institutional setting. Of interest to psychiatrists is his employment in

1954 on the staff of the renowned Henderson Hospital, then the Belmont Hospital Social Rehabilitation Unit. (Jones, 1968, pp. 17–8, 25–6)

Nokes comments on the highly generalised, humanitarian statements of objective prevalent in the institutions he examines and amongst the welfare professionals employed by them. The relative absence of clear performance criteria provides a high degree of job security, 'for if it is not clear when a man is performing adequately it is no clearer when he is doing otherwise. Teachers and psychiatrists are rarely sacked'. He points out, however, the adverse effects of lack of clear objectives on staff morale, as well as on planning.

The book suggest that this situation may not be basically a management problem at all, but rather a political problem. The uncertainty and conflict of society about the objectives of these institutions lies at the heart of the matter. Multiple and often conflicting values are seen to be at stake, and deciding amongst these is primarily a matter of moral and political choice guided by factual data if people can be persuaded to take notice of it. Nokes says, 'science as such can have a part only insofar as it can comment on the practical feasibility or otherwise of particular choices'.

According to Nokes, 'the welfare professions are only partially instrumental, only partially means of bringing about particular results with particular classes of client'. These professionals also have an important expressive function, reflecting the often grandiose humanitarian sentiments of the populace at large. Too hard-headed an insistence on organisational and professional objectives which indicate what is practically possible and what is actually *done* would outrage public sentiment, he claims. Yet until objectives are made more limited, precise and operational, people do not know where they stand and justifiable moral choices can scarcely be made. (Nokes, 1967)

It is a truncated version of morality which concentrates only on intentions rather than outcomes, and yet this is still the basis of much of 'welfare' activity in our sort of society (Lawrence, 1968)

Before I leave the subject of professionals in organisations, there is one further issue I want to touch on briefly. When should a professional resign rather than carry out policies which he finds abhorrent? What is the 'responsible' thing to do? Downie (1971, pp. 138–42) has a helpful discussion on this topic but warns against a simple unmodified 'resign-if-you-disagree' view. The person should balance the over-all effects of such a resignation before deciding what to do, and staying in the job trying to modify it from within may be the lesser of two evils.

Resignations of professionals can, of course, primarily reflect inducement of a better position rather than dissatisfaction with the present one. A position may be better financially but not professionally, that is, in terms of the opportunity to pursue professional values. The conscientious, or responsible professional person will sometimes have a difficult decision to make in deciding what the next move in his professional career should be. His marketability and the maximising of his professionalism do not always go hand in hand, and this can apply in entrepreneurial private practice as well as in professional practice in a bureaucratic setting.

In conclusion, I want to focus upon the individual citizen and his relationships with professional people. As I have been pointing out, increasing numbers of professional and other services are being seen as necessary for him to live effectively in our sort

of society. Yet he receives little schooling in what is available and how he might function when he is supposedly receiving a service (Lawrence, 1970). We must always remember that what is being affected is his life for which he fundamentally is responsible. As a human being he has potentially a wide range of values which can give meaning and point to his life. Being encapsulated in any one so-called service system too comprehensively, or for too long a period, is likely to mould the person to that system and make him over-dependent upon it. This may well suit the service managers and others who make a living from the system, but who really is being served?

Professional group after professional group seem now to be aware that they are specialised, that they is more to a person than the particular aspect which they previously have concentrated upon. This is all to the good, if they decided to work collaboratively with other specialised groups who bear responsibility for dealing with other important aspects of people's lives. But from what I have been saying earlier, working collaboratively is likely to be problematic. In health service settings, the actual service provided often reflects the status differentials and conflict between the members of the service 'team', with the various aspects of the patient's life being pawns in the game. And the patient is there to be 'treated', not to adjudicate over his own affairs.

As I have said on another occasion (Lawrence, 1970), I do not like 'treatment', 'therapy' or 'illness' language, except when carefully applied in specifiable and agreed upon biological and mental conditions. New professions like social work and clinical psychology have, I think somewhat blindly, copied this medical terminology. The extension of the sick role into large areas of personal and social functioning is a most serious matter. I believe it encourages illegitimately patterns of dependency on professional help, and at the same time makes people acutely aware that there will never be enough professionals for all the so-called 'illness' around them.

Educational and skill acquisition models, rather than medical or social 'treatment' models offer possibilities in which increasing numbers of professional people are showing interest, and they allow the extensive use of non-professional labour. (Mechanic, 1969, pp. 108-116)

I see professional responsibility in this next generation, more and more taking the form of helping people to acquire skills in their own personal and social decision-making. Too often in the past have paternalistic professionals used their status and power to limit, not enhance responsibility of those they claim to serve. Working with, rather than just on people, will perhaps become the touchstone of professional responsibility. The 'practical philosophy' of the professional will need to be basically a democratic, collaborative one, if it is to be functional.

My discussion of professional responsibility in a changing world is likely to make any one professional feel overwhelmed by the complexities and challenges I have mentioned. Yet, as I have emphasised, highly individual though he may be, the professional is part of a collectivity. All of us have specialised roles in relation to our profession. Secretariats of professional associations, educators, and senior public service professionals are likely to be especially concerned with the over-all shape of the collectivity, but they, like the rest, bear responsibility for only their specific roles in it. However, if there are important roles missing in the life of our profession, then perhaps all of us share some responsibility to do what we can to rectify the situation.

REFERENCES

- AASW (NSW Branch) – The Health Commission Committee (1972), 'Comments on the Report of an Advisory Committee, *Personal Health Services Within Metropolitan Regions*'.
- Bagdikian, Ben H. (1964), *In the Midst of Plenty: The Poor in America*, Beacon Press, Boston.
- Barclay, William A. (1968), 'Community Psychiatry', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 2: pp. 127 – 7.
- Benn, S. I., and Peters, R. S. (1959), *Social Principles and the Democratic State*, George Allen and Unwin, London.
- Bucher, Rue, and Stelling, Joan (1969), 'Characteristics of Professional Organisations', *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 10 (1), pp. 3–15.
- Bucher, Rue, and Strauss, Anselm (1961), 'Professions in Process', *American Journal of Sociology* 66:4, pp. 325–334.
- Cloward, Richard, and Epstein, Irwin (1965), 'Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor': The Case of Family Adjustment Agencies', in Zald, Mayer, N. (ed), *Social Welfare Institutions: A Sociological Reader*, Wiley, New York.
- Downie, R. S. (1971), *Roles and Values: An Introduction to Social Ethics*, Methuen, London.
- Dunham, Warren H. (1965), 'Community Psychiatry: The Newest Therapeutic Bandwagon', *Archives of General Psychiatry* (March) 13, pp. 303–313.
- Engel, Gloria V. (1969). 'The Effect of Bureaucracy on the Professional Autonomy of the Physician', *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 10 (1), pp. 30–41.
- Etzioni, Amitai (ed), *The Semi-Professions and Their Organisation: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers*, New York.
- Goodes, W. J. (1960), 'Encroachment, Charlatanism and the Emerging Professions', *American Sociological Review*, 25 (December), p. 903.
- Harries-Jenkins, G. (1970), 'Professionals in Organisations', in Jackson, J. A. (ed), *Professions and Professionalization*, Cambridge University Press, London.
- Howard, Donald S. (1969), *Social Welfare: Values, Means, and Ends*, Random House, New York.
- Jones, Maxwell (1968), *Social Psychiatry in Practice: The Idea of a Therapeutic Community*, Penguin Books, London.
- Kahn, Alfred J. (1969), *Theory and Practice of Social Planning*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Lawrence, R. J. (1968), 'A Social Transaction Model for the Analysis of Social Welfare', *The Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 3:4 (October), pp. 51–72.
- Lawrence, R. J. (1970), 'Service to People in the 1970s', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2: 1205 (December 19).
- Lawrence, R. J. (1971), 'Medicine and Related Professions', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 1: 41 (January 2).
- Maddison, David (1966), 'The Changing Responsibility of the Psychiatrist', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 2: 302 (August 13).
- Maddison, David (1972), 'Psychiatric Education and Psychiatric Care: An Interlocking System', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 6: 19–23.
- Nokes, Peter (1967), *The Professional Task in Welfare Practice*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

- Olesen, Virginia, and Whittaker, Elvi W. (1970), 'Critical Notes on Sociological Studies of Professional Socialisation', in Jackson, J. A. (ed), *Professions and Professionalization*, Cambridge University Press, London.
- Parsons, T. (1968), 'Professions', *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York.
- Sobey, Francine (1970), *The Nonprofessional Revolution in Mental Health*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Turner, C., and Hodge, M. N. (1970), 'Occupations and Professions', in Jackson, J. A. (ed), *Professions and Professionalization*, Cambridge University Press, London.

Before this lecture, I can recall attending a congress session discussing individual cases in psychoanalytic language which I failed to comprehend. The psychiatrist I was with said I was not alone! After my lecture, Dr Cunningham Dax, a key person in the development of mental hygiene services in Victoria, said he would welcome mental health initiatives becoming shared responsibilities.

I did not maintain ongoing contact with David Maddison, although he sent me offprints of several of his articles. In September 1975, while writing to him about a book review he asked me to do, I mentioned I was coming to Newcastle for a meeting organised by the Newcastle CAE, to examine the possibility of them setting up a social work course.

I don't think any new courses will be getting off the ground at present because of the economic climate. This may be a good thing in connection with this proposed development!

It seems to me that if there is to be a social work course in Newcastle it should certainly be located in the University. Reasonably qualified social work educators are difficult enough to recruit in the university context, let alone in a CAE – to mention only one important factor. Have you any views on the subject? I would certainly appreciate a chance to discuss the situation with you. I have tried to do this by phone before the meeting on 18 September, but I understand that you are away at present.

Hope all is well with your own planning, although it's obviously a bad time to be trying to develop new educational ventures.⁵

As expected, nothing came of the CAE proposal so I did not need to have this discussion with David Maddison. Sadly his life ended with a sudden heart attack in 1981.

7.8.4 First Australian Conference on the Family and Health 1977

In April 1976, I received an invitation to participate in a week-long conference in Perth in May 1977 (later changed to August 1977), being planned by the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, with the assistance of the extension service of the University of Western Australia. The theme would be: Changes in Australian family life and society and changing roles of the GP.

This conference is a 'first' in Australia and, possibly, in the world. ... Its success,

⁵ Letter, John Lawrence to David Maddison, 3/9/75.

however, depends upon the contributions of major world thinkers and educators, such as yourself, because, although the theme may be national, the implications are global. ...

Conferees will include GPs and health/welfare professionals from across Australia. Other speakers and workshop leaders will be both national and international.

Enclosed you will find materials describing the philosophic and operational bases for the conference. ...

We would, of course, assume full responsibility for all costs ...

My participation *could* include a morning theme lecture for about an hour on other professional services in the community – working with the general practitioner without him, or against him? This would be published in the proceedings.⁶

Hugh Cook, whom I first knew when he was a medical student at the University of Adelaide in the early 1950s, was currently W.A. director of the family medicine program of the RACGP. As conference director, he informed me in December 1976, they now thought it would be appropriate for me to provide the first lecture, for the opening of the conference. The theme for that day would be 'The Changing Australian Family: Patients and Doctors'. 'If you don't want to say very much about the doctors I shall quite understand, but I know you have a vast amount of knowledge of the changing Australian family.' Sidney Sax would be giving the final day's lecture which would be mainly concerned with the health team.⁷

Jay Sayer and Hugh came east for discussions which resulted in a number of changes in the draft program, many of which, according to Jay, reflected my suggestions. (He had extensive experience in Canada and the United States in organising conferences of health professionals, and had provided a complex structure for the Perth conference – lectures, shorter presentations, panels, discussion groups, workshops, concurrent seminars, public and media occasions.

At 9am on Monday, 15 August, 1977, the Western Australian premier, Sir Charles Court, opened the conference in the Octagon theatre at the University of W.A.. About 350 people were participants. My lecture on the Australian family followed. Each day commenced with a long main lecture. The lecturers for the subsequent days were Sidney Sax (chairman, Hospitals and Health Services Commission, Canberra), Nathan Epstein (director, family research program, Department of Psychiatry, McMaster university), Donald Rice (executive director, College of Family Physicians of Canada; former president of in the World Organisation of Associations of GPs/Family Physicians).

After my lecture on the opening day was a shorter presentation by Anne Deveson on the Australian family and human relationships. A journalist and film-maker, she had been a member of the Royal Commission on Human Relationships set up by the Whitlam government. We were then part of a panel

6 Letter, Jay M. Sayer (deputy director, university of W.A. extension service) and M. C. Canning (chairman, preventive and community medicine committee (W.A. Faculty), RACGP) to R.J. Lawrence, 22/4/76.

7 Letter, Hugh Cook to John Lawrence, 22/12/76.

discussion, which included one of our UNSW social work graduates Brian Cheers.⁸ After concurrent seminars, in the late afternoon was a session on identifying objectives and expectations for the conference, with June Huntington⁹ and Hugh Cook acting as facilitators. At 8pm was a public lecture, with the conference title of 'The Australian Family ... Who Cares?' with myself and Anne Deveson, selecting from material we had provided earlier to the people at the conference. My opening lecture:

The Australian Family

All of us living here in Australia have been born into a family and the vast majority of us as adults have formed new families of our own. At some stages of our life cycle, especially in our very early years, and again very often in the final stages, the most significant people in our lives are likely to be others members of the family. Even for the relatively few who live their lives separate from any family involvements, they cannot avoid interacting with others who have such involvements. Being involved in and with families is one of the most pervasive aspects of being human.

But we are not just family members, we are also members of Australian society and are involved in a host of way in its various other social institutions – its governmental system, its economy, its occupational system, its educational institutions, its religious institutions, its leisure and recreation arrangements, its social class system, its age status system. And our membership is not seen to stop there. In a shrinking and ever more volatile and dangerous world, our need to recognise our membership of a world society and accept the consequent obligations is increasingly being thrust upon us.

I wish to declare at the outset the nature of my interest in the general topic of the Australian family. I belong to the profession of social work which has traditionally been concerned with the well-being of individual people in their social context, helping them to understand that context and to use it as productively as possible in leading their lives. Inevitably this has meant that social work has had a heavy involvement in family systems, both as part of individuals' problems and part of their solutions. And it has helped individuals and their families relate to their external social environment through understanding how it affects their lives and how they can use the resources and facilities it offers. Social work has been especially concerned with some of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged sections of the Australian society, where individuals and families are under heavy strain, and where the inadequacy of our social arrangements become painfully obvious. Within social work it has become firmly recognised that the case by case approach must also be accompanied by action to help groups of people get a better deal from their society, and action to try to influence our society's social policies and services generally so that they are seen as both relevant and just. These broader responsibilities for contemporary social work call for adequate collective data on Australian families and the life conditions they experience. Generalisations from personal, or individual

8 He was director of family service centre and lecturer in social work, University of Western Australia.

9 June was a valued sociology colleague in the UNSW School of Social Work. See pp. 200–4. During the long plane trip to Perth, we had opportunity to discuss many matters. Her PhD study was very relevant to GP and social work concerns at the conference. She appreciated my material on the Australian family and regretted that I had not had more time for sociological writing.

case experience provide a very insecure basis for designing services and policies which are relevant to the Australian population at large.

My second reason for being interested in the Australian family is that for many years I have studied the social welfare arrangements of Australian society and other similar societies – the way they are organised, their rationale, their auspices, their resources, their clients, and so on. The family was the claimed centre of concern for the reorganised local social services in Britain under the Seebohm Report (1968). The Community Welfare Act in South Australia is ‘to promote the well-being of the family as the basis of community welfare’. The relevant Minister in 1972 stated:

The State’s welfare policies in South Australia are to be centred about the family. The well-being of the overwhelming majority of the people depends upon those people being members of a well-adjusted and harmonious family group. Welfare services must be directed therefore towards supporting the family unit where it is under stress and towards providing a substitute family environment for those who have been deprived of the opportunity of development and fulfilment in a normal family environment. (King, 1973, pp. 43–4)

Other State social or community welfare departments tend to say they have similar objectives, although their activities in fact tend not to be directed at family units but rather to individuals (Commonwealth-State Family Services Committee, 1977).

The South Australian Act has a prior obligation ‘to promote the well-being of all persons in the community’. As the Minister I have quoted has indicated, the family-centred approach is seen as *the* major means to this end. A family-centre approach is, however, only one of the competing bases for organising our social policies and services, and as yet it seems to have been only weakly represented in our arrangements.

This leads me to my third reason for being interested generally in the Australian family. I am not interested in it as an end in itself. It interests me to the extent it influences, for good or ill, the well-being of all members of our society. I accept as a personal, a professional, and a citizen frame of reference, what has been called ‘the moral point of view’ (Baier, 1958; Hospers, 1969, pp. 169–172; Benn and Peters, 1959, pp. 30–56). This entails trying to take into account and balance the interests of everyone involved in a situation. It involves trying to get informed about the consequences of different courses of action for the lives of the people affected. The assumption is that every human being is potentially a source of rights and of arguments when you are trying to decide what is the morally right thing to do.

Of course in the decisions of the real world the interests of some people or groups of people tend to predominate because of their age, or their sex, or their financial resources, or their education, or their skin colour, or their ethnicity, or their personal characteristics, or their being somewhere at the appropriate time, or their being able to say what they want, or because they are known to the decision-makers. The interests of such persons as unborn generations, severely physically and mentally handicapped people, infants and young children, mentally disturbed people, geographically mobile people, people not of the dominant culture – these tend to be neglected.

The moral point of view insists that decisions be justified in terms of how they

affect the interests of the people involved. It does not make decision-making easier. It tends to make it more complex and more troubled because of the often conflicting claims to be considered and balanced. And it does not, of course, mean that in the final analysis the decision-maker is discovering *the* morally right answer. He or she must choose between competing possibilities, and the choice made may well still be challenged on genuinely moral grounds because essentially a judgement is being made between competing ends, not a calculation which will give a single morally correct answer. The moral point of view merely prescribes a way of going about making justifiable decisions.

The traditional debate in moral and political philosophy about the place of the individual in the family, other associations, and especially the nation-state, is an extraordinarily complicated one in the context of a modern urban industrial society like Australia. The place and influence of family life will vary greatly according to such factors as the person's age, sex, religion, temperament, cultural group, geographic location, availability of other ways of living, and so on. In Australia we in fact have only a very sketchy picture of Australians' family involvements. Before we start prescribing what ought to be done about our family arrangements in any national way, it seems necessary to find out what the present situation is. But again I need to emphasise that research as such will not tell us what we ought to do. It can only help us to be better informed about the likely effects of different possible courses of action. Only if we had the fantasy situation of full agreement about the general ends we should pursue in Australian society and agreement about the nature of the social reality of our society, would it be possible for research to tell us what to do. Even then there could well be disagreement on detail because of the moral rather than technical issues raised.

My fourth and final reason for having a general interest in the Australian family is that I am chairman of a steering committee responsible for a national family research project, and I will be saying more about this shortly.

I know that it is all too easy for each successive adult generation to consider their particular times especially turbulent and undergoing rapid social change. However, I think future historians are likely to point to the period from about the mid-1960s until fairly recently as especially restless and troubled for Australian society; and this has paralleled similar trends in other western nations, prompting questions about the nature and balance of internal and external influences in a modern nation's social change.

I remind you of some of the things that have been happening:

- Vietnam
- demonstrations
- physical violence
- student protest
- the marijuana controversy
- the development of a hard drug problem
- general drug abuse
- smoking and lung cancer
- the proclaimed generation gap
- the counter-culture
- the women's movement

- Germaine Greer
- equal pay for women
- the 'gay lib' movement
- abortion
- the sexual revolution
- pornography
- pollution
- the conservation movement
- the zero population growth movement
- Toffler's panic-making best-seller *Future Shock*
- the urban condition especially in our largest cities
- the decay of public transport systems and the dominance of the private motor car
- the new 'growth centres' mostly aborted before they could flourish
- high inflation coupled with persistent unemployment especially among young people
- uncertainty about future careers and general loss of confidence about the future
- the charting of poverty in our midst
- the growing awareness of social inequality in what has been thought of as an egalitarian society
- the guilt about aborigines and attempts to make amends
- the recognition of ethnic pluralism
- the cessation of large-scale migration
- the claimed end to a 'white Australia' policy
- new religious sects
- the ecumenical movement
- the changes and tensions in the Catholic Church
- the over-long reign of a conservative national government followed by the brief spectacular reign of a reforming but often inept national government
- the polarisation of politics
- the politicisation of group and individual social relationships
- the politicisation of scholarship especially in the social sciences
- disenchantment with our method of government – at the constitutional, parliamentary, and public service levels
- the challenge of 'bigness' and the over-centralisation of authority and the moves to regionalisation
- the demand for citizen participation
- the escalating cost of medical technology and the maldistribution of the health and other service systems to match the needs of the population as a whole
- the challenge to professional elitism and professional mysticism
- the loss of a certain amount of public confidence in the integrity and capacity of some individual members of the established professions and of the organised bodies acting on behalf of their professions
- the anti-psychiatry movement
- the challenge to segregating and institutionalising sick and dependent people

- new understanding of the nature and importance of family and individual crises
- the emergence of new occupational groups
- increasing specialisation and fragmentation within established occupations
- continuing problems of relationships between different levels of government
- uncertainty and disagreement on the roles of voluntary sector social service activities
- rising concern about the influence of the media and especially about the effects of television on children
- strikes which have demonstrated how easily our society is brought to a halt
- worry about the power and sectional role of trade unions
- Bob Hawke
- Jack Munday
- Gough Whitlam
- John Kerr
- the increased awareness of international tensions and conflicts including terrorist activities
- the recognition of Communist China and increasing interest in its way of life
- the rift in international communism which has given the lie to the West's inevitable destruction by a monolithic international socialism
- cynicism and loss of confidence in government leaders epitomised by Watergate
- the influence of the multinational
- the energy crisis
- and now the Uranium issue

The list could, of course, be extended. As a citizen, a social work educator, and a parent, I certainly have found this a fascinating but taxing period through which to live. All of the phenomena I have listed, in a host of ways have affected Australian families both directly and indirectly.

Ours until recently has not been a society deeply troubled by its social problems. The 'Lucky Country' description of Donald Horne referred to both the luck of chance and circumstance, but also our luck in getting away with our ignorance of our society. From the mid-1950s this luck began to run out, and policy-makers with responsibility to do something about society found they had little or no data to guide them. There was increasing political pressure for a wide range of social reforms. The policy proposals were rarely researched for their possible effects on Australian society. They could not be because so little basic data was available about that society except in the areas of economic statistics and demography.

The spate of national social enquiries especially under the Whitlam Government reflected a belated attempt to provide underpinning for the development of new, well-informed national policies in areas like health, education, recreation, income security, urban affairs, the national estate – to name but a few of the areas. Many of the enquiries found themselves operating in a plethora of opinion but a desert of data, their deadlines were unrealistic, they competed for very scarce social research expertise, and often had to settle for talking about pilot studies and the need for further work. Much of the data collected was no doubt fascinating to those involved

in the process, but its relevance for knowledge building and policy were often obscure, and few of the enquiries have led to accepted national policy.

One of the worries of much of this is that the whole notion of trying to get social data for accurate knowledge about our society and on which to base policies has become so suspect that the politicians and administrators, and sectional community groups, are again free to return to their own personal and sectional biases which will continue to remain unchallenged.

One looks to a much more even and systematic development of social data which is up-to-date and widely available, and is an integral part of the policy debates throughout our society. I think we have a much keener awareness now of what I would call the politics of knowledge. Who knows what about social matters has obvious political implications, but a democratic society should insist on a much fuller social knowledge than we have at present and as open a sharing of information as possible.

The Family Research Project at the University of New South Wales aims to provide relevant data about Australian families for use by our policy-makers and their critics. A recent progress report by the research staff explains the genesis of the Project (Smith, English, King, 1976; English and Smith, 1976, pp. 57–62):

Over the past two decades in Australia there had been a growing community and governmental concern over the steady increase in the number of unmarried mothers and deserted wives seeking government assistance. Many people feel that this increase reflects a basic change in attitudes to marriage and family life. However, only a very few studies have been undertaken and there is little data available to explain these changes. It has been increasingly recognised that there is a lack of basic knowledge about the family in this country, and both government and voluntary agencies have only limited data to help in planning family services at state and national levels.

Consequently, in August 1972 the University of New South Wales was commissioned by the (then) Commonwealth Department of Social Services, with the support of the state departments concerned with child and social welfare, to establish a Family Research Unit. It was proposed that the Unit undertake a series of studies and surveys directed toward understanding families at risk, family disruption and family breakdown in Australia, and to document services available to families.

In 1973, the staff of the Unit went about its task by first examining available data about families in departmental records and studies of beneficiaries, the census and academic research. The census data was found to be limited in several ways. The departmental data was obviously confined to beneficiaries and comparative studies of non-beneficiary families were needed. Few national studies had collected social statistics and none had looked specifically at family life. A considerable number of smaller studies had looked at particular aspects of family life in Australia, but most of the studies were geographically limited and used very small samples, and often the work was largely of an exploratory nature, was not published and was not followed up. A large proportion of these looked at special groups such as migrants, aboriginals or beneficiaries.

Because the existing data failed to provide a comprehensive picture of family life in Australia, the Research Unit decided it could make two major contributions. The

first would be to collate and publicise the literature on Australian family research. The three Research Bulletins published to date have included a cumulative bibliography of the family in Australia 1945 – 1975, and this will be published with annotations before the Project's end, in mid-1978,¹⁰ in a single volume. ...

The second major contribution the Research Unit decided upon was to mount a national survey of Australian families which would provide information about variables associated with family breakdown in Australia, and at the same time provide a broad data-base for persons working in family research and related fields to enable them to place their own studies within a more general context.

... In March, 1974, the Family Research Unit made a request to the Australian Bureau of Statistics to conduct such a national family survey. At the time the Bureau was planning a general social survey. After negotiation it was agreed to develop The Family Survey as the basic element of the General Social Survey. [Some description of the sample and questions to be covered was then provided.]

The final report of the Family Research Project will incorporate the results of the Family Survey and a discussion of the policy implications of the policy implications of the Project's findings.

Since the field work of the Family Survey was completed in May 1975, there has been a quite inordinate delay in the production by the Bureau of tabular results. ... Preliminary estimates show that ... in non-rural Australia covered by the Survey there were about 1.9m. families with at least one child aged 17 years or under. 91.2% of these were two-parent families and 8.8% (165,000) were one-parent families. Of the one-parent families, 11.6% had male heads.

Staff shortages and changes in the Bureau coupled with technical difficulties have forced an extension in the life of the Project. In the general public service climate of cutbacks and axed projects, these delays have been worrying, and they mean, of course, that the Survey data is getting progressively dated. We have, however, managed to achieve further and final finance for this 1977/78 financial year. Then this Family Research Unit will cease to exist. But there will not cease to exist the need for systematic national research on the Australian family.

We had hoped that the National Family Survey might be maintained by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in the future on a periodic basis, in conjunction again with an independent research team so that the survey will continue to be informed by theoretical understanding and the results will be interpreted in ways that are meaningful for scholars, policy-makers, and the public at large. At present this looks to be a forlorn hope. It will need widespread political pressure to persuade the government and the Bureau that such a survey should become a regular feature of our national data collection.

It is expected that family research will be an important part of the Social Welfare Research Centre currently being established at the University of New South Wales on the invitation of the national government. The work of our Family Research Project could well be integrated into this Centre, and perhaps this Centre, in conjunction with the Bureau will provide the focus for future periodic national family surveys.

An alternative possibility may be the new Institute of Family Studies, set up under the 1975 Family Law Act. This Institute is to encourage co-ordinated research

¹⁰ Unforeseen circumstances further delayed the completion date.

into factors affecting marital and family stability in Australia, and it has a statutory obligation to act 'with the object of promoting the protection of the family as the natural and fundamental group unit in society'. A recent advertisement for its Director describes the field of family studies as a multi-disciplinary one, involving psychology, sociology, social work, law, economics and theology.

Worry had been expressed in social welfare circles, however, that the Institute of Family Studies is not well placed in the Attorney-General's Department and that such an institution should not be too closely associated with the law and the legal profession. Yet its establishment under the Act is very understandable for the Act has made divorce much easier to achieve, and for all sections of the population. (Under the Act, the sole ground for divorce is irretrievable breakdown of marriage evidenced by one year's separation. Thus the traditional concept of divorce as a remedy for matrimonial fault has gone, and the period of separation which can justify divorce has been sharply reduced – it was 5 years under the 1959 Matrimonial Causes Act.) One of the obvious reasons for another national family survey fairly soon is to discover how the new divorce legislation is affecting family structure and functioning.

Ailsa Burns argued in an article just prior to the change that many de facto marriage breakdowns went unrecognised because at that time divorce was expensive and punitive. She insisted that the divorce rate has to be seen in the context of attitudes to marriage and parenthood, both of which institutions were today more popular than at any previous time. A realistic divorce rate in fact operated to strengthen the family by providing the opportunity for remarriage or for obtaining legitimated substitute parents for children involved. Finally she added that as standards of marital behaviour and expectations rise and relationship quality becomes more valued, so would the need for an efficient safety valve for the dissolution of substandard marriages increase. (Burns, 1974, pp. 33–8)

In striking contrast to other types of social data, Australia has had throughout the twentieth century excellent demographic statistics. In 1975, Australian society had the benefit of the Report of the National Population Inquiry headed by Australia's leading demographer, Professor W. D. Borrie. I think it would help this Conference to draw to your attention at least some of the observations made in the Report (Borrie Report, 1975, pp. 353–368).

The Report observes that reference to a single or average family type is an oversimplification, for there are still large families and small families, rich families and poor families, immigrant families and Australian families, religious families and pagan families. In all of these, the pattern of interpersonal relationships, cultural motivations and behavioural patterns will be different; yet structurally, in the demographic sense, families, like the nation's motor cars and domestic appliances, seem to be conforming increasingly to an average pattern. Demographic differentials have been decreasing as average family size has been reduced.

Much of the 'developed' world, including non-Aboriginal Australia, has moved to a low mortality situation, which requires major constraints over natural fertility to contain population growth within manageable limits. Increasing proportions of the population have adopted practices to limit the size of their families. A 1971 survey of Melbourne married women found over 90% of the women interviewed were currently employing some form of contraceptive practice. This compared with

evidence for about 66% employing some family planning method at the end of the 1940s. Introduced in 1960, the pill has become the most popular contraceptive device.

While most Protestant groups displayed larger family size than Catholics in the late nineteenth century, the differential is now reversed, but the completed family size of Catholics is now marginally above three children. It seems clear, says the Report, that the majority of Catholics do now effectively reduce their family size by deliberate planning.

There has been a marked difference for many years in the family size of those living in metropolitan areas and those living in smaller urban and rural areas. The smaller metropolitan family size applies for both different birthplace groups and different religious groups. The completed family size of immigrants tends to be smaller than that of Australian-born in the same broad area of residence. The urban-rural differences are tending to be reduced, and in any case, says the Report, the pattern of major urban areas in which about three out of four Australians now live, now dominates national growth patterns, and will continue to do so.

Earlier differentials according to the educational status of wives seem to be disappearing, although those with the lowest educational attainments still show higher but nevertheless substantially controlled fertility.

There are differentials in family size according to occupational groupings but they are not great. The most significant difference is between wives in the labour force and those not in the labour force. The 1966 census data shows the average issue of the former was 2.5 children compared with 3.1 for the latter group.

Wives in full-time 'career occupations' have the lowest average issue among wives in the labour force, while wives in service and rural occupations have family size patterns not significantly different from those women not in the work-force. The Report comments that this could mean that increasing opportunities for women will encourage lower future fertility levels.

More recent data than the Report had available to it has indicated that there has in fact been a drop in the nation's total fertility rate from 2.9 children in 1971 to 2.4 in 1974 (ABS, *Social Indicators*, 1976, ref.no. 13.16).

The Report comments that the general reduction of family size differentials has almost certainly helped to reduce the proportion of children disadvantaged in the educational and career opportunities from belonging to large families.

The emerging pattern for some time has been for the Australian family to have not only a smaller number of children but for childbearing to be concentrated into a shorter period of the life cycle (Borrie Report, 1975, p. 78) The 1971 family formation survey of Melbourne women found that the one-child family is the least 'desired' family size and that few parents want more than four children.

This survey also yielded results on the pattern of the family life cycle of the modern family. Dr. C. Young has described four main stages after marriage for the average family: childbearing starts after 1.4 years and is completed after another 7.9 years, a further 15.2 years elapse until the first child leaves home, and 8.5 years later the last child leaves home, an average of 33 years after the marriage commenced.

There has been a long-term trend towards relatively early marriage with recent figures (1974) being 20.9 for females marrying for the first time and 23.3 for males. Pre-war figures were 24 and 27. Since 1971, however, there has been a noticeable

drop in first marriages registered. (ABS, 1974, ref. no. 4.10)

The pattern has been not only of earlier marriages but also of more marriages. The Borrie Report states that 9 out of 10 Australians will marry at least once in their lifetime and some five-sixths of all Australian babies are both conceived and born in wedlock. But it has not been always so, and it need not always be so in the future. (Borrie Report, 1975, p. 75)

Although the actual period of childbearing has probably halved in the recent period, the fewer number of children have tended to become breadwinners at a steadily increasing age. Families have had increased financial responsibilities associated with rising educational expectations for their children, and the Report suggests that this may be one of the major reasons for the increased participation of married women in paid employment.

Two significant trends in work participation rates of women have been a marked decline in the work-participation rates of young single women, presumably for educational purposes, and a very steep rise in the work-participation rates of married women, particularly between ages 20 and 54 years. This latter trend is so steep it is, in the view of the Report, almost revolutionary in character.

Sol Encel commented in 1970, 'The growing participation of married women in the work force is ... likely to force gradual changes in relationships between men and women in general, and inside the family in particular'. (Encel, 1970, p. 290)

MacKenzie's study of *Women in Australia*, a decade earlier had noted in its introduction that it was felt by many Australians and by overseas visitors that women had a less significant role in the professions and public life and encountered more formal and informal discrimination in Australia than in other industrial democracies (MacKenzie, 1962). In the late 1950s, a comparative study by Dan Adler found that in the Australian family the mother played a strong leadership role in the absence of full father participation. This was so prominent compared with other western cultures that he coined the new term 'matriduxy' to describe it. (Adler, 1965, pp. 149-155) It is obvious that over the recent period substantial change has taken place in sex roles, both inside and outside the family, but we are still a long way from men and women sharing equally and fully both public and domestic spheres (Encel, MacKenzie and Tebbutt, 1974).

In the light of its analysis, the Borrie Report asserted generally that most young women now go into paid employment, most young women marry, most married women remain in employment while they have no dependent children, most women cease employment while they a dependent child under school age, and when there is no dependent child under school age over half the married women are in either full or part-time employment. While there is a child below school age, about three quarters of married women stay out of work, but when there is no child under school age about a half are back in employment.

Finally I want to link up some of my earlier remarks about data, values, and decision-making. We in fact have emotionally charged competing ways of looking at social phenomena, especially phenomena in which we are so intimately involved such as the family, sex roles, inter-generational issues, and sexuality. A 1973 American book by Arlene Skolnick is helpful in identifying a number of general approaches to, or perspectives on, these issues (Skolnick, 1973, chapter 11).

The first is what she calls 'the breakdown-liberation perspective'. This is actually

two opposed points of view, one conservative and one radical, but what they have in common is a sense of a sharp break with the moral and family traditions of the past. Increases in divorce, sexuality outside marriage, pornography, youth rebelliousness, and the increasing openness about homosexuality are seen as moral breakdown and decadence by the conservative, but by the radical as a breaking free, and overthrow of artificial, repressive restraints. The one sees impulses as dangerous, the other as beautiful and innocent. The one sees children as savages to be restrained by moral and rational adults; the other sees children's clarity of perception and moral sensitivity corrupted by adults.

Next Skolnick refers to the continuity perspective. This is the classic response on the part of most sociologists to popular assertions of change such as family breakdown and sexual revolution, and is summed up by the old French proverb, 'The more it changes, the more it is the same thing'. This position is based on both statistics and theoretical assumptions. Society is seen as a balanced social system where change is gradual and incremental, rather than sharp and discontinuous.

It is said that marriage is more popular than ever; the sexual revolution is not taking place even though people have become more open about their behaviour; the generation gap is an illusion; and the women's liberation is a passing fad. It is argued that young people are assuming more responsibility for their own standards in sexual matters and in matters of social concern, rather than simply overthrowing their parents' morality in the name of no restraint or no standards. On women's liberation issues, youth are reluctant to identify with radicalism or far-out life styles even though they accept many of the principles advocated by militants. On this approach, then, continuity and stability are emphasised.

The first two approaches identified by Skolnick look at the situation of the family in contemporary society from the point of view of changes in the values, attitudes, and behaviour of individual family members. The third and fourth perspectives identified by Skolnick agree on looking at family change as a product of changes in society at large.

The third perspective, 'a contextual strain perspective', sees the society as placing great strains on marriage and the family. While there is seen to be a 'fit' between the nuclear family and industrial society, there are also strains. Women, children and old people are left in an ambiguous position outside the occupational world. As the father works away from the home the mother plays a larger child rearing role and boys cannot observe and participate in father's work. The modern woman is offered equality and liberation from the restrictions of the kin group, but is left in an isolated household with increased burdens of child rearing. Under constant pressure to produce, achieve and support, most men spend their lives at work they do not like, and thus the home and family provide the role of refuge and retreat, a difficult if not impossible assignment.

The fourth and final perspective identified by Skolnick is 'a future-adaptation perspective'. Here current changes are interpreted as an adaptation to future social conditions with the lead being taken by the most educated and technically skilled. High divorce rates are said to indicate a new pattern of marriage more adaptive to contemporary and future conditions. The women's movement is a response to the need for women to define themselves as something other than mothers in a world with a very low birthrate and extended life spans. Homosexuality, it is said, may be

seen as an adaptation to the need for population control. The emergence of a life style which emphasises do-it-yourself crafts and music, on being rather than doing, may be an adaptation to future problems of work, leisure, and identity in a post-industrial society. The new antimaterialism may be seen as an adaptation to the need for a more modest standard of living in the face of the environmental crisis.

I find each of these perspectives in our own society. Each represents a way of looking at individuals, the family, and society. They are a mixture of fact, fiction, and values. This is the inevitable 'mix' of politics and community decision-making.

As I have indicated earlier, I certainly think we need more fact in the Australian 'mix' not just for its own sake feeding our idle curiosity, but to make our community choices better informed. But for what and whose ends? I recommend to you the moral point of view which I mentioned earlier. If we keep this as our guiding principle no-one is neglected and all are fairly considered. People's interests are so bound up with the contemporary family, both for good and ill, that the modern person cannot avoid taking an active interest in it as one of our most significant human institutions. Certainly as citizens, as professionals, and as parents, we at this Conference cannot opt out of a concern with the Australian family.

Perhaps when we are reasonably well informed and are taking the moral point of view we will in fact decide that the continuity perspective makes most sense, if not for us personally, for the vast majority of Australians – despite all the fuss and flurry of our verbal revolutionaries and the media industry who flourish on reporting change and difference, not continuity. But we are also likely to pay greater regard to the family as a social system in interaction with and adapting to its changing environment, so that building onto a sense of continuity with our past, we will welcome not reject changes in its structure and functions which help to maximise its contribution to human well-being.

The adaptation should not, however, all be in the one direction. We must work to make our other social institutions more aware of the Australian family and adaptable to its form and functions. To the extent that our schools, hospitals, clinics, workplaces, social agencies, public service departments, professional groups, trade unions, and the rest, are operating in ignorance of, and in disregard for the institution of the family, and the family is therefore having to adjust to their requirements, Australian families are being unjustly treated and it's time we did something about it.

REFERENCES

- Seebohm Report (1968), *Report of the Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Social Services*, HMSO, Cmnd.30703.
- King, L. J. (1973), 'The Family in Search of a New Pattern', in Burnheim, Ronald B. (ed), *Social Welfare Consequences of Change*, Australian Council of Social Service, Sydney.
- Commonwealth-State Family Services Committee, *Families and Social Services in Australia*, shortly to be tabled in the national parliament.
- Baier, Kurt (1958), *The Moral Point of View*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press;
- Hospers, John (1969), *Human Conduct*, Rupert-Davis, London; Benn, S. I., and Peters, R. S., *Social Principles and the Democratic State*, London, Allen and Unwin.
- Smith, Sali, English, Brian A., and King, Raymond J. (January 1976), 'Progress Report', *The Australian Family*, Research Bulletin No. 3, Family Research

- Unit, UNSW; and English, Brian, and Smith, Sali (September 1976), 'Family Policy and Family Research'. *Australian Child and Family Welfare*, Vol.1, No.3. Australian Bureau of Statistics (May 1975), *General Social Survey*, Bulletin No. 1 – Preliminary Estimates of Families.
- Nygh, P. E. (1975), *Guide to the Family Law Act 1975*, Butterworths, Sydney.
- Burns, Ailsa (1974), 'Marital Breakdown and Divorce', in Dawson, Madge, (ed), *Families*, Sydney, ANZAAS.
- Borrie Report (1975) – *Population and Australia: A Demographic Analysis and Projection* – First Report of the National Population Inquiry, Vols. 1 and 2, Government Printer, Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1976), *Social Indicators*, No.1.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1974), *Marriages*.
- Encel, S. (1970), 'The Family', in Davies, A. F., and Encel, S. (eds), *Australian Society*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 2nd edition.
- MacKenzie, Norman (1962), *Women in Australia*, Melbourne, Cheshire.
- Adler, Dan L. (1965), 'Matrimony in the Australian Family', in Davies, A. F., and Encel, S. (eds), *Australian Society*, Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Encel, Sol, MacKenzie, Norman, and Tebbutt (1974), *Women and Society: An Australian Study*, Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Skolnick, Arlene (1973), *The Intimate Environment*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston.

Landmarks in the Study of the Australian Family (1977)

In the course of preparing for this paper, I decided I would also produce a supplementary description of various landmarks in the study of the Australian family – for distribution to conference members and other interested parties. This commenced with the 1904 New South Wales Royal Commission into the decline of the birth-rate, the first inquiry of its kind in the world.

It indicated Australia's interest in population problems, and the quality of its demographic statistics. The Commissioners did not, however, examine the differentials within the statistics and then investigate their causes. Instead, they accepted moralising as evidence and supposedly 'explained' the prevalence of family limitation by 'an increasing love of luxury and social pleasures', and 'a dislike of the interference with pleasure and comfort involved in child-bearing and child-rearing'. [Ware, Helen (1973), *Fertility and Family Formation: Australasian Bibliography and Essays 1972*, ANU, Canberra, p.2.]

This early combination of having good demographic statistics, which accurately measured changes in the size and composition of the Australian population, but only superficial, impressionistic explanations of social behaviour had been typical of Australian society until perhaps the very recent period.

During the conference, I had various other involvements – with the media, running a concurrent seminar with Pat Hansen on making a team work, and being responsible, on the final day for commenting on the morning presentations which were focused on strategies for improving the delivery of health services to families. (Included in the final day presentations was one by June Huntington on preventive health and the general practitioner, and another by

Brian Cheers on an innovative independent family service centre, staffed by teaching members of the Department of Social Work, University of Western Australia.¹¹)

The conference ended with a statement and resolutions:

The deliberations of this Conference have made it clear that the health of the family is central to the continued well-being of our Society.

The many discussions have highlighted the paramount importance of a multi-disciplinary approach which having been discussed at this Conference should be extended and developed at both a nation-wide and interstate level.

1. That individual members of this Conference stimulate local multi-disciplinary meetings on the health problems of families.
2. That the Federal Government should mount a periodic national survey of Australian families.
3. That a national multi-disciplinary follow-up group be established by the Conference organisers.
4. That the national follow-up group attempt to establish in each State a multi-disciplinary liaison group to focus in a continuing way upon the topic of the family and health in their State.
5. That the national follow-up group decides when national action seems warranted taking into account advice from the State groups.

After the conference, Hugh Cook wrote to me:

Thank you very much for your very valuable contribution to the Conference. I believe that one of the most important factors in its success was the quality of papers presented. I certainly hope we have started something that will result in an on-going examination of the family and the care of the family. Perhaps some individuals may have been stimulated to critically examine their own roles and to gradually bring about some badly needed changes.

He was setting about forming a local committee of three to implement the Conference resolutions.

I had a little difficulty in persuading the local College executive that this action was appropriate. One member stated that we had to be careful not to present all of primary medical care on a plate to 'those para-medical workers'! I shall certainly let you know what happens.

Barbara is working on the proceedings of the Conference and you will be hearing from us when this is ready. ...

Once again thanks very much for all your help, and particularly for your assistance in the early stages of programming.¹²

11 Three of its four members were UNSW social work graduates – Brian Cheers, Margo Nichols and Judy Taylor. Brian and Judy both had completed our MSW degree.

12 Letter, Hugh Cook to John Lawrence, 1/9/77.

7.9 A Social Planning Consultancy with ACROD 1973-74

I was in Bangkok, 11 October to 9 December, 1972, on another international assignment.¹ After my return to Sydney, early in 1973 Jean Garside had discussions with me about assisting the development of ACROD in the light of the Brisbane international seminar on social planning,² and the advent of the new social reforming Whitlam government in Canberra in December 1972. Just before going overseas for five weeks, to visit 13 countries, Jean wrote enclosing a letter which confirmed my appointment as consultant in social planning. The appointment would be on a trial basis for a period of one year (from 1 March), on the understanding that terms of reference would be satisfactory to both me and the Council. An honorarium and money for expenses would be paid.³ She thanked me for notes I had sent for an announcement of my appointment in their journal.

My letter to the UNSW vice-chancellor for approval for undertaking the consultancy was in these terms:

I see it as helping rather than hindering the work of the School, and certainly will be keeping strictly limited the amount of time involved.

ACROD is at a critical stage of its development and badly needs external assistance at this juncture. I am not sure my help will be as productive as I would like, but I feel I should at least make the attempt since the organisation does seem to be genuinely seeking new professional assistance and has the potential to affect the lives of large numbers of disabled Australians and their families.⁴

Jean Garside said it would be helpful to have brief terms of reference for my appointment for referral to a meeting of the executive committee on 1 June. In October, I prepared a statement for the executive committee of ACROD which set down what I saw as the purpose of the consultancy, some reasons for the appointment, and a number of relevant tasks which I could undertake:

THE ROLE OF THE ACROD CONSULTANT ON SOCIAL PLANNING ...

The Purpose of the Consultancy

As I see it, my role is to assist those associated with ACROD to understand where ACROD's activities currently fit, and where they might fit, into Australia's system of social welfare services.

Some Reasons for the Appointment

There are many possible reasons for ACROD seeking assistance at this point in time. Included amongst them could be -

1. The organisation under its present name has been in existence for a decade and is due for a review of its purposes and functions.
2. The International Seminar on Social Planning for the Physically and Mentally

1 See Vol. 5, pp. 87-111.

2 See Vol. 5, pp. 35-69.

3 Letter, Jean Garside to R. J. Lawrence, 5/4/73. The honorarium decided on was \$5,000, the expenses \$500.

4 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to R. H. Myers, 17/4/73.

Disabled, held in Brisbane , August 1972, revealed that ACROD was not in the mainstream of social welfare thinking in Australia. In fact, most of those associated with the planning and organisation of that Seminar had to be drawn from outside those regularly involved in ACROD's affairs.

3. That Seminar's papers and discussions emphasized a need to see people with disabilities as having the same rights to a full and satisfying life as the rest of the population in the same society, and there was strong support for keeping them integrated in the service system for the general population, rather than isolating them in separate service systems, especially very limited, small-scale, 'charitable' ones. Whatever the auspice of the service, it was agreed that contemporary and future services needed to pay far more regard to their consumers. Too often services reflected the views and needs only of the service providers. The idea of consumers' rights was seen as just as relevant for voluntary agencies as for government ones. These perspectives have strong implications for the role of ACROD, and raise important questions about its relationship to the general social welfare field in Australia.
4. To a great extent because of the change in our national government, a large number of commissions and committees of inquiry have been set up to examine and make recommendations about various aspects of our social welfare policies and services in Australia. How does ACROD relate effectively to all of these, and how do these see ACROD – especially in view of the perspectives mentioned in 3. above?
5. Whether those associated with ACROD accept it or not, ACROD'S activities – their focus and their scope – are under increasingly critical scrutiny. If ACROD does not, and cannot, fulfil some of its claimed functions, shouldn't these be performed by a body or bodies that can?
6. How clearly stated and understood are ACROD's objectives anyway, and are its activities regularly assessed in terms of these objectives? For example, what forms of disability are actually covered? Is the main focus on disabled clients of its member agencies or all disabled members of the community? What is a 'disability'? Why is there a stated limitation on interest in the well-being of the disabled to their 'rehabilitation'? Whose responsibility is the person with a chronic disability once he has been rehabilitated? What aspects of people's lives are being served in a particular service? Is there a purpose to collaborate with other voluntary and with government agencies so that there is a community system of service to people with disabilities?
7. What types of staff are employed by ACROD to help the organisation relate effectively to the many fields of knowledge, the organisations, professional practitioners, and communities, which are relevant to its work?
8. A single, part-time consultant on social planning cannot hope to do more than make ACROD more alive to these kinds of questions and to help those involved in its affairs to see more clearly various options so that they might choose their future course wisely. There is no doubt in my mind that an uncritical 'business as usual' attitude on the part of ACROD, and of other Australian social agencies, is increasingly out of tune with the times in which we live. ACROD's appointment of a consultant on social planning indicates some degree of awareness of this.

I wish to state two things at the outset, however:

1. I am not interested in helping ACROD merely survive in turbulent times. My purpose is to help the organisation identify, and perform effectively a well-understood, and agreed-upon range of functions, which will form part of this country's welfare system, once a clear over-all system emerges from the current ferment.
2. Any assistance I can give is in no way a substitute for ACROD employing as a matter of urgency, its own professional full-time staff who can understand and help ACROD's office-bearers, executive director, executive committee, and members, to be currently informed of the organisation's place in Australian society.

Relevant Tasks

In the light of what I have said, the following seem to be relevant tasks, and I have already made a start on each:

1. Provide help and information on social welfare matters of current concern to the Executive Director.
2. Using Annual Reports of ACROD as a basis, analyse, in a brief discussion paper, the organisation's development in terms of its objectives, composition, structure, resources and activities. This could not be an elaborate 'history', but it would identify patterns and recurring issues, and would indicate where ACROD had been and is - at least as reflected in its Annual Reports.
3. Apply this analysis of the organisation to a framework of what constitutes social welfare policies and services in our society, so that those associated with ACROD can see more clearly where it is located in the society's social welfare service structures. In other contexts I have had to develop a general framework for the analysis of social welfare policies and services in a modern, urban, industrial society like ours, and this framework can be used for this present purpose.
4. Amalgamate into one document information on the various commissions and committees of inquiry which recently have been established - their terms of reference, their membership, their mode of operation etc. I am already undertaking this task in connection with a number of my other professional responsibilities. For the purpose of this consultancy, I can use such a document to help ACROD, (a) to be informed about these various activities which are likely to shape our future social welfare service structures, and (b) to play its part in influencing these activities so that the well-being of people with physical and mental disabilities is adequately considered.
5. Help ACROD to consider its involvement in a proposed national conference in Bathurst in 1974.

Jean Garside reported that this statement was circulated to members of the ACROD executive committee for their meeting in October, and some initial discussion took place, in particular on the ramifications of its name, 'a subject on which there will be a great division of opinion'. (My material had been 'most stimulating'.) However, due to the absence abroad of the president,

two vice-presidents and two members of the executive committee, many matters relating to ACROD's activities had necessarily been held over. With the approaching end of year activities, it was possible there would not be a great deal of sub-committee activity before 1974.⁵

On request, I raised the possibility of renaming the organisation to 'Australian Council for the Handicapped' – simply described as 'The national organisation for the rehabilitation and well-being of people who are disabled or handicapped'. This would extend the organisation's umbrella as wide as possible and would allow differential emphases and flexibility according to needs. Jean Garside discussed with solicitors in Canberra what was entailed in a renaming of the organisation. I was consulted about professional and research staffing for the organisation, and the appropriate administrative structures. We discussed opening the organisation to individual membership, and enlisting the help of people outside the member organisations. The organisation's library was built up with relevant social welfare literature, and social welfare articles were included in the organisation's journal. When my consultancy concluded at the end of February, 1974, various things had been set in train, but significant change would take time and be difficult to achieve in the social turmoil of the period. The organisation itself had to have staff and leadership which would take responsibility for the social welfare development of the organisation. I continued occasionally to provide Jean Garside with informal help until I left for the United Kingdom in July, 1974, for six months, but a continuing formal consultancy was out of the question, given all of my other responsibilities and commitments.

5 Letter, Jean Garside to R. J. Lawrence, 29/10/73.

7.10 The International Year of the Child in Australia 1979

In December 1976, the General Assembly of the United Nations agreed that 1979 should be designated International Year of the Child and that UNICEF should be the 'lead agency'. Guiding principles set down by UNICEF were:

- It is for all the children of the world, both in industrialised and developing countries.
- The objectives are advocacy and action. The advocacy is to guide the attention of the world community to the importance of the child, both as a child and as a future adult, to enhance the awareness of special needs of children on the part of decision makers, parents and public everywhere, and to further a recognition that services for children should be an integral part of economic and social development plans. The action is to help governments and others to expand their efforts at the national and community levels to provide lasting improvements to the well-being of children, with special attention to those in disadvantaged groups. This implies a substantial increase in the resources available for services benefiting children.
- There should be special emphasis on action to provide basic services for children in developing countries.
- The emphasis must be on action at the country level, with supporting activities at the regional and possibly international levels.
- There will be no global conference but it is hoped that there will be special discussions at the General Assembly both in 1978 and at the conclusion of the year in 1979.
- A separate and new international plan of action is unnecessary as the main elements of such a plan have already been approved by the international community through the Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959) and world plans of action of various other organisations and Years.
- A small secretariat must be created within the administrative structure of UNICEF, with officers in New York and Geneva, to stimulate and assist the activities of governments and organisations, and provide general information materials and activities in support of the Year.

National governments were given the task of originating and coordinating national activities for the IYC. Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, minister for social security, was made responsible for coordination of Australia's participation in the IYC. She chaired both a commonwealth ministers' committee and a commonwealth/state ministers' committee, and these were supported by officials' committees. An IYC unit within the Social Services Department serviced these committees. Every state and territory established planning committees representative of both government and non-government organisations.¹

Pat Lanigan, director-general of the Australian Social Security department, on behalf of Senator Guilfoyle, launched the IYC National Committee of Non-government Organisations (24 representatives) in 12 June 1978. Greg

1 *International Year of the Child 1979, Australian Planning Structures*, IYC Unit, Department of Social Security,

Taylor, the immediate past president of the UNICEF Committee of Australia, was appointed chairman. As its director responsible for the IYC, he had been heavily involved in discussions with government officials about how best to involve non-government organisations. He had extensive experience as a teacher in Sydney schools, had been an active member of the NSW Teachers' Federation since 1944, and was currently headmaster of Randwick School. Between August 1977 and April 1980, he produced 24 informative newsletters on the IYC, packed with international, national and local material, aimed at advancing the objectives of the IYC.

Bill Langshaw, president of the UNICEF Committee and director of the NSW Department of Youth and Community Services, was a member of the IYC National Committee of Non-government Organisations and convenor of its 'The Child in the World' sub-committee. At his invitation,² I joined this sub-committee in September 1978, and we continued to meet throughout 1979 – in his office, 15th level of 323 Castlereagh Street. Our task was to ensure due regard was given by the non-government IYC committee to the needs of children in countries outside Australia, particularly in the developing world.

Initially, our convenor wrote to all agencies of the Australian Council of Overseas Aid (ACFOA) asking what each organisation was doing to increase aid as part of IYC. In January 1979, we made a submission to the Australian Development Assistance Bureau (ADAB) for a special purpose grant under the project subsidy scheme, for a study project, 'The Impact on Children of Overseas Aid'.³ The assessment committee did not meet, however, until 26 April which enabled some modifications to be made in the submission in response to feedback received from international aid agencies. I had been centrally involved in preparing the submission. The April version of our submission⁴ stated:

In every society, the interests of its youngest members are in danger of being neglected, yet they have the longest-term stake in their society. Through this project stimulated by the IYC there is a unique opportunity to examine the extent to which Australian Overseas Aid is 'child-conscious', and hopefully, the results will give direction to it becoming so in the future.

The aim is not, of course, to focus exclusive attention on children, but to ensure that children's interests are fully considered and balanced with and against the interests of other society members in all of our overseas aid and development ventures. Because children are not an organised, articulate group in our society, special attention and safeguards are necessary to ensure that their interests are not neglected.

The work and experience of the Australian Overseas Aid organisations provide a realistic, practical focus for the Sub-Committee's concern for children in other countries. The project is not designed to make value judgements on individual aid organisations but to use the factual information gained as a generalised basis

2 Letter, W. Langshaw to R. J. Lawrence, 6/9/78.

3 Letter, W. Langshaw to E. Ingevcis, ADAB, 18/1/79.

4 IYC National Committee of NGOs – Child in the World Sub-Committee, 'Application for Special Purpose Grant, Australian Development Assistance Bureau, 1979.

for reviewing aid programs for children.

The provision of aid in other countries often raises issues about Australians' understanding of the culture of those countries, the motivation of donors, the development of donor attitudes, the actual recipients of aid and the effects of aid, both short and long-term. The project should help to promote greater community understanding of these policy issues.

The final objective proposed was:

To design methods of overseas aid program review and evaluation that could be used to ensure that the developmentally sound emphases prompted by IYC are perpetuated.

Not until July was the Child in the World sub-committee told the project could not be funded under the ADAB scheme. Although it was still seen as worthwhile, the project was reluctantly dropped in August. Originally, it had been hoped that this specific project would give shape and focus to our work, but unfortunately no funds were available for such study projects as part of IYC, and we had been unsuccessful in finding an alternative.

7.10.1 IYC National Conference, March 1979

As one of the Commonwealth government's major contributions to the IYC, the Department of Social Security sponsored and convened a national Conference, 'The Child, the Family and the Community', at the Australian National University (ANU), 16–19 March. I was asked to provide a conference summary in the final plenary session and to edit the conference proceedings, so took part in a planning session in DSS in Canberra on 27 February. Pat Lanigan (DSS director-general) and Elizabeth Jeffries (assistant director-general, secretariat and information),⁵ also attended some of the time. The conference was well planned by DSS departmental officers.

About 600 Australians came to the conference to raise and debate critical issues about the well-being of our children, and to highlight special areas which required action and further consideration. The conference program was developed around four general themes – the rights of the child, child development, children who have particular needs, and new approaches to policies and programs for children. The Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowan, two distinguished overseas visitors (Professor Gisela Konopka and Professor Ragnar Berfenstam) and a number of notable Australians provided substantial plenary session papers, and the conference format enable all participants to share their views, concerns and experience – in questions to plenary session speakers, and in the 27 regular and special discussion groups of the Conference.

It was, of course, impossible to attempt to give a summary account of all of this material in the final session, but my conference overview, which highlighted 12 key concepts drawn from the contents of the conference, was very well received.

⁵ She was an impressive social worker originally from South Australia. My sister Margaret knew her well.

A Conference Overview

The theme for the IYC in Australia is CARE, and I am going to use that word to help me organise my comments on the Conference. We live in an age of slogans and captions. Instead of casting this one aside as yet another mindless substitute for thinking about the complexities of the real world, I have decided to put the word, and each of its letters, to work. I apologise if it seems a bit gimmicky, but if it helps you to remember some of the key content of the Conference, this is one slogan which will have earned its keep.

The theme and the logo are usually printed together, and perhaps first I might make a brief comment on the symbolism of the logo. It represents two people, a child and an adult. Looked at in the way I am sure intended the child appears to be stretching up to an adult for comfort, and adult in turn seems to be about to provide it. This is an older human being succouring or taking care of a younger one. It can also symbolise an older generation taking care of a younger generation. An alternative way of looking at it, and a way which I am sure was not intended, is to see a younger person which is trying to stand tall but is being somehow smothered by a larger older person hovering above. Here the outstretched arms of the child are pushing away not reaching towards the older person. Again, the symbolism can relate to generations rather than to individual people.

At this Conference, Professor Konopka in particular has helped us see the reality of this second oppressive interpretation of the logo, especially as children move into adolescence, and she has reminded us how much earlier in chronological age adolescence now begins. Also Philip Adams in his very bitter sweet account of childhood helped us, through laughter, to remember oppressive elements in all our childhoods – not just of adults over children, but often children over each other. The humourist and satirist often hit the mark.

Child care, in the sense of taking care of, or taking charge of children, can be one of the most oppressive of all human activities because of the weakness and vulnerability of the human beings involved. There is even the use of the word 'care' to mean 'to eliminate', for example, one footballer 'taking care' of another and putting him out of the game. Some so-called child-care systems are perhaps rather too close to this usage for comfort. The word 'care' then is as ambiguous as the logo. I suggest, all the same, that CARE is an excellent moral theme or slogan for IYC if it has as its primary meaning, not taking care of, or caring for, but caring about children. IYC is concerned with stimulating, extending and making effective, care about the young developing human beings in our midst who because of their age are in a highly vulnerable position. How much and when caring about children should involve taking care of them in the form of doing things for them, and controlling and protecting them, has inevitably been a running debate through the Conference.

*If we care about our children's well-being, what are some of the key concerns which have emerged in the papers and discussions of the Conference? I will use each of the letters of the word CARE and select three key words for each letter. The Conference content suggests to me that in the IYC slogan C stands for **Community, Continuity, and Commitment**; A can stand for **Attention, Action and Accountability**; R can stand for **Respect, Rights, and Risk-Taking**; and E can stand for **Evaluation, Enthusiasm, and Ethics**.*

Community

The concept, the reality and the ideal of 'community' are abiding human concerns. Each new person and each new generation has to learn to live together, or if you like, to live in and as a community. But both the Governor-General and Professor Konopka stressed at the outset, living together must increasingly be seen in a world context. Our shrinking world means that our children will have to come to terms with being part of a world community in a way that has not been required of earlier generations. But not only this, many parts of the world are now actively represented within Australia in our more than 60 distinct ethnic groups, and, as indicated by the Governor-General, there are wide intra-group and inter-group differences in our migrant population.

The implications of these changes for our child-rearing practices and our educational systems generally are massive. Australian parents, educators and politicians will be badly short-changing our children if we continue to convey a view of the world which is only local and culturally parochial. We must be careful, however, not to saddle young minds prematurely with adult concerns. This is where the work of research behavioural and social scientists like Professor Goodnow, is crucial. Notions of individual and group readiness for particular types of learning at different developmental stages, give the key to what seems a hopelessly and complicated task.

Developing human beings have wider and wider social involvements as they grow to maturity. Helping a person understand and participate effectively in these are what may be described as the person's 'community education'.

We must be wary of limited, exclusive, sectional versions of 'community' where the term is merely referring to a local geographic community, or just to any activities outside an institution, or just to non-government activities, or just to non-commercial activities. We need to help the next generation to understand more fully that our social and physical arrangements for living together cover a full spectrum of political, economic and social institutions, at various levels of organisation. Professor Konopka rightly stressed our need to understand what she calls 'the larger physical and human environment, and stop concentrating blame on one aspect of the mosaic – the family, the parents'. And, one might have added, the children themselves.

Professor Berfenstam's account of childhood accident prevention in Sweden is an excellent illustration of using a full national community context for understanding a problem and for taking concerted action to cope with it. A wide range of community institutions – governmental, non-governmental, professional and commercial – have been apparently successfully involved. But their successful intervention has been dependent upon funded research to discover the particular accident risks of particular age groups of children in particular circumstances. Knowledge of our social or community arrangements is clearly essential both to identify the nature of problems relating to children and their world and to do something about them.

The Governor-General's paper was the first of a number which have stressed the need for full community membership for all people whether they belong to cultural minorities, or come from deprived and disadvantaged backgrounds. Helping our children to become full, understanding members of our world, and not to suffer the unfair discriminations of the past and present based on race, sex, age, and creed, is an essential part of a community perspective on IYC.

Continuity

From Conference discussions, we are concerned about many continuities – continuity between the different stages of a person's life cycle, continuity between a child's experience in the home and in the school, continuity between a child's experience of each of his or her parents, continuity between a child's experiences of the one person over time, continuity between a child's experiences of people in the same social categories, like teachers, friends, brothers and sisters, continuity between one generation and another in the same community. Professor Konopka mentioned 'the long rows of children who go from one foster home to another without ever feeling they belong anywhere'.

Clearly human beings need consistent reference points, not only in their immediate family environment but in the wider community. But continuity does not mean that nothing changes. Change in one sense or another is continuous, but it is stimulating not crippling for children, as for other persons, when it has some degree of novelty but not so much that the child has lost all reference points. Calamities and disasters point up how important it is generally for human beings to experience a fair measure of continuity in their lives. Continuity is basically a cultural product; it comes from the way we learn to structure our environment. Each generation learns from the preceding one through social transmission what to value and how to cope with man's existence on this earth. We are in deep trouble when there is an apparent wholesale rejection of all that has gone before, when a generation arrogantly tries to get by without drawing on at least some of the experience of earlier generations. Our cultural heritage – in the form of our moral and aesthetic values and accomplishments – is a collective torch to be used and rekindled by each generation and then passed on to the next. A sense of continuity between the past, present and future seems to me to be a particularly human attribute. It gives a sense of direction and purpose.

The talk about 'the unprecedented rapidity of change', and 'the completely changed circumstances' of this generation, is dangerous talk when carried to these extremes. As Professor Konopka has said, 'It seems every period of history is thought to be one in which the fastest changes are taking place'. We need to clarify both the continuities and the discontinuities in the experience of the present generation of children, compared with earlier generations.

One important set of changes observed by Professor Konopka is the challenge to authoritarianism in the family, which is bringing greater continuity between the values in the democratic political system and the values in the family. Perhaps in Australia there is still considerable authoritarianism in both our political systems and our family systems, despite our declared democratic values. Values and the way they are manifest clearly play a crucial role in our sense of continuity and discontinuity.

Commitment

Many of the Conference papers have pointed out that human beings are not indifferent to themselves or their environment. To go on living as human beings we are constantly taking a position on things, although often implicitly. The so-called social scientists and the technocrats are by their behaviour committing themselves to certain sorts of objectives. We live at a time when the debate about the relationship between facts and values has perhaps settled down into some kind of perspective. Whenever we decide on something, we are making assumptions about the empirical world and about what is desirable, important or unimportant.

Our children are coming into a world which is demanding that they be more explicit about their commitments. The two prime values that Professor Goodnow highlighted – worth and competence – are dependent on making commitments, not just to any old commitment, but commitments that we can justify to ourselves and to others. As humans we have choices, and our choices have effects and outcomes.

As Professor Goodnow emphasized, children need to learn not that their lot is one of helplessness, that they must only follow authority, that they are creatures of fate or of blind or capricious external forces. They need to learn instead to make commitments which are worthwhile and attainable. Pessimism, cynicism and ‘belly-aching’ are seen as enemies of commitment. Yet seen in one way, people who allow these views of life to be their own are making a commitment – one which is timid, one-sided, and unrealistic.

Commitment links strongly with the notions of both ‘community’ and ‘continuity’. But there can be harmful and destructive commitments, and the sooner these are reviewed and re-assessed the better. As many papers have indicated, young people in particular need to have the chance to try out what is involved in various commitments. The only commitment for life that I would prescribe for all people is a sense of personal worth of oneself. We have heard in the Conference many examples where children are slow to develop their sense of personal worth, how fragile it is in the early stages, and how difficult it is to sustain if you fall into one of the less privileged or stigmatised groups in our society – the poor, the physically handicapped, the mentally handicapped, minority groups of one kind or another.

Making commitments which are realistic and justifiable involves both facts and values. It involves making choices and often extraordinarily difficult ones. Commitment to some things means we cannot be committed to others. One outcome of a much higher level of personal commitment in our community could well be a much higher level of conflict. Many Australians are uncomfortable about conflict, and try to deal with it either by evasion or by using authority to resolve the matter. Our children as well as adults have to learn to accept differing and often conflicting views and to argue about them and not pretend they are not there. Our liberal democratic political arrangements are under severe strain, partly because we do not take them seriously enough in Australia. They do at least give us the opportunity for individual commitment to be a genuinely individual choice, and they provide us with the consequent conflict-resolution arrangements which result from conflicting commitments. Seen in another way, ours is a messy, inefficient society compared with other political regimes. Seen in another way, it does take seriously individuals and groups making their own commitments as to what their life should be about.

Attention

We live in an age of distractions, diversions and competing interests. This Conference and the IYC itself are collective ways of concentrating our attention. There is, of course, a danger that we have a burst on children and then forget about them again. Those who have immediate responsibility for children’s welfare cannot forget about them, and they in particular (the parents, the government and non-government organisations specifically charged with children’s well-being) are perhaps right in being sceptical about good lasting effects of the IYC. They are, in fact, performing one of the most important tasks for the continued well-being of their society. This task can be,

and often is, enormously rewarding, but the task can be frightening, demanding and frustrating, and especially if the rest of the community does not seem to care about what you are doing, and how well you are doing it. It will be tragic if our parents and our child carers are not continuously re-affirmed in what they are doing, but instead are subsequently let down, and they retreat into cynicism and weaker commitment to their task. Equally, if IYC stimulates our children to feel more wanted and worthwhile and subsequently they too are let down, what effects will this have?

Attention, then, has its great possibilities but also its later hazards. IYC should be a year of enjoyment for all of us, and especially our children and those who have immediate responsibility for them. But it must also be a year to lift ourselves onto a higher plane of continuing awareness of our children and their rightful place in our community.

I believe that we in Australia have a rather poor track record of following through after national social welfare conferences. I hope this Conference might begin a new tradition by taking the proceedings sufficiently seriously for the Department of Social Security to establish a broadly-based follow-up group. It is unrealistic to imagine that sound policies and actions can be worked out at a large, multi-purpose conference of this kind. But important ideas and possibilities have emerged in plenary sessions and the discussion groups of the Conference. All the points from the cards, both from the plenary sessions and the discussion groups, and the resolutions from various groups in the Conference, will be incorporated in some form in the Conference proceedings so that this valuable material can be followed up. Not to carry our collective attention further to the point of working out a variety of action possibilities and strategies for implementation would be wasteful, and neglectful of the opportunities that have come from getting people's attention.

Action and Accountability

Already I have begun to mention Action and Accountability, two closely connected words which clearly the 'A' in CARE can be referring to.

Conferences can be just so much talk, if they do not lead to action. As I have indicated, the connections between the Conference content and subsequent justifiable action are often complicated and not immediate, but they should be there, otherwise our words have become a substitute for doing something, rather than essential pre-requisites.

Increasingly the concept of action is being linked with that of accountability, especially when the action impacts on the lives of other people. It is salutary to try to answer the following questions when you are thinking of taking action which involves other people's lives. To whom am I accountable? For what am I accountable? How is my accountability made effective?

Respect

Mr Ellicott in his paper on rights pointed to a basic assumption that each child is a person in his or her own right. Dr Speedy stated that the central issues (in his two stories of humiliation and power) is one of respect; of recognition of children as persons in their own right, entitled to as much respect as we want from each other as adults.

Almost every speaker has stressed the need to recognise and respect the child already as a person, not just a potential person. In our democratic moral system, each person's interests are meant to be equally considered, differences in treatment should only flow from what are seen to be morally relevant differences in condition. Clearly there are

morally relevant differences between adults and children which do justify children being treated differently from adults, but this Conference has forced people to think more clearly about those differences. The differences to be taken into account are things like children's stage of biological development, and their physical, emotional and social vulnerability. The differences which should lead to differences in treatment are things like differences in physical size or strength, and differences in power and resources.

Rights

The notion of children having rights is closely linked to the notion of respecting them as persons. At this Conference, the Governor-General, Mr Ellicott, Professor Eisen and Dr Speedy have all discussed the concept of children's rights. IYC is the twentieth anniversary of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. The Declaration's ten principles, cited by Mr Ellicott, continue to provide us with a check list of moral conventions stated at a high level of generality. Drawing up charters of rights for particular groups of people within a society has become a popular modern political practice. Whether they really affect what happens to people and what should happen to people are important empirical and moral questions. Professor Eisen's paper especially addresses these questions.

To talk about a person having a right is meaningless unless there is a correlative duty or responsibility on the part of someone else to recognise the right, or in other words, unless there is a rule which specifies the normative relationship between the two. Rights only exist in a context of rules and correlative duties. This is only a logical point, but too often rights are asserted without reference to the correlative duties which can make the rights a reality. People do not actually have the rights in the sense of experiencing and enjoying them, until and unless the correlative necessary responsibilities are recognised by parents, individuals, voluntary organisations, local authorities and governments.

One of the critical aspects of making rights a reality, and not just empty rhetoric, is to pin down whose responsibility it is to make the rights in question a reality. The Conference has, in fact, given surprisingly little attention to discussing the respective responsibilities of the different levels of government, the voluntary sector, the commercial sector, the family and other social groups, in making children's rights a reality.

The actual rights that hold in our society are embedded in our rule systems and social institutions and are therefore culturally specific.

To talk about children having certain rights in our society when clearly they do not have them in the sense that the necessary correlative duties are recognised, is to confuse the situation. If we are prescribing that they ought to have certain rights, that surely is the best way of expressing it. Then as a prescription the point of view calls for moral justification, which may or may not be able to be given.

Risk-Taking

The R in CARE clearly can stand for risk-taking. However, I think there is a fair amount of difference amongst us on what we see as risks and how we view risk-taking. These differences obviously reflect our value systems, our knowledge of possible outcomes, and our temperaments.

Many Conference participants have underlined the importance of children being able to try things out, to experiment for themselves, to take risks. There are inevitable hurts along the way in the process of developing into a fully developed human being.

The old saying 'nothing ventured nothing gained' is worth remembering when we find we are being too protective. Encouraging developing human beings to take risks and at the same time trying to ensure that not too much harm comes to them is a constant area for difficult judgements by parents, by teachers, and by the community at large. Risking oneself by reaching out to others, by listening to them and their ideas, by re-examining one's own views and behaviour – this kind of risk-taking is essential to living as a successful human being. But as I have mentioned earlier, risk-taking is easier when it is in a context of basic continuity, or in other words, you can afford to take risks because not too much hinges on the outcome.

In addition to this positive side of risks, the Conference has, of course, also been concerned about children and parents who are at risk, not because of consciously risking behaviour on their part, but because of their disadvantaged position in the Australian community. Mrs Mollie Dyer's paper on the Victorian Aboriginal Child Care Agency has given the Conference an awareness of what can be done when sensitive attention is focused upon some of our community's children who are most at risk.

Professor Berfenstam has given us a clear exposition of how a national community can by research identify groups of at-risk children, and then can take effective steps to reduce the risk. When the risks involved are death and severe physical trauma, you have a solid value agreement underlying your work. When the risks are less tangible and relate to various concepts of social failure, the situation is more problematic.

Evaluation

'Evaluation' has obvious links with the concepts of 'commitment', 'action', and 'accountability'. Both Professor Watts and Neville Barwick have underlined the need to come to grips with the evaluation of policies and programs. 'Evaluation' is becoming an increasingly common concept at least for those who claim to be concerned about the effectiveness and efficiency of using scarce resources. But as Neville Barwick points out in his paper, it is crucial to identify what and whose values, and within what community frameworks and time scales, particular evaluations are carried out. We need to be especially alert to the political aspects of evaluation and to the dangers that measurable economic values are likely to ride rough-shod over all other human values.

We should welcome this developing interest in evaluation if it means that our decision-making is improved in terms of things that count, rather than just countable things. It makes us think more carefully and be more specific about our goals and objectives, and forces us to examine results, both expected and unexpected, in specific time frames and utilising specific resources. Ideally, evaluations are feed-back mechanisms for policy-making. Australian decision-making and administration in the area of family and child welfare, as in other social welfare areas, has not yet built in evaluation as an integral and regular part of its responsibility.

I believe there is perhaps a place for a National Institute for Families and Children which would have a nation-wide perspective in evaluating our policies and services as they impact on our children and families, and could play a vital role in developing, monitoring and changing national policies in these areas. I would like to see such an Institute experiment with the idea of government and non-government enterprises preparing 'child and family impact studies', before the enterprises launch new developments. The idea of 'environmental impact' studies had drawn attention to community concerns that in the past have tended to be overlooked or ignored.

Enthusiasm

The E in CARE must refer to enthusiasm, not a whipped-up temporary enthusiasm which leaves you flat and stale afterwards. I am referring to the enthusiasm that comes from commitment, from working with others on something worthwhile, from a continuing sense of wonderment at the good, the beautiful, and the rich variety in our world.

In Gisela Konopka, we have in our midst during this Conference a living example of the kind of intelligent enthusiasm I am referring to.

We must be especially careful not to allow children's lives, or our community generally for that matter, to be dominated by tired, satiated cynics, who long ago lost their enthusiasm for anything.

Ethics

Finally E in CARE clearly stands for ethics. All of the concepts I have highlighted from the Conference content, have emphasised, to me at least, how much we are tangling with ethical issues, that is issues of right and wrong, of justice and injustice, responsibility and blame. By our very nature we cannot be value-free. We decide and take positions on things, and we try to justify what we do, both to ourselves and others. I see this Conference and IYC generally as bringing to our attention the moral claims of all young human beings. These morally should not be decided upon in isolation from the moral claims of other human beings. But as has been strongly asserted in the Conference children generally are likely to be relatively ignored by our adult-oriented society, and there are particular groups of disadvantage children, in both our own national community and our world community, who are grossly neglected as human beings with moral claims on their communities.

I hope that from now on when you see the IYC slogan and the logo, you remember the two ways of looking at the logo and you remember the twelve key concepts I have drawn from the content of this Conference:

*Community, Continuity and Commitment
Attention, Action and Accountability
Respect, Rights and Risk-Taking
Evaluation, Enthusiasm and Ethics*

Staying at University House had helped in the process of reading all the Conference material and organising my thinking about it.

Gisela Konopka

Born of Jewish parents in Berlin in 1910, Gisela Konopka graduated from the University of Hamburg in 1933. Work against the Nazis resulted in a short internment in a concentration camp. After periods in Austria and France, she migrated in 1941 to the USA where she gained her MSW from the University of Pittsburgh. Her DSW at Columbia University was awarded in 1957. She joined the School of Social Work at the University of Minnesota in 1947, and retired in 1978. In 1979, she was an emeritus professor of social work of the university, and consultant to its Center for Youth Development and Research of which she had been director. Particularly noted for her work with troubled

adolescents, she represented the practice of social group work in many social work conferences and organisations. According to her entry in the 'NASW Social Work Pioneers' series, 'Throughout all her teaching and research, Gisela Konopka emphasised the importance of love, compassion, understanding and group relationships'.⁶

I sent to Gisela Konopka a copy of 'my final remarks on the IYC National Conference' which I had promised to send to her, and also copy of some final remarks I had been asked to make recently at our national professional association conference, which I thought might interest her.⁷ 'I thoroughly enjoyed getting to know you in the brief time we had together and look forward to seeing you again soon'.⁸ She replied:

I was pleased to get a copy of your remarks at the IYC National Conference. I think it is an unusually good paper. I like a paper that is imaginative, well written, and has real content.

I was also interested in your comments in regard to the National Conference in May 1979. I wish we could discuss all these questions. Whenever you come to the United States, please let me know. I hope we can get together. It was a pleasure to get to know you.

With warm regards.⁹

She enclosed, with an inscription ('To Professor Lawrence, with appreciation') *Proceedings of the First Konopka Lectureships: On the Occasion of Gisela Konopka's Retirement from the University of Minnesota*, June 6, 1978. On the cover was a sculpture by her late husband Paul with whom she had shared much of her remarkable life. The lectureships were intended to carry on her tradition of integrating theory and practice and humanising services for children and youth.

7.10.2 IYC National Conference Follow-up Group

Senator Margaret Guilfoyle wrote to me after the conference:

At the closing session ... I indicated that a Follow-up Group would be formed to give consideration to the many issues which arose at the conference.

In view of your most thoughtful and stimulating summary paper, your involvement in editing the proceedings and your concern to ensure that appropriate follow-up action is taken, I would like to invite you to convene the Follow-up Group. I am confident this will be an important working group, with the principal function being the dissemination of the ideas and information contained in the Conference proceedings. ...¹⁰

We were asked to produce a report for the minister for social security

6 See on the internet, 'Gisela Konopka (1910–2003)', NASW Social Work Pioneers, NASW Foundation. She received many awards for her work, including 'the highest merit award of the Federal Republic of Germany for her work in rebuilding German social services after World War II'.

7 John Lawrence, 'Conference Critique', in Winsome Ward, Alan Sutherland, and Peter Rice (eds), *Social Policy Planning and Administration*, Proceedings, 16th National Conference, Canberra, 14–17 May, 1979.

8 Letter, John Lawrence to Professor Gisela Konopka, 28/5/79.

9 Letter, Gisela (Gisa) Konopka to John Lawrence, 19/9/79.

10 Letter, Margaret Guilfoyle to R. J. Lawrence, 11/4/79.

(Senator Guilfoyle) and all conference participants at the conclusion of its work and not later than 30 October.

By design, we were a small but diverse group. The other members were Mrs Diane Alley (National Council of Women, Victoria), Neville Barwick (Victorian Education Department), Ms Heather Crosby (YWCA, South Australia), Mrs Marianne Crowe (Women's Welfare Issues Consultative Committee, Victoria), and Fr John Davoren (Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission). We received ready cooperation from Roy Dowell, NSW director of DSS, in providing typing and postal assistance, and our task could not have been completed without the willing cooperation of some of the office staff in the UNSW School of Social Work, where our work was seen as part of the school's contribution to IYC. (In addition (but not mentioned in the acknowledgements in our report), was help from all the members of my own family at a critical stage of organising material to send to the relevant agencies). Our follow-up group held four day-long meetings; the first in Canberra, the rest in Melbourne, thanks to the ready cooperation of Neville Barwick and the Victorian Department of Education. Jeannine Bevan, from the DSS IYC unit, served as our executive officer.

Our report of 30 October, presented by all members of the committee in a meeting with the minister on 22 November, had these main headings: Our Task, The Conference Proceedings, The Dissemination of Selected Conference Materials, Responses to the Conference Materials (Commonwealth Government, State Government, and Non-Government), Communicating Our Activities, and Moves Towards a National Policy for Children and Families.¹¹ In a final comment, we stated:

We are confident that without our work, many of the ideas expressed at the IYC National Conference would not have reached relevant decision-makers in our community. We can only hope that, on balance, the result is some improvement in the lot of our children and their families. We are grateful to the Minister for Social Security for making our work possible, and to those who made the Conference content worth disseminating.

Our task, as we saw it, was:

... to ensure that, for the sake of the nation's children, the content of this Conference did not remain locked away in the fading memories of the participants, or lie idle on a dusty shelf in a typically delayed and unused published volume of the Conference proceedings. Our task was to ensure that the Conference proceedings became quickly available and that specific content was carefully channelled and brought to the attention of the relevant decision-makers and groups in our society for their serious consideration. Our principal commission was to disseminate the ideas and information contained in the Conference proceedings. It was not our function to initiate new strategies in the subject areas which were covered.

Obviously, neither the Conference as a whole, nor the members of the Follow-up

11 'Report of the IYC National Conference Follow-Up Group', for Senator the Hon. Margaret Guilfoyle, 30 October, 1979.

Group, necessarily endorse all the ideas, views, and questions in the Conference proceedings. What we in the Follow-up Group have endorsed is that, in accordance with the democratic ideals of our society, views, ideas and arguments from a wide spectrum should be seriously considered by our decision-makers.

Soon after the Conference, the convenor of the follow-up group collated and edited for the Proceedings, the material that had emerged from the conference's 27 discussion groups, and the questions prompted by the plenary session speakers. It was agreed that the Proceedings should be as comprehensive as possible and should include the resolutions from specific interest groups at the Conference. A special issue of the DSS's publication *Social Security* was to be used for the Proceedings. This was expected to ensure proper publication standards and relatively prompt printing through the government printer (about 6 weeks was the original anticipated time).

By the end of April, the Proceedings were ready for printing. Since then, there has been a series of delays, and it is now anticipated that the Proceedings will be ready for posting at the end of October.

The Follow-up Group wishes to bring to the attention of the Minister and others concerned with government printing, the unfortunate effects of the Government Printer not meeting the original expectation of a prompt printing.

15,000 copies of the Proceedings are being printed. 12,500 will be sent to those on the regular mailing list of the 'Social Security' publication, and the remainder will be sent to the Conference participants, every person or organisation written to by the Follow-up Group with selected Conference material ..., and other selected persons and organisations which the group considers should receive a copy. Included in the Proceedings is a request that people share them and pass them on to other interested people. Every State and Federal politician will be receiving a copy.

The Follow-up Group considers that the IYC Unit in the Department of Social Security should take responsibility for publicising the Proceedings once they are available.

Despite its efforts, then, and efforts on its behalf, the Follow-up Group has been singularly unsuccessful in the course of its limited life (from April to the end of October 1979) to 'disseminate the ideas and information contained in the conference proceedings' through the most obvious general mechanism, namely, making sure the full Proceedings were promptly printed and widely distributed.

When it became clear that the Conference Proceedings were not going to be quickly available, the Follow-up Group sent to the IYC National Committee on Non-government Organisations, a full set of the 'Participants' Views and Concerns', and of the 'Specific Interest Group Resolutions at the Conference'. This enabled that committee to channel this particular material to its various specialised sub-committees.

The Group's main follow-up work, however, took the following form: After studying all the material in the manuscript of the Proceedings, we selected 14 subjects for follow-up purposes – Aboriginal Affairs, Australia's International Responsibilities, Child and Family Welfare Policies and Programs, Childhood

Accident Prevention, Education of Adults in Relation to Children, Education of Children: Policies and Programs, Family Law Act, Handicapped Children, Multiculturalism, National Policy on Children and Families, Organisational Issues in Policies and Programs, Rights for Children, Television, and Unemployment. The content on each subject was incorporated in a single document which contained relevant Conference content – from the plenary session papers, from the participants' views and concerns recorded from plenary sessions and discussion groups, and from the specific interest group resolutions. The document on each subject was used as an attachment for an especially written letter to various key persons and/or organisations in the Australian community who were involved in the subject area.

Selected relevant Conference content was sent in June to 298 person and/or organisations. In many instances, because of their various interests and involvements, a person and/or organisation was sent a number of letters and attachments each dealing with a different subject. (Our report enclosed details of the persons and organisations who had been contacted, and the letters and materials sent.) In the absence of a comprehensive Australian directory of social welfare organisations which listed functions, key people, and addresses, we had to use a variety of sources (commonwealth and state government directories, social service directories at the state level, information from ACOSS, and the knowledge of members of the Follow-up Group. When a letter and its attachment was sent to a minister, a copy was also sent to the permanent head of the minister's department, with each knowing of the other's copy.

In our letters, the Follow-up Group made it clear that our prime function was to disseminate the ideas and information of the Conference. We did, however, invite any comment on the Conference material if it was wished, mentioning our work had to be completed by the end of October. In our report we gave a brief account of the substantive responses we had received – 10 were from commonwealth government organisations, only 4 from state government organisations, and 7 from non-government organisations.

As requested by the minister, we kept others informed in the course of our work. We provided her with an initial account of our proposed actions, and minutes of our meetings. The minutes were also available to any other interested parties, including the family policy committee of the minister's Consultative Council on Social Welfare, and the IYC National Committee of Non-government Organisations. In addition, two of us on the latter committee kept it aware of our activities, and I had periodic discussions with Helen L'Orange, its executive director. The Follow-up Group's executive officer kept the DSS IYC unit informed of our activities.

In the final section of our report to the minister, the Follow-up Group commented on moves towards a national policy for children and families:

One of the key objects which emerged at the Conference was the need for a national policy for children and families. At the Conference, an interest group on this topic had about 70 members drawn from a wide political and geographic spectrum. Originally their resolutions were worded for endorsement by the total Conference, but this did not prove feasible. The Follow-up Group considered,

however, that in view of the diverse character of the interest group these particular resolutions were likely to have been strongly endorsed by the total Conference if there had been opportunity to debate and vote upon them.

In view of this, the Follow-up Group sent the Conference material on national policy for children and families to a considerable number of organisations. In the accompanying letter, we stated that perhaps the most lasting achievement for IYC in Australia would be for the Prime Minister and Federal Minister responsible for IYC to set in train the collaborative national community consultative process suggested at the Conference, which would be necessary to develop and monitor national policy relating to children and families. We suggested that organisations might lend their argued support to this idea.

At the Conference, there was endorsement of the IYC National Committee of Non-Government Organisations negotiating with the Prime Minister and the Minister responsible for IYC about this matter. We understand that the matter is currently being examined by the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Because some of the recent, current, and projected developments indicate considerable confusion and possibly cross-purposes, the Follow-up Group wishes to make the following comments before we disband:

1. Our understanding of the general purpose is the establishment of a national structure through which policies that affect children and families can be clarified, discussed, and developed, with the involvement of all the major interested parties in Australian society.
2. What will be the most appropriate structure requires a preliminary national discussion process which involves all the major interested parties.
3. The planning and organisation of such a discussion requires a carefully-chosen steering committee. Its members should not represent particular sectional interests, but they should come from major sections of our society. They will need a good understanding of the structure and processes of Australian society.
4. To give it requisite national standing, this steering committee should be appointed by the Prime Minister.
5. The steering committee will need to be concerned with
 - problems of arriving at agreed definitions of 'family',
 - the major policies and decision-making systems which affect children and families,
 - the key interested parties and the nature of their interest, and
 - taking these into account, how to develop a national structure and process for monitoring and developing national policy for children and families.

It will be as important for the structure and processes to clarify differences and disagreements as to identify and develop consensus.
6. Both the preliminary discussion process and the eventual national arrangements for policy discussion in this field will need to be broadly based. If resulting policy discussion and development reflects only a limited range of sectional interests, the result will not be truly national policy.
7. The projected national conference sponsored by the Welfare Ministers in May 1980, can be seen as a most significant development in the desired

direction. However, it should be seen as only part of the necessary process and should not be confused with what is necessary over-all.

8. The Follow-up Group's general concern is that an important idea should not be put in jeopardy by over-ambitious claims by any relatively limited interests, government or non-government, or by premature policy prescriptions before we have adequate structures and processes in which to consider them.

One of our Follow-up Group, Marianne Crowe, wrote to me on 16 October for my comments on a paper she had given on national family policy at Hamilton which was in the prime minister's electorate. She wondered if it was suitable as a contribution for the ministers' May conference.

I hope I am not imposing too much on your time with this request, knowing that you already have quite a burden in writing our report to the Minister.¹²

May I say you have taught me quite a bit on the subject matter, and as a Chairman of a committee to get something done in the shortest possible time with the least amount of expenditure, you have my praise and admiration. I have not experienced this attitude before either in Government or Non-Government. Would there were more like you.¹³

What we were doing was, of course, necessary for all the work that had gone into the IYC national conference to have some chance of making a lasting impact on the lives of children in Australia. Pat Lanigan, DSS director-general who had come from Treasury, was particularly grateful for the part I had played and without personal financial reward. (Frankly it had never occurred to me that I might ask for any. As far as I was concerned, I was already reasonably paid by my professorial salary, and the work was centrally relevant to both of my major interests, social policy and social work). I recall him offering me use of his department's computing facilities if I ever needed them for my own research!

12 John Davoren assisted me in the preparation of the draft report which went to the final meeting of our group.

13 Letter, Marianne Crowe to John Lawrence, 16/10/79.

7.11 AASW National Conference 1979, Canberra

Lady Cowen, wife of the governor-general, came to my office at UNSW to discuss her opening address for this conference.¹ She had a social studies diploma from Melbourne University and was aware of many of the relevant issues, but had not pursued a professional career. I had known Zelman Cowen since serving on the selection committees at the University of Queensland, which had eventually resulted in Edna Chamberlain's appointment to a chair of social work in 1974. Although I did not relish the thought of another over-view assignment at the end of a national conference, I agreed to tackle it because the conference theme was 'Social Policy Planning', and I welcomed the AASW conference being in the national capital for the first time. My final comments on the content of the conference took this form:

A Conference Critique

I have found this a particularly difficult conference to arrive at a balanced judgement. It certainly has had its good aspects. All the main speakers have been people of manly ability, discussing significant issues for Australian social workers.

Lady Cowen spoke with admirable directness about her satisfactions from her traditional role of wife and mother. And you will remember Professor Caldwell's comment that our society may turn back to justifying again the role of full-time mother. If it does, the feelings of self-worth of many Australian women are likely to be enhanced. Lady Cowen also demonstrated that, had she not only dusted off her diploma, but brushed it up, and had been actively assisted to do so by our professional association, she would have become a valued social work colleague in her own right.

Rightly, at the outset of this Conference she highlighted the importance of the work issue relating this to technological change and uncertainty. One of the Conference workshops has focused on assessing social work's possible role in the process of technological change and intends to present evidence to the Committee of Inquiry into Technological Change in Australia, which is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor of my university, Professor Rupert Myers. Another workshop has focused upon youth employment. In addition, through ACOSS and other means, many social workers are trying to help the present situation, and practically all of us are affected by it in one way or another.

I personally would have wished a major paper by a policy analyst early in the Conference on the matters raised by Lady Cowen. In particular, I would have wanted a careful non-ideological discussion about the possible roles of taxation levels, public expenditures and interest rates in affecting levels of employment and levels of inflation.

The new conventional wisdoms of the late 1970s have taken hold with alarming rapidity. In the name of being 'realistic', we are being told that we have to accept and adjust to permanent levels of unemployment which a short span of years ago would have been intolerable to members of all political parties. In the meantime our productivity still increases, even if at a rather slower rate, and, as Professor Russell

1 I was rightly reprimanded for not having warned the man at the gate into the western campus area that she would be visiting!

Matthews has observed, this increased wealth is going somewhere. But it is certainly not going to the most vulnerable members of the society. They are the ones who in fact are bearing the brunt of our economic difficulties. The affluent, employed ones salve their consciences by swapping stories of job vacancies that they have heard cannot be filled – that is, until one of their own children cannot get a job.

When people say we have enough doctors, enough lawyers, enough architects, enough social workers, etc, they are not just describing a situation, they are prescribing a way of looking at the situation. There are more than enough community tasks which such people might do with profit to the community and themselves. Judgements made about sufficiency are essentially political value judgements.

What is our future is essentially a matter of decision and choice, and of persuading others what the future ought to be amongst a range of possibilities. Futurologists increasingly are coming clean and making explicit their political value assumptions on which their work has always been based. Planning and policy-making necessarily make assumptions about the future, yet you cannot know the future just by projecting current trends. In a very important sense, human beings choose the future and to some extent make it happen. A social policy and planning perspective on all of this is to try to clarify whose values are determining what and whose choices, within what time frames, and with what outcomes.

Again in the opening address, we had underlined the widespread call for more adequate data on which to base planning and policies, and the possible role this could play in more positive, preventive work. We had two impressive examples on Monday afternoon of the kinds of data that might be used for policy and planning purposes. But I think most of us had difficulty digesting them at a single hearing and neither speaker had a typed paper which could have been referred to later in the Conference. There was, however, a ready appreciation of the potential importance of the content of the talks of both Professor Caldwell and Paul Gross in policy discussions. This raises the issue, however, of who reads this material and what notice is taken of it. The structure and process of this Conference certainly has not made it possible to examine how and when it could and should be utilised in social work practice.

Much of Professor Caldwell's content is fortunately contained in the Australian Family Formation Project Monograph series. Schools of social work, social planning and research units in government departments, and others, would do well to get hold of this series if they have not already done so. From an interchange I happened to hear between Professor Caldwell and Senator Baume, key people in the Senate are apparently not aware of this material. This is just one of numerous examples of existing data not being channelled for potential use by policy-makers.

Professor Caldwell spoke of the well-known perils of population projections. 'Wild guesses', he describes them, mainly because of the changing government policy in relation to levels of migration. But even so, I remind you of his estimates of some of the possibilities. Each has considerable implications for the planning of social services. Our present population of 14 million, he said, would rise to 16 million by the year 2000, even assuming a net reproduction rate of 1 (slightly over 2 children per parents) and zero migration. It would rise to 19 million, assuming 1973 fertility rates and 50,000 immigration. If in the next 20 years we add about 4 million people, this will be more than in the last 20 years.

At present we have 8% of our population 65 plus in age. On an assumption of a

net reproduction rate of 1, and zero migration, by the 1990s, 11% of our population would be 65 plus, and by the year 2030, 15%, the current U.K. and Sweden figure. Professor Caldwell guesses that the more likely figure in 2000 will be 9–10%.

The dramatic drop of 1/5 in our births from 1971 to 1977 is already built into our demographic structure and will be affecting primary school intakes from 1980, high schools from 1986, and tertiary education from 1992. In almost a throw-away line in discussion, Professor Caldwell commented that in at least a dozen years or so, there will be fewer young people to be employed!

Before making some comment on the other talk which had substantive content for policy and planning purposes, I might also remind you of Professor Caldwell's observation, again in the discussion period, that crises in various parts of the world continue to occur and this isn't a bad way of selecting migrants. It can certainly radically alter population predictions.

The data which Paul Gross presented on public expenditure on health and welfare was confined to Commonwealth expenditure. State and voluntary expenditures were not included because of absent or non-comparable data. Further, it was fully acknowledged that the other half of the evaluation (as it was described), which should match the benefits against the Commonwealth costs was omitted and Senator Baume's Committee's report on evaluation was cited in justification for the omission.

Paul Gross is asking one of the basic social policy questions for our society – who gets what in the way of public health and welfare expenditures? Incredibly, for the first time in this country, we are beginning to get some of this kind of data. It is crucial for such data to be made generally available to stimulate careful policy analysis and critical debate.

I find it gratifying that at long last our society is beginning to produce people like Paul Gross, and beginning to have Commonwealth-government funded structures like the Social Policy Secretariat, and Social Welfare Research Centre at the University of New South Wales, where this kind of data can be produced, analysed, challenged on value or methodological grounds, revised and debated again.

Lindsay Curtis, in his particularly lucid paper on 'Access to Government Information', spoke of the need for a substantial goodwill on the part of the Ministry and the bureaucracy for freedom of information legislation to have a chance of working. It seems to me that we need to develop, particularly in our governmental bureaucracies but also in our non-governmental bodies, reward systems for openness, for taking reasonable risks and for assuming goodwill. At the same time, let's not pretend that knowledge is not closely linked with power. Important aspects of social policy and planning come under the concepts of the politics of knowledge, and its closely connected concepts of the economics of knowledge and the sociology of knowledge. We have not paid much regard to these aspects of knowledge in the formal papers, although Lindsay Curtis's paper deals with some of the relevant issues.

In general, I welcome the recent report on evaluation by Senator Baume's committee, and hope that it will lead to structures in the future that are more rational in terms of meeting the needs of populations they are meant to be serving. But we must be on our guard against simplistic means-ends claims, and against categorising behaviour as irrational when close analysis would show that goals are being sought and achieved, but they are often multiple and are different from one's own. Inevitably people are involved in supporting and administering policies. People will pursue

what is said to be the same policy for greatly differing reasons. Similarly people will pursue the same goal through a wide variety of policies. I believe that policy analysis is a highly complicated business if you take it seriously, because a great deal of human beings' behaviour is goal-directed. We are, in fact highly normative creatures, doing things for reasons which we often take for granted or implicit rather than explicit.

The other major input we received in the plenary sessions about our changing social conditions and our social service arrangements came, of course, from Professor David Donnison. His writing in the social policy field in Britain over the years has been well known and greatly appreciated in this country and he has visited Australia a number of times before.

You will recall that Professor Donnison referred to the growth of social services and forces likely to take that growth further in future. He referred to four pressures in this direction – first, more old people, particularly the very old, and more severely handicapped people; second, technological pressures, especially from advances in medical science; third, legal and political commitments such as people contributing to better pension schemes and increasing numbers of children reaching the requisite standard for entry to higher education; and fourth, Australia's economic troubles which are unlikely to disappear when the trade cycle turns upwards again. He sees us inextricably involved in the growth of the social service industries.

His observations about the attitudes of the 'average' men and women from the middle-income groups, 'middle Australia' – and their political influence are, I believe, particularly perceptive and helpful.

However, I frankly had a number of difficulties with Professor Donnison's paper when he moved more directly into talking about social work and its tasks and functions. I have no problem at all in thinking of various social service systems as industries. 'Service industries' is a common usage. 'Industry' seems to be a useful general term for describing a production and consumption system. For me, it can apply equally well to a government production system as to a non-government or private system. There are analytical problems in where you put a boundary around the so-called industry, and this is a not insignificant problem in areas of activity which are called social welfare services. In the recent past, the Social Welfare Commission avoided the issue, it continued to plague the 'social welfare' manpower study, and it remains in determining the membership of the ASWU (Australian Social Welfare Union).

I would have appreciated Professor Donnison discussing these conceptual and boundary issues more thoroughly, for there are few people better equipped to do so. But that is not my main worry. My main worry is that I think it is a category mistake to classify what is essentially an occupation, as an industry. In Britain, the temptation to do this may be great because of the creation of the so-called 'personal social services' as a separate service in which social workers have key roles. I do not like that term because it implies that other social services are not primarily aimed at personal or individual welfare. In any case, even in that service system social workers are an occupational group working within it. They are not coextensive with it.

I have no quarrel with the view that our social systems should provide our citizens with accurate relevant information, advice and practical help. Of course they should, and social workers should do all they can to ensure that this is readily available and used. But is the actual providing of this information the central social work role?

The development of training for welfare workers and for volunteers who work in collaboration with social workers within the same service industry is a way of dealing with this. Of course, there are problems about respective roles and, for a variety of reasons, there is considerable overlap and confusion. But there do seem to be a range of more difficult and demanding tasks in many social service systems which require the kind of education which might be fairly characterised as professional in character.

For many years, I believe many Australian social work professionals have been acutely aware of the kinds of issues being raised in Professor Donnison's paper. How well we have handled them is another question.

I had hoped that in view of the focus of the conference on social workers' roles in policy, planning and administration, Professor Donnison might have elaborated on these roles in Britain.

As many of you will know, social administration or social policy and administration, has been a subject area developed in many British tertiary institutions. There are at least 20 chairs in the subject in Britain. Historically, the early teachers of the subject were associated with teaching social work students – not to make them policy developers and administrators but to give them some understanding of the country's social policies and its social service structures, because caseworkers needed to know about such things to help their clients.

I believe the subject's separate autonomous development makes a great deal of sense for the society and that its courses can be taken with profit by students from a large array of professional occupations and from a variety of single subject disciplines, like sociology, political science, and economics. Although it would be difficult to achieve, I would like to see such a long-term development in this country.

In Britain, however, its separate early development does seem to have had an effect on delaying social work education accepting policy, and administrative roles as social work roles, and graduates from social administration courses have gone into policy and administrative roles even though social administration was taught primarily as a subject area and not as a professional policy and management course.

*Throughout Joyce Warham's British book, *An Introduction to Administration for Social Workers*, she distinguishes between social workers and administrators, not seeing administrators of social work or other social welfare organisations as apparently still practising their profession – even when they have social work qualifications, and presumably may be drawing upon social work knowledge, skills and values in pursuing their administrative responsibilities.*

It is not uncommon to hear a doctor who has left clinical practice to become a health service administrator described as no longer practising medicine. When Dr Barclay one of the N.S.W. Health Commissioners resigned a couple of years ago, he was said to be returning to professional practice.

The notion that if you are not providing a direct personal service to clients you are not a practising professional is a widespread one. Yet I believe that each professional occupation can only effectively fulfil its ethical claims to be serving the community, if some of its most able members are working in broad policy and administrative roles as integral practising members of their profession.

I believe that social work educators in Australia have been to some extent helpfully influenced in these matters by our often-maligned American colleagues. One of the volumes of the major curriculum study of the C.S.W.E. in North America in the

late 1950s was devoted to administration as a social work method. Its author, Sue Spencer, wrote at the time:

As the administrative project progressed, it became more and more clear that what we were discussing in the preparation of social work students for executive level positions was social work in an administrative setting and not administration in a social work setting.

Almost ten years ago, in 1970, appeared a Resource Book and a Casebook on Social Work Administration, a project of the Council on Social Work Education in North America.

Most, if not all, Australian schools of social work now certainly contain some teaching in this area in their educational programs.

The three papers by Harold Weir, Peter Travers and Frances Donovan on Tuesday afternoon pinned down the Conference to some discussion of the administrative role in social work practice. It is clear that there is greater acceptance that this is an important practice role, and that administrative skills in fact are necessary in almost any form of practice. But there are still solid problems connected with attitudes to women in executive positions, lack of adequate Australian teaching data, the timing of relevant educational preparation, and the coopting by the organisation of social workers in administrative positions so that they lose their professional social work identity. This latter problem is especially important in large bureaucratic structures when perhaps it is most essential for external professional reference points to be retained. Phyllis Montgomery in her paper on social work practice made a special point that there was very little communication between the practitioners delivering health and welfare services in the Canberra community and those social workers in administrative positions contributing to the planning and administration of national social policy.

Before making some comment on what I see as the major gap in the Conference. I want to say something about Sugata Dasgupta's contribution. Again, it was a pity that it was not in a written form which we could subsequently refer to. He was dealing with vast macro issues, rightly reminding us of a number of things – our parochialism in not taking notice of the recent experience of development in third world countries, of our need to be encouraged to think globally, of our need in social work education to keep focused on changes taking place in society and not just supplying manpower for existing social welfare structures, of our need to reassess our blind faith in technology, and our need to be concerned with widening gaps between both rich and poor nations, and rich and poor within our nations. Some of these are old social work concerns, easily lost sight of in the complexities of the modern urban industrial society in which we live.

I wish we had had time to talk further with Sugata Dasgupta, particularly to identify and clarify with him the alternative model of social work which he referred to, and know whether it could really redress in our kind of society the kinds of concerns he has. Of one thing I am sure, and that is that in the 1980s, Australian social workers must make every effort to interact with social work colleagues in other countries, especially with social work colleagues in our immediate geographic region. Perhaps the regional IFSW(A) and ARASWE joint seminar in Melbourne in August will help to stimulate this. Its topic is 'Diversity and Social Justice', and Sugata Dasgupta is its opening speaker.

For me, the glaring gap in the Conference program has been the absence of any attempt to try even to describe the social policy formulation structures in our society and the roles that social workers do play in these, could play in them, and ought to play in them. We do now have a number of members of our profession in key policy shaping and policy influencing roles in Commonwealth, State, municipal, and non-government social service activities, and some are now shaping policy in industrial and other settings outside the social services. They have often been placed in those positions because of assumed or claimed social work or social welfare expertise. A number have been appointed relatively early in their careers.

I would have wished for something more systematic and rigorous to have been built into the Conference program, but at the very least we might have had a Murray Geddes run-down on some of the significant political, bureaucratic and community pressure group structures and processes at the national level, giving us a state of play within the structures and suggesting some possible strategic points for social work intervention.

From what I know of its recent activities, the Social Welfare Policy Secretariat could well be one of the most relevant policy influencing structures for the AASW to relate to in the coming months, if policy-oriented social workers wish to influence national government.

Our President, Grace Vaughan, in her very notable Norma Parker Address, has certainly indicated our need to have a thorough knowledge of the power structure of our society. If she is right, that the 1980s will see less and poorer communication between socio-economic strata, then social workers are going to have a special responsibility to try to make sure that the interests of the disadvantaged and vulnerable are not further neglected.

It is now 32 years since Norma Parker addressed the first national conference of the AASW as its Federal President. It was the time of post-war reconstruction, a time of considerable policy-making and planning. It was also a time when anticipated high levels of unemployment did not eventuate. Lyra Taylor, the other person we have honoured today, was also one of the main speakers at the Conference. Her influence on the social policy thinking of Frank Rowe, the first Director-General of Commonwealth Department of Social Security, was said to have been considerable.

It has taken us 32 years for a national conference to be held in the national capital. Phyl Montgomerie reminded me on Monday evening that 8 of us used to attend AASW meetings in the late 1950s in Canberra. I was then engaged in writing an early history of professional social work in Australia. It was through these meetings that I first met Bill Langshaw who was then a humble district officer or the New South Wales Child Welfare Department, wondering if there was any future for a qualified social worker in that Department. I can recall saying to him that in the long-run such a Department surely could not afford not to have some professionally qualified people at least at the policy level, even if only for its own protection and survival. As some of you will know, Bill Langshaw has now been Secretary of the Department for many years. My words were truly prophetic.

Since the late 1950s, Canberra's population has increased 4-fold to over 200,000 people; its social work population 15-fold to about 120, and many are involved in policy, planning and administrative roles. The idea of this Conference's theme in this location was admirable; and you could not have wanted for more pleasant

surroundings than the Academy of Sciences building and University House.

Now that the A.C.T. branch of the Association has demonstrated its obvious capacity to plan a national conference, I hope we have another one fairly soon and I would be very happy for the focus again to be on social planning, policy and administration.

Thank you for inviting me to make this critique. I once wrote an article which appeared in our professional journal, on 'Has Australian Social Work a Critical Tradition?' I was using the term 'critical' in the sense of using one's judgement in a balanced assessment, not in the sense of fault-finding. I suggested to Peter Rice that we use the word 'critique' for my task, because this has the right flavour for a professional person who is making some sort of assessment of one's professional conference. I hope you agree with what I have said falls into the notion of a critique. There is one obvious gap in what I have done. I have clearly neglected the workshops, and for many of you they will have been the most important feature of the Conference.

Apart from that gap, I am very conscious that critiques are necessarily individual. Another professional colleague would have done the job differently. But for me, that's part of the fascination of being human.²

2 John Lawrence, 'A Conference Critique', in Winsome Ward, Alan Sutherland and Peter Rice (eds), *Professional Perspectives – 1980 and After*, Social Policy Planning and Administration, Proceedings, AASW 16th National Conference, Canberra 14–17 May, 1979, pp. 75–9.

7.12 Montcalm Inquiry, 1982¹

Maria Colwell had been killed by her stepfather in Britain in 1973. According to an official report on the case in 1974, the main contributing factors were the lack of communication between the agencies aware of her vulnerable situation, inadequate training for social workers assigned to at risk children, and changes in the make-up of society. Australia's first official child abuse inquiry occurred in New South Wales in 1982.

On 10 May 1982, a 10-year old boy, Paul Montcalm, died in his home in a fire allegedly lit by his mother. She was subsequently charged with his murder. In June 1982, I was appointed by the minister for youth and community services, Kevin Stewart, to conduct an inquiry and report to him on the following terms of reference:

1. To inquire into the response by Officers of the Department of Youth and Community Services to allegations that Paul Montcalm was ill-treated or at risk of abuse.
2. In particular to assess whether –
 - (a) policies and procedures were followed, and
 - (b) whether Departmental policies and procedures were adequate to protect the child in the circumstances.
3. To report and make recommendations to the Minister for Youth and Community Services.

Before undertaking the inquiry, I received from the minister an agreement in principle to the publication of its findings, subject to his agreement of this course after receiving the report. Since the report dealt with matters of genuine public interest and concern, it was important that they were publicly discussed. I deliberately prepared the report in such a way that it could be appropriately used as a public document. Place names were generally avoided for the recent period of the Montcalm story, and apart from Mrs Montcalm and Paul, no-one else was referred to by name. Their names were used because it was public knowledge that this inquiry was set up in connection with the Montcalm case, and Paul's death had received widespread publicity. I believed the report should help the department and others argue the case for improving services in the child abuse and child protection field.

The director-general of the department, Bill Langshaw, appointed Mrs Jane Brazier, senior program officer (child protection and development) in the department's children's bureau, to assist the inquiry. She had recently joined the department after highly relevant professional social work experience in the Community welfare Department in Western Australia. In my report I paid a special tribute to her. 'One could not have wished for more skilled and knowledgeable assistance and yet which paid scrupulous respect to the need for an independent inquiry'.

I took the phrase 'in the circumstances' to refer to both the circumstances

1 *Report and Recommendations of the Inquiry into the Statutory and Moral Responsibility of the Department of Youth and Community Services in New South Wales, in the Light of an Analysis of the Case of Paul Montcalm, conducted by Professor R. J. Lawrence, dated 27 October, 1982, Parliament of New South Wales, 1983.*

of the specific case and the circumstances of the Department having statutory responsibility to be involved with all New South Wales families which contained a child who was alleged to be ill-treated or at risk of abuse. I therefore sought answers to these questions and structured the report accordingly:

1. What are the Department's responsibilities in relation to child abuse/neglect or child protection?
2. How has the Department been organised to meet these responsibilities?
3. What happened in the Montcalm case?
4. What was the Department's performance in meeting its responsibilities in the Montcalm case?
5. What recommendations would improve the Department's performance in meeting its responsibilities generally in relation to child abuse and neglect?

I dedicated the report: *To the children who should be helped by the protective services of the Department of Youth and Community Services of New South Wales*. Under the dedication was a quotation from a district officer at the conclusion of giving evidence to the inquiry:

I just hope that all this effort will have some permanent benefit, and that it is not just a manoeuvre to whitewash somebody, or shoot somebody down in flames. This sort of case is constantly recurring. I'm amazed we haven't had this sort of situation recur many times. Potentially, there are many of our cases where this could happen, and it's time we faced up to it ... We can't do anything for Paul, but we can do something for the future cases perhaps.

The department began in 1968 to collect statistics of suspected cases of 'child battering' in which it was involved. At the national child welfare administrators' conference in 1972, a departmental research officer commented on an increase in the number of cases referred since 1971 (24 to 43) since a clarification of the definition, and called for further precision in the definition and standardisation of reporting. The number of cases reported to the department rose from 47 in 1974, to 160 in 1975 and 449 in the next 18 months – apparently because of child abuse teams now operating from a couple of the district offices, and because 'child abuse' was extended to cover emotional and sexual abuse as well as physical abuse. In 1974, the relevant minister recognised 'the huge number of unreported cases'. Some legislative action would be necessary.

At the first national conference on child abuse held in Perth in 1975, the keynote speaker was the director of the USA federal government's National Centre for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse. He emphasised the need for an interdisciplinary team chaired by a child protection social worker to diagnose the child, provide a family diagnosis and develop a treatment plan. No one profession could manage the complex problem of child abuse. There was, however, danger in taking care of things by committee, because finally someone had to be responsible. Under-notification occurred because professionals in the field needed to be better educated. He admitted, however, that too often notifications did not lead to adequate treatment, adding a third crisis to the crisis that led to the child abuse and the crisis represented by the injured child.

A 1976 report of the NSW privacy committee on mandatory reporting of

child abuse, listed organisations and individuals in favour of it, those opposed to it, and those giving qualified support. The latter all agreed that mandatory reporting could only be justified if it were backed by adequate, effective services.

The New South Wales Child Welfare (Amendment) Act, 1977, introduced compulsory notification by a medical practitioner who had reasonable grounds to suspect that a child had been assaulted, ill-treated or exposed, and voluntary notification by a person who believed upon reasonable grounds that a child had been assaulted or was neglected as defined by the Act.

The 1977 notification legislation was accepted by the minister and director of the department as giving the department statutory responsibility for identifying all cases and suspected cases of child abuse in New South Wales, for achieving early intervention, for giving prompt attention to the cases, and for providing the families involved access to professional treatment. In organising to meet their responsibility the department at first established a professionally staffed centralised unit at Montrose. This, however, could not handle all the notified cases, and a substantial proportion, even at the outset were handled by the so-called 'generalist' staff in the department's district offices. By 1980, the department had virtually abandoned its initial Montrose strategy. The professionals who remained at Montrose were mainly engaged in the Montrose Child Protection Unit, which handled a very small number of selected cases in a residential and day care centre. A Montrose Family Crisis Service received the child abuse notifications. It had a mix of both 'generalist' and professionally qualified staff. Apart from its brief crisis work, almost all the notified cases had become the responsibility of the 'generalist' district officers. Some of these had the help of professionally-qualified consultants who had previously been located at Montrose, and most had undertaken short courses on child abuse, provided by the department. How did this departmental system respond to the Montcalm case?

In the next section of the report, I provided a detailed account of the department's involvement in the case – in 134 numbered paragraphs, organised chronologically with headings along the way. In addition was 'an historical postscript' of a further 13 paragraphs constructed from information from a district officer whose earlier involvement with the family since about 1972, had been unknown until he came forward to the inquiry. How adequate was this account? I had three sources – the written record, later written evidence, and verbal evidence.

A major problem of trying to provide a reasonably accurate account was the not more than 20 pages of recording in the Montcalm file while the case was proceeding. 'Recording at the time is, of course, likely to be far more accurate than later recollections made with hindsight and the stress of both a tragedy and inquiry into the circumstances of a tragedy'. Written materials compiled after Paul's death were an 11-page report by the senior district officer of the relevant district office, containing additional information not in the file, gained from officers involved in the case; and reports from Montrose staff about the case. The inquiry also had copies of letters to the minister from neighbours, Action for Children, and 'D' from Darlinghurst.

Given the flimsy written record, the inquiry had to place heavy reliance

on verbal evidence. It interviewed, sometimes at considerable length, all the officers of the department who had significant involvement in the case, the various neighbours who had made complaints to the department before Paul's death, and representatives of the two community organisations that wrote to the minister. Near the beginning of the inquiry, the union to which relevant staff belonged, the Public Service Association of New South Wales, expressed concern about the possibility of disciplinary action being taken against some of its members as a result of the inquiry. Assurances were given by myself and the director-general that this was not the purpose of the inquiry. In the event, everyone cooperated very fully and apparently freely in providing evidence. Many in fact demonstrated a considerable need to have the opportunity to talk about Paul's death. The inquiry was kept as informal as possible. By agreement, tapes were kept of the interviews for accuracy, on the understanding that they would be destroyed at the conclusion of the inquiry.

Although the account of the case was based on inadequate records extensively supplemented by inevitably limited and distorting personal memories, I believed it provided a reasonably accurate basis for the assessment which followed. When a child died in horrific circumstances there was universal agreement that this was unacceptable and legal process was set in train to establish the guilty party.

However, establishing causation and responsibility in human affairs is complicated. There are different degrees and types of causation; there are multiple factors; human beings are goal making and goal seeking creatures so what causes their actions is a combination of 'natural' and human-made 'causes'; there is an apparently endless chain of causation; and there is the apparent incidence of chance.

Decisions and actions along the way in any single case were obviously shaped by what had gone before, and represented attempts at rational action to bring about a more desired future than would otherwise be the case. Although 'ifs' in history were always still-born, they could help us identify possibly realistic alternative decisions and courses of action for the future by people confronted with similar circumstances. The ultimate failure for a child protection service might be seen to be failure to protect a child from death. Sheer survival was, of course, a basic human value. However, it was only a necessary not sufficient condition of human well-being, especially for children. Paul's death had occasioned this scrutiny of the department's child abuse service, but clearly the department's service must be judged primarily on its achievements in improving the life of the family prior to Paul's death. Fortunately effective service and protection from death usually went together.

Would the course of this case and the level of service achieved have been different and probably better if various things over which the department had at least some control had happened or not happened along the way? There were, of course, a large number of 'ifs' that could be raised. The inquiry had selected what seemed to be fairly significant ones. It was obviously easier to be wise after the event, but the 'ifs' listed could reasonably have been considered at or before the relevant time. If they had, the course of the Montcalm case would probably have been different and probably better. I considered what might have been

by listing 90 'ifs', chronically arranged. The first 5 applied to the earlier period for which there was no trace in departmental records. All the rest dated from August 1981, when the department received its first of four complaints about Paul's situation. These were grouped in three periods – August-December 1981, January-April 1982, and May 2nd – 10th 1982.

Many of these 'ifs' were matters of judgement, but seen together they did indicate the extent to which the departmental system failed to provide adequate service in the Montcalm case. The department's performance was badly inadequate when assessed in terms of case identification and early intervention, case assessment and professional treatment, and clear responsibility – the major criteria expected of an effective child protection service.

My report commented:

The Inquiry is fully aware of the difficulties in effecting change in a large-scale organisation, especially when key personnel see themselves to be threatened by the proposed change. Since at least 1943, there have been periodic attempts to professionalise aspects of the Department's work but the process had been more successful in similar Departments in other States, than in the New South Wales Department.

The social work professional currently in charge of Montrose stated to the inquiry:

We need to professionalise this Department and there's tremendous resistance to doing it. I can speak strongly about it because I started my own welfare career as an untrained worker and resisted strongly the need to attain any other qualification because I honestly believed I didn't need it. ... This Department resists and denies the need to increase its generalist workers' level of skill. ... there are many people who would benefit from professional training and desire it. ...

One reaction to my report might be: given all the difficulties the Department of Youth and Community Services had experienced in trying to provide, or be responsible for, adequate professional services in child abuse cases, should the statutory responsibility be shifted to the Health Commission? The Commission could at least provide a variety of professional services and the professional mode of organisation. There were, however, powerful arguments against this:

- The services would become medically dominated.
- The problem of child abuse would be seen too much in terms of individual cases only, educational and broader intervention strategies being neglected.
- 'Sickness' models would predominate.
- Psycho-social aspects would be neglected.
- There would be no continuum with general family support services.
- The help of the health sector can be enlisted without it having the prime responsibility.
- Where court action is taken to protect children, the relevant authority will continue to be the Department of Youth and Community Services.

My recommendations therefore were based on the assumption that the Department of Youth and Community Services would continue to have

statutory responsibility for the notification and ensuring of adequate services for child abuse cases. The 1982 Community Welfare Act had adopted virtually unchanged the relevant provisions of the 1977 Child Welfare (Amendment) Act. I decided not to make a large number of detailed recommendations to the minister, but to recommend a number of general principles to be used by the department in changing to arrangements which would enable it to fulfil its statutory responsibilities. Much more detailed desirable changes would flow when these principles were implanted.

1. Each Community Welfare Office of the Department should employ professionally qualified staff to take responsibility for case identification, case assessment and case treatment in all cases of child abuse or suspected child abuse.
2. The number of professionally qualified staff employed for this purpose in each Community Welfare Office should depend on the number of cases being notified from the Office's locality, and the way the cases are subsequently handled.
3. These professionals should determine, in consultation with the Senior Program Officer (Child Protection and Development) what caseloads enable a professional level of service to be maintained.
4. The Director should be informed where actual caseloads are above this, so that he in turn can make this known to the Minister and the public, and the question of a substandard professional service in these cases is then seen to be a matter of political choice.
5. The most relevant qualification for child abuse casework in a Community Welfare Office is social work because of the relative breadth involved in social work's frame of reference, compared with that of other disciplines.
6. People with other professional qualifications such as clinical psychology and community nursing, should, however, also be employed in each Community Welfare Office, if such services cannot be readily attained by working collaboratively with other agencies. They need to work in the closest collaboration with the social work staff, with respective roles and responsibilities clearly determined.
7. Consideration should be given to the appointment of appropriately qualified case aides to undertake useful, but limited tasks under the supervision of professionals.
8. The Department's social work professionals specialising in child abuse should have the experience and capacity to develop collaborative work both inside the Department and with other agencies, around individual cases, and around intervention at group and community levels.
9. In those cases that involve psychiatrically disturbed people, special care should be taken to work collaboratively with relevant professionals.
10. To keep the Department's responsibilities within reasonable bounds, and to utilise fully professional resources of the community, fullest use should be made of designating professionals in other agencies as prime workers in child abuse cases. This should not be done, however, if a Departmental professional is acting as the Case Coordinator.

11. Consideration should be given to the possibility of developing purchase for service arrangements to ensure access to relevant non-government or even other government services which could be better provided under an auspice other than the Department's.
12. Because of the particularly stressful and unpopular nature of child abuse work amongst many professionals, the Department needs to give special support and recognition to its child abuse professionals, and should encourage outside professionals and the community at large to do likewise. They are, in fact, doing important and difficult work on behalf of the community. Not to recognise this, but instead to give it low status and few resources is to invite professional disillusionment and disengagement.
13. The Department should fully utilise the experience and views of its professional staff in its local Community Welfare Offices in determining its policy and planning to meet its responsibilities for combating the problem of child abuse in New South Wales.
14. Each District Manager (formerly called Senior District Officer) should have the relevant qualifications and experience to understand the professional functions being undertaken with the Community Welfare Office and to provide the necessary supports for them.
15. The Department should identify suitable members of its existing staff to qualify for admission to social work courses, and make it possible for them to become professionally qualified.
16. The Department should discontinue using short training courses to try to prepare officers working with child abuse cases, except when the officers already have a basic professional education appropriate for such work.
17. All child abuse notifications to Montrose, including those involving after-hours crisis intervention, should be handled by professionally qualified staff.
18. Long-term planning should include the location of Regional after-hours crisis intervention centres staffed by professionals specialising in such work.
19. It seems hard to justify as a priority the resources currently going into the small number of cases being dealt with by the centralised Montrose residential and day care program, unless it is used far more obviously as a demonstration and research facility. Consideration could be given to the long-term development of similar specialised multi-disciplinary facilities in each Region, if further resources become available in future.
20. The Central Index should be maintained as a tool for case identification, planning and research, but only if it is accurate and up-to-date, it reflects adequate professional assessment and judgement of what are 'at risk' situations, it uses modern methods of data retrieval, and cases can be identified by more than just a name.

Before submitting the report to the minister in late October 1982, the relevant departmental officers met to discuss a draft of my report. It was claimed the report had various errors in it. I, together with Jane Brazier, subsequently checked the supposed 'errors' against the recorded evidence, and found I did not have to revise anything apart from three inconsequential typing mistakes!

At a meeting with the minister, Kevin Stewart, before I left the country for

a year in USA in 1983, he agreed the report would be published. I, of course, regretted leaving at this stage, but I was firmly committed elsewhere. From Rutgers, I wrote to Bill Langshaw on 9 March.² On 10 June, I received a telegram from Anne Gorman (Action for Children) requesting that I release the Montcalm Report. The report had not yet been published and it appeared the minister was stalling, but I certainly did not want to 'leak' the document. I tried unsuccessfully to reach Bill Langshaw by phone, so wrote to him on 22 June via Tony Vinson to make sure he received the letter. From Cleveland, I posted a letter special delivery on 10 August to Frank Walker about releasing the Montcalm Report, pointing out the undertaking made by his predecessor. Walker, NSW minister for YACS, housing and aboriginal affairs, had replaced Kevin Stewart as YACS minister.

Finally, at long last, on 25 August, Bill Langshaw rang about the Montcalm report. It had been tabled in the NSW Parliament the previous week. Bill apologised for not responding to my earlier letters, but said the minister, for some reason he was not aware of, did not want him to be in touch with me until it was tabled. Frank Walker had delayed acting on it for a long time because the appeal was still not heard in the case. Even now it had not been heard. Bill had obtained my phone number from our daughter Ruth who would be visiting us in Cleveland, and would send with her next week material on the media response, etc. The minister had set up a committee of Jane Brazier, Hawker (a lawyer) and Pam Roberts to deal with any case in which deaths occurred. Its terms of reference would be the same as mine. Action for additional resources was slow. Ann Gorman was trying to get Bill out of his job. All interested parties now had copies of the report. Walker thought it potentially defamatory, but Bill was not sure why.

In December 1983, from Cleveland, in a letter to Bruce Lagay, I wrote:

The 'Montcalm Inquiry Report' was finally tabled in the NSW Parliament by the Departmental Minister shortly after I wrote a fairly toughly worded letter in August. Since then there have been a number of newspaper items on the Report, and at least one very helpful editorial in the Sydney Morning Herald, the most substantial daily newspaper in Sydney. In the recent state budget, the Department received additional funds to increase its specialist child abuse staff by 40 officers, and most importantly, it is reported that they must be qualified social workers or clinical psychologists. The appointment of more of the existing staff would have been a disaster that I was anxious not to bring about. It will be interesting to see how all this looks when I return home. One has a considerable sense of helplessness being at such a distance and not really knowing what is happening. Now the Report is a public document, Bruce, I will try to get one sent to you when I return.³

2 On that same day I sent a letter to my son Peter to destroy all of the tapes I made collecting evidence for the Montcalm inquiry. I had intended to wipe the contents so I could use them again, but had not managed to do this before I left.

3 Letter, John Lawrence to Bruce Lagay, 5/12/83.

7.13 The Benevolent Society 1978–86 – Substantial Welfare Progress

My second period of involvement with the Benevolent Society began with a very long, persuasive phone-call from Professor Malcolm Chaikin in 1977. He was about to become president of the organisation and was very keen that I should join what was now a good board. 'We badly need you.' He assured me that the situation would be very different from the one that I had encountered earlier before finally disengaging in 1971.¹ An age retirement for board members had been introduced, Reg Della Bosca had been succeeded (in September 1975) by Richard Gould, as the secretary and chief executive officer, and this time I would be operating at board level where I could directly influence the organisation with my social work and social policy thinking. Richard Gould BA, MHA (UNSW) was keen to develop the welfare services of the society, as well as the Royal Hospital for Women. His deputy chief executive officer was Ross Joseph BA, MHP. Both were capable young administrator/planners, able to work well with the board.

In December 1986, Malcolm Chaikin (still president) wrote this letter of appreciation:

This is to acknowledge your letter of 20th November advising of your intention to resign at the end of this year. During the nine years that you have been a member of the Society's Board of Directors, you have played a significant and invaluable role in assisting the Board to address conscientiously its future directions.

Your active involvement in reviewing the Society's welfare activities led to the Board's acknowledgement of deficits in this important area, and influenced the Board to create a senior position of Director of Welfare Services in 1980. Other decisions which have followed on from this appointment have aimed to strengthen the work of the Society in the welfare area.

Your work as Chairman of the Objectives Committee on the Board culminated in the Board adopting a very significant document in 1981, which our executive advise has been an important guide in directing the thinking and planning of our future programmes. I am hopeful that we will make further progress in this regard in 1987 and beyond.

I hope that you will continue your interest and relationship with the Benevolent Society. We will value your informal counsel on important matters in which you have special interest and expertise.

On behalf of your many friends and colleagues at the Benevolent Society, we wish you a fruitful year in New York.²

I have copious archival material from my nine years on the board. Each of the programs of the society, including of course the hospital, had a managing committee, usually with board representation, and minutes of the meetings of these committees came to the board. In addition was material for special board committees and the special board seminars in 1979 and 1985. The board would meet monthly in Hardwick house, on Glenmore Road, Paddington,

1 See pp. 279–94.

2 Letter, Malcolm Chaikin to John Lawrence, 1/12/86.

located adjacent to the growing buildings of the Royal Hospital for Women. A meal provided by the hospital preceded meetings and provided opportunity for board members and senior staff to interact informally and get to know each other. After meetings, on my drive home I regularly dropped off Mary Moore (BA, BEc, formerly headmistress of SCEGGS, Darlinghurst), and Malcolm Hardwick MA[Oxon], QC, son of the former Society's president, C. A. Hardwick), at their respective homes – another opportunity for informal interaction. Malcolm was very conservative politically, but seemed to accept me because I had been to Oxford.³ As new board members, Trevor Rowe and I visited the various sites and services of the Benevolent Society together and he was on the Scarba Review Committee with me in 1979. He had served in the Second World War before completing his BA and LL.B at Sydney University, had been a manager and director in the carpet industry, and was currently a consultant in the industry and an investment adviser.

The Board of Management

Malcolm Chaikin was president of the Benevolent Society 1978–88. He was born (1923) and educated in Shanghai, China. After studying textile technology at University of Leeds 1947–53, he came to Australia where his stateless Ukrainian parents had arrived as refugees, leaving China after the 1949 revolution. Appointed in 1953 to the foundation chair of textile technology at the NSW University of Technology (now UNSW), he was dean of the Faculty of Applied Science 1961–84, and then UNSW pro-vice-chancellor (international and research). He was not religious but was aware of his Jewish identity, and was on the governing bodies of an Institute of Technology and a Ben Gurion University in Israel. From 1975 to 1988, he was chairman of the National Institute of Dramatic Art at UNSW.⁴ He was obviously influential in various circles. Within UNSW amongst my professorial colleagues he was known as an astute political operator. I had no doubt, however, that his welfare concerns were genuine, which was not surprising in view of his particular life experience, his Jewish identification, and his obvious intelligence.

All of the four vice-presidents in 1978 had given many years of service to the organisation – E. L. Callaway, Mrs E. Cox, Dr R. H. Syred, and G. M. Thorp. Roy Syred had been elected chairman of the senior medical staff at the Royal Hospital for Women in 1968. Graham Thorp's firm (Peddle, Thorp and Walker) were the Society's architects. Ron Rathbone, a school teacher, had taken over from Eric Callaway as treasurer.

The rest of the Board of Management in 1978 were people usually successful in their respective fields, able and willing to make their contribution to the community in a voluntary capacity. As a highly reputable organisation proud of its history, still under the continuing patronage of the governor of the day, the Society would have appeared to be worthy of their time and effort. My fellow board members were an interesting mix – with a range of qualifications

3 In 1982, after a discussion with his son Julian and looking at his impressive curriculum vitae, I willingly wrote in support of Julian's application to read PPE at Magdalen.

4 See Harriet Veitch, 'Malcolm Chaikin, 1923–2012', available on the internet.

of varying relevance to the work. Amongst the 12 'subscribers' representatives', we had 3 fellows of the Australian Institute of Management (F. S. Buckley, Malcolm King and Alf Paton), 3 with engineering qualifications (King, Paton, and Paul Huggins), 2 with commerce or economics degrees (David Elsworth and Mary Moore), 2 with legal qualifications (Mr Justice Dennis Mahoney and Trevor Rowe), 2 with BAs (Moore and Rowe), a politician (Syd Einfeld MLA), and dean of the Faculty of Medicine (Professor R. J. Walsh). Professor Frank Rundle, the former dean, continued as one of the four government nominees on the board. Two of the 12 subscribers' representatives (Miss Moore and Mrs Freeman), and 2 of the government nominees (Mrs Cohen and Mrs Reed) were women. I was the only professionally qualified social worker and PhD on the board. It was a traditional male-dominated, 'top down' board, although its female members were very active in some of its sub-committees responsible for service delivery. None of the women had formal qualifications for their responsibilities.

I can recall my social work and social welfare colleagues, sometimes asking why I persisted with my membership of the board of the Benevolent Society. My usual response was – 'Given the history and nature of this voluntary organisation, reform will obviously not be easily achieved and will take time. It is a professional challenge and I will stick with for as long as it takes – unless I think we are getting nowhere'. Following is an account of various stepping-stones along the way of making progress during my period on the board.

In April 1978, Ross Joseph, together with senior staff at Scarba House for Children, and 'with the considerable assistance of Professor J. Lawrence', prepared a submission for financial support for a Scarba Family Services Unit. The aim was 'to assist the long-term functioning of families whose children may be referred to Scarba House for temporary care'. Richard Gould thanked me for my 'valued assistance'. The submission was to NSW family support services scheme, Department of Youth and Community Services, but was unsuccessful.

In his 1979 'President's Report', Malcolm Chaikin wrote:

The year 1979 has been distinguished by a critical self-review of the Society's effectiveness, a review which has been undertaken with vigour by our Board and Administration. On 28 July, Board members and senior officers of the Society took part in a one-day seminar, entitled 'Where are we heading?' Our work, our effectiveness in meeting our objectives, our strengths, our weaknesses, were discussed and the alternatives before the Society reviewed. All the participants felt that the seminar was a success and further reviews should enable the Society to provide even better services to the community than in the past. One important initiative that should be mentioned is the Board's decision to appoint a Director of Welfare Services to coordinate our welfare policies and programmes. It is anticipated that an appointment to this key position will be made within the next few months.

The Society's spirit of self-review during 1979 was also exemplified by an analysis of the operation of Scarba House for Children. In May the Board established a Sub-Committee under the chairmanship of Professor R. J. Lawrence, to consider the Society's role in the area of child and family welfare generally and the operation of Scarba House for Children in particular. The Committee's report has been

received by the Board and important decisions on our future plans in these areas are yet to be made. Scarba, of course, is only one activity on our Bondi site, the others being the Maurice O'Sullivan Day Care Centre for Children, the Chapman House Hostel and the Walter Cavill Homes for Senior Citizens. ...⁵

7.13.1 Board Seminar 1979

On 28 July, 1979, a Board Seminar looked at 'a number of aspects of the Society's activities, particularly the relevance of its current objectives; the role of the Royal Hospital for Women; the Society's future course in the provision of Welfare Services; its ability to identify the real needs of the community and its strength and weaknesses in the field of funding.' The summary of the discussion group in which I participated gives an indication of our thinking at that time. Our group consisted of: Mrs Freeman, Professor Walsh, Mr King, Professor Lawrence, Mr White, Mr Paton, Dr Syred, Dr Greenwell, Mr Joseph and Ron Rathbone (chairman).

STRENGTHS

1. The Society is well served by the administrative ability of its key executive officers.
2. The Society has experience in health administration and some areas of social welfare.
3. By virtue of its incorporation by Act of Parliament the Society enjoys a special status and prestige.
4. Whilst acknowledging that diversity of activities can result in a dissipation of expertise and resources the fact that the Society can diversify its activities is regarded as a strength.
5. The Society enjoys significant independence of financial support, and is not entirely dependent on Health Commission or other government funding for its activities.
6. The Society benefits by its association with a university and a number of professional and specialised groups.
7. The Society has significant areas of real estate available for development of its activities.
8. The Society has provided for over 10 years, low cost, secure accommodation for Senior Citizens.
9. Within its limited operation of hostels and a nursing home for the aged, there is evidence that the Society is able to provide appropriate nursing and physical support services.
10. The Society through the Royal Hospital for Women has demonstrated the ability to take initiatives in certain specialised areas.
11. The Society enjoys the confidence of Government instrumentalities in its ability to implement and develop new programmes.
12. The Society has not had to resort to obtrusive publicity to attract and maintain public support.

⁵ Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *Annual Report 1979*, p. 5.

WEAKNESSES

1. Within the broad scope of the original Charter, there are no clear goals and objectives for the Society.
2. It is necessary to clearly define the word 'need' within the context of the people for whom the Society provides a service and aspects of their lives with which the Society is primarily involved.
3. The Society's activities are too diversified to the extent that existing expertise and resources are dissipated and inadequacies of service result. The rate and direction of the Society's recent growth and development in various fields of activity requires reappraisal.
4. There is no obvious evaluation of policies and programmes measured against the Society's goals and objectives. In the absence of adequate evaluation, the Society cannot be seen to be accountable to the people receiving service and the public supporters of the Society.
5. In the eyes of a number of agency groups and professional social workers, the reputation of the Society's social welfare activities is not high.
6. The Society lacks adequate professional expertise in social welfare matters.
7. There is a lack of staff capacity to provide adequate social welfare data as the basis for determining welfare objectives and priorities.
8. The operations of the Royal Hospital for Women tend to dominate the Society's other activities.
9. There is an inability to control the supply of Government finances and thus to effectively plan public hospital activities.
10. There is a lack of periodic review and evaluation of the Society's support and standing in the community.
11. The Society's name would seem to be inappropriate in terms of:
 - i. The nature of present and possible future activities, and
 - ii. The geographic location of the Society's activities.
12. The current restriction of the Society's activities to quite a small geographic area within New South Wales limits its area of service and support.
13. The Society's Act of Incorporation imposes certain rigid limitations in the use and investment of Society's finances and in its administration.
14. There is a tendency to assume that the Royal Hospital for Women is the leader in all its fields of endeavour.
15. The Royal Hospital for Women is not sufficiently integrated with its surrounding community.

THREATS

1. Viability of voluntary organisations in Social Welfare generally and in Australia.
2. Lack of knowledge of the effect of the Society's activities on the very people being assisted.
3. Threat to autonomy of organisation, posed by a variety of outside influences.
4. Possible failure of existing voluntary funding lines.
5. Withdrawal and shifts in Government funding.
6. Complacency and apathy as a long-established organisation.
7. Apparent changes in social mores.
8. Insensitivity to change in external factors.

9. Current government attitudes to expenditure in health and social welfare areas.

OPPORTUNITIES

1. Need in NSW for a multi-purpose non-sectarian organisation which will provide expert leadership in social welfare policies and services. (e.g. similar to the Brotherhood of St Laurence in Melbourne.)
2. Opportunity for Society to meet this need, and develop its contribution in such areas as:
 - i. Providing continuous evaluation of social needs.
 - ii. Development of specialised hospital activities.
 - iii. Evaluation of health and welfare services.
 - iv. Service to the dependent aged and dependent young.

7.13.2 The Scarba Review Committee and Report 1979⁶

As indicated by the president in his 1979 annual report, this committee under my chairmanship was appointed by the board to consider the Society's role in the area of child and family welfare generally and the operation of Scarba House for Children in particular. Its terms of reference (drafted by myself and Richard Gould) carefully set down the committee's task. In brief, we were asked:

- to examine the present role and functioning of Scarba House in the local community, the wider community, and the Benevolent Society, and assess whether its present service is appropriate and desirable for the children and families involved;
- to identify and evaluate possible service alternatives for the Benevolent Society in child and family welfare;
- to advise what should be the Society's future role in child and family welfare, and the likely attitude of the appropriate statutory authorities; and
- to advise what organisational arrangements and resources would be required, and how to bring about the desired role.

The Committee was expected to 'maintain a prime focus on the Society providing an appropriate and effective service to children and their families'. We were asked to report to the board within four months, having sought evidence from appropriate persons and written material.

Committee Members

My fellow committee members (whom I had recommended) were Edna Cox, Richard Gould, Mary McLelland, Trevor Rowe, and Bert Sucgang – a well-balanced committee.⁷ I was particularly keen to have Mrs Cox with us, and was relieved when she said after one of our hearings with expert witnesses,

6 'The Role of the Benevolent Society of New South Wales in Child and Family Welfare: A Report on Scarba House for Children', November, 1979. This was not a public report, although it obviously was dealing with issues of considerable public interest.

7 Appendix 5 of our report provided biographical notes on each of us – a feature often absent in a report of this nature.

'How could we have got it so wrong!' She was one of the 'old guard' and had given devoted service to the Society. Appointed a director in 1960, she had been a vice-president since 1971, and in 1978 was appointed chairman of the Bondi Site committee, which was responsible for all the activities on the Bondi site, including Scarba. Richard Gould's direct involvement was particularly helpful. It gave him insight into social work thinking and experience, and he provided excellent administrative support for the committee. He and I worked very well together. Trevor Rowe was a director and a member of the Bondi Site committee. As already mentioned, I had got to know Trevor Rowe, and it was important to have another director immediately involved, although he had had primarily business rather than social welfare experience.

The other two members of the committee were expert 'outsiders', willing to participate in an inquiry with considerable welfare potential. They were social work colleagues, appointed because of their long professional experience and expertise in the family and child welfare field. Mary McLelland was a friend and colleague whom I first knew when we were on the staff together at the University of Sydney. She took over from Norma Parker as supervisor of professional training in the Department of Social Work at the university in 1966. Since her retirement from the university in 1975 (at the age of 55), she had worked in the family research unit at UNSW, was chairman of the Child Welfare Advisory Council, vice-president of the Marriage Guidance Council, and board member of the Mercy Family Life Centre, Waitara. Bert Suggang was currently administrator, community welfare department Waverly Municipal Council. Originally a graduate from the University of the Philippines, he had master's degrees in social work from Case Western University in Ohio, and in education from Springfield College in Massachusetts. I had first met Bert in Manila in 1970 when he held a senior social work position in the Philippines. He had subsequently migrated to Australia. I knew of his expertise in family and child welfare, including a period as director of welfare programs, Dr Barnardo's in Australia.

THE SCARBA REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

The introduction of the Report provided a brief historical account of the development of Scarba, data on the present service, the immediate factors which led to the establishment of the review committee, the task given to the committee and the committee's composition. It concluded with a description of the people from whom evidence was collected and of the other sources of evidence which had been used. The historical section referred to the moves in the late 1960s to change the form and focus of the traditional temporary residential care for children at Scarba.

This was part of a more general move to re-organise and develop the Benevolent Society's social welfare activities on a more professional base. The present review picks up these earlier concerns, but it does so in a rather different community situation:

- There is now much more experience in New South Wales and elsewhere

about realistic alternatives to institutional child care.

- A number of other voluntary organisations have been engaged in re-thinking and re-organising their social welfare activities, and this has involved an examination of the respective roles of professionally qualified staff, other welfare staff, volunteers, client groups, local community groups, the governing board and financing bodies.
- The recent report on the evaluation of health and welfare services by the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare indicates an increasing concern that all organisations should be regularly evaluating their social welfare activities.

In the course of the inquiry we collected evidence from a variety of selected people. These interviews and discussions were taped and transcribed, and in addition to providing invaluable evidence to the current review, we saw them as providing a continuing rich source for the Society's board and staff. In our letter of transmittal, we commented on:

... the very ready cooperation we have received from the many people who have helped us in our review. Those currently associated with Scarba have given generously of their time and ideas, and each of our invited witnesses with experience in the field of child and family welfare carefully prepared their evidence and willingly shared their experience, knowledge and wisdom. Without the benefit of so much concerned, constructive help, this review would not have been possible.

We encountered wide-spread support for the Society undertaking the present review, and having a different role in future in the field of child and family welfare.

From Scarba, we collected evidence from Sister R. Burrows (deputy administrator), P. Watson (administrative officer), Miss C. Bradshaw (social worker), and M. Young (acting social worker, a psychologist), and we also interviewed Mrs M. Field (senior social worker, Royal Hospital for Women), and Ross Joseph, deputy chief executive officer of the Society. Our interviews and discussions with people outside the Society covered a wide spectrum of experience and expertise: Peter Boss (professor of social work, Monash University);⁸ 4 from the Department of Youth and Community Services – W. Langshaw (director), Mrs B. Burgess (field planner), Mrs A. Gorman (executive director, family and children's services agency), Mrs R. Tankard (senior allotment officer), and Mrs B. Checkley (from YACS, chairman, NSW Consultative Committee on Social Welfare); 2 from Mercy Family Life centre – G. Boyle (executive director), and sister M. McGovern (assistant administrator, Mater Misericordiae hospital, director, Mercy Family Life Centre board); P. Hart (director of welfare programmes, Dr Barnado's in Australia); Rev W. Payne (welfare director, Church of England, Children's Homes);⁹ P. Quirk (executive director, Association of Child Care Agencies); Mrs L. Voigt (social worker, Waverley temporary family care, Waverley Municipal Council); Miss B. McIntyre (acting regional director, southern metropolitan region, Health Commission of NSW); and Dr P.

8 In 1981, Peter Boss and Cliff Picton (a colleague in the Monash Department) produced *Child Welfare in Australia: an Introduction*, Sydney, Harcourt Brace, Janovich (Australia).

9 Phil Hart and Bill Payne were both UNSW social work graduates.

Churven (child psychiatrist, Redbank house, Westmead Centre). The evidence we heard, particularly from the experienced outsiders, could not be ignored by any inquiry concerned with the well-being of children and families. Most of it came from people professionally educated in social work.

In addition to our recorded evidence provided by these people, the committee studied other material, which was listed in an appendix to the report. These included material referred to by the witnesses, past annual reports and other records of the Society, a report on the implications of the introduction of group care at Scarba, data on Scarba especially prepared by Morri Young (the psychologist responsible for the 'group care' report), relevant articles and book chapters, and various policy guideline documents such as those prepared by the Child Welfare League of America.

Conclusions Reached on the Present Role and Functioning of Scarba

These were our general conclusions:

Because of increased understanding and concern about the effects of children being separated from their parents, especially in crisis situations, and about the effects of children living in institutions, any emergency residential child care facility can now expect to come under close examination. Many of the more progressive child and family service organisations in Sydney, and in other parts of Australia, and overseas, have shifted away from residential care, especially institutional residential care. The emphasis is now on the need for a wide range of preventive family support schemes, or, if after careful assessment a child does need to be separated from a parent, or parents, family foster care schemes or other small group care schemes.

It will be noted in some of the developments which led to the present review, there have been a number of attempts by various staff of the Society to improve Scarba's present role and functioning. These have, however, been largely unsuccessful because of constraints in the present arrangements. Scarba's hospital classification, the size and inappropriate nature of its building, and the large number of children, particularly very young children, are major features which make it quite unsuitable as a modern residential child care facility. In fact, all the evidence before the Committee has indicated that the nature of the present service at Scarba is totally inappropriate for children and families.

More specifically, we wrote:

1. Family situations and possible local alternatives are not always carefully assessed by Scarba staff before children are separated from their parent/s and their familiar surroundings, and admitted to Scarba. Such assessment is impossible without sufficient social work staff, the encouragement of early referrals, and a concentration on a relatively local geographic area where local alternatives can be known and identified.
2. Admission for children is often sought to take immediate pressure from a parent or parents, with the referral coming from an over-loaded District Officer of the Department of Youth and Community Services, or other

welfare or health worker, who has not sufficient time or other resources to help a family find a better alternative. Many health agencies making referrals appear to be more interested in their particular patient than in the well-being of the patient's children or of the family as a whole.

3. When a child is admitted, the family, Scarba and any other agency involved do not enter into an effective 'contract' which establishes mutual responsibilities, agreeing on the length needed for the child's stay in Scarba and what plans are needed for the child and the rest of the family. No matter how much goodwill there is amongst the interested parties such 'contracting' is only possible when there are adequate and expert staff resources available, and the parties are not too dispersed geographically.
4. The numbers of children in Scarba and the hospital-oriented staff structure make it extremely difficult to hold regular conferences of all the relevant staff for each child, where a child's experience, behaviour and development can be reviewed periodically and the management plan developed and modified, if necessary.
5. There is a danger that family ties will be weakened by the placement of a child in institutional settings such as Scarba, unless the institution has very expert staff and liberal numbers of staff. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to maintain family ties when most of the families live long distances away from Bondi, there is a paucity of social work staff, and the institution is hospital-oriented.
6. Little is known about the family situation to which children return. A very high re-admission rate seems to indicate many children bearing the brunt of recurring family emergencies.
7. The individual identity of a child in Scarba is threatened by:
 - the 'massive' scale and complex lay-out of the building, particularly for very young children,
 - the separation from personal possessions,
 - the separation from family members, friends and familiar others,
 - the large number of rostered 'carers' none of whom is continuously responsible for the child,
 - living amongst a large number of strangers, eating, playing and sleeping in a crowded, communal situation,
 - lack of consistent and regular physical comforting,
 - being expected to conform to new group norms rather than to behave as they do in their own home environment.

It is recognised that some of the factors exist in any placement away from a child's home, while some are more specific to the Scarba facility.

8. A considerable body of research literature indicates the harmful effects, some of them long-term, on children who are deprived of the love and care of parents, or of parent-equivalents, in their first five years, and especially in their first two years of life. Two-thirds of the children separated from their parents in Scarba are in their first five years, and almost one in four in their first two.
9. Scarba's form of temporary care makes exceptionally high adaptation demands on the child who is already under stress because of a family crisis.

For the school-age child adaptation includes attending the Bondi School, where it is reported that the teachers are understanding but the child remains isolated from the other children at the school.

10. At least 1 in 10 of the children in Scarba comes from an Aboriginal family. Such a child requires special attention and resources, particularly in view of community prejudice, yet the present Scarba facility makes this especially difficult.
11. Scarba is inappropriately staffed and financed as a hospital. Clearly, the children for whom it is caring are not admitted on the grounds of health. Yet it is Scarba's hospital classification which makes it such an expensive residential child care facility.
12. Nursing staff are not the relevant key staff to care for these children and relate effectively to their families and to the full range of services that could be employed to assist the children and their families. The nursing staff, consistent with their training, have emphasised hygiene, physical health and illness management; rather than psycho-social, family and educational aspects of child care and development. Many of the caring staff are not trained observers of child and family behaviour.
13. There are major supervision problems arising from the caring needs of the children. Staff with nursing qualifications have the responsibility of supervising child caring staff. As an increased number of the child caring staff has undertaken child care training, this arrangement has become increasingly anomalous.
14. A single social work appointment cannot possibly provide an adequate social work service for the number of children and families referred to Scarba – at the crucially important initial assessment stage, while a child is in Scarba, and after a child returns home. In addition, the single social work appointee cannot be expected effectively to influence general agency policy, to build up agency relationships in the local community and in the child and family welfare field generally, and to monitor relevant community trends. The professional isolation of the position also must have some effect on the quality of the service provided.
15. Scarba staff tends to be low, at least partly because of some uneasiness about the appropriateness and effects of the service provided.
16. Scarba's service is not well integrated with other local community services, with community services in other parts of the metropolitan area, or in other parts of the State. Within the Society itself, Scarba's welfare service is isolated from the Society's other welfare activities.
17. Through Scarba, the Benevolent Society does not make an active contribution in knowledge and policy development, in collaboration with other services also concerned with child and family welfare.
18. A pilot service project in the Waverley area in the recent past has dealt with Scarba referrals of local children under 6 years of age. This project has demonstrated that with careful assessment and intensive work, at least two-thirds of the referrals do not require a child to be separated from a parent or parents, and the other one-third can be placed in foster family emergency care, which provides much more appropriate care than Scarba.

19. The separation of children from their parent or parents and their normal surroundings should be avoided wherever possible, by supporting and strengthening the family unit especially at time of stress. Very occasionally, even with a great deal of local help and professional assistance available, a family may be unable to cope with a highly disturbed child, or a sick child, or a severely handicapped child, and this may warrant some form of special residential care away from the family – small scale, treatment-focused and family-oriented. Clearly, Scarba does not cater for these situations.¹⁰

For all of these reasons, the present program operating at Scarba did not provide an appropriate or effective service for children and families. It could not do so while it used institutional care, was hospital-oriented, and had a state-wide coverage.

The Range of Possible Services

From the evidence presented and from other sources, the committee identified 40 service possibilities for the Society in the field of children and families. These were indicated in an appendix, where each was classified according to:

- for whom the service is provided,
- the nature of the service provided,
- the service duration (short-term, medium-term, long-term)
- the location of the service (in a part of Scarba, in the whole of Scarba, or in a new building on the Scarba site, or at some other location)

In addition each service was roughly classified on two further dimensions:

- whether it is primarily supportive of, supplementary to, or substitutional for family functioning, and
- whether it is primarily concerned with preventing major problems, or with dealing with problems once they have arisen.

Clearly there was now much greater emphasis on supportive and supplementary services, and on preventive services, than on substitutional services and remedial services. The Health Commission of NSW had indicated funding to Scarba might be maintained if it were used as a residential unit for moderately and severely handicapped retarded children, or as a children's psychiatric unit, or as a residential out-patient psychiatric unit for adolescents. The review committee considered the continued availability of Health Commission funding should not be a prime determinant of what services the Society should run. All of the Society's activities should reflect primarily the Society's own goals and objectives. The proposals could cause problems for the other activities on the Bondi site, but perhaps more importantly, the Society had no relevant experience of expertise in these service areas, which were especially difficult, expensive and technical in character, and if the Society were to undertake one of these, it could well remain isolated from the Society's other activities reinforcing further the existing fragmented pattern of services. The review

¹⁰ An appendix provided a guide to where some of the evidence for these particular findings could be found in the recorded interviews with the committee, now held by the Benevolent Society.

committee could not possibly adequately assess each of these proposals, or any of the other 40-odd service possibilities. We did, however, make some suggestions amongst the possibilities and some recommendations on how the Society could develop appropriate staff resources to undertake the necessary assessments, prior to making the eventual choice.

A Time of Uncertainty

There was considerable current uncertainty about the respective roles of each of the levels of government, and of voluntary organisations, in the planning, funding, and provision of possible services in the family and child welfare field. In the next two or three years, this uncertainty was likely to be reduced:

1. Decisions were likely to be taken by the Commonwealth and State governments on the outcomes of the various field projects running under the present 3-year family support services scheme.
2. The State Government was likely to clarify and begin to implement the new fee for service possibilities raised in the recent Green Paper on its community welfare legislation.
3. The State Government department concerned with community welfare was likely to develop clearer policies about respective roles in family and child welfare services, and was likely to win increased resources for community-based child and family services.
4. The widespread current pressure for the development of national policies for children and their families could lead to a statutory national body where the issues of planning and respective responsibilities in the child and family welfare field were clarified, and at least to some extent, settled.
5. The parts of the voluntary child and family welfare sector in New South Wales undergoing extensive change were monitoring and sharing their experience. They were likely to increase their collective influence at least partly through further development of the NSW Association of Child Caring Agencies, which acted as both a standard-influencing body and a pressure group.

The Welfare Capacity of the Society

The Benevolent Society at present did not have a strong welfare planning service, and welfare evaluation capacity – in its individual services, or in its welfare activities taken as a whole:

1. Not only Scarba, but each of the Benevolent Society facilities appeared to be isolated from the other welfare services run by the Society, other services run by other organisations in similar or adjacent service areas, and from community coordinating bodies. This isolation was at both the individual case and case management level, and at the policy assessment, coordination, and developmental level.
2. The Benevolent Society at present made little, if any, contribution to the community's general understanding of what policies and services are most relevant and helpful for the citizens served by social welfare activities.

3. The recent social work appointment in connection with the Society's services for senior citizens had a duty statement which was in line with what was desirable, but at present it was an isolated appointment.¹¹
4. The social work department of the Royal Hospital for Women had sound professional leadership but worked in relative isolation from the rest of the welfare work of the Society, and the hospital did not enjoy a reputation for being a strongly community-based hospital.
5. The Society's two social workers at the Peakhurst Community Health and Welfare Centre worked exclusively within the confines of that centre.
6. There was no clear statements of the goals and objectives of the present social welfare activities of the Benevolent Society, including Scarba, in terms of which its work could be coordinated, assessed, and be seen to be accountable. A progressive welfare organisation must be able to indicate very clearly for whom it is providing what kind of service, where, with what effects, and why. The general rationale should make community welfare sense.
7. The Benevolent Society did not have the relevant professional staff or planning structures which could give coherence and accountability to its welfare activities.

Recommendations

The Review Committee made three main recommendations:

1. The Society should substantially scale down and possibly phase out the present Scarba facility, according to a clear, timetabled plan, made widely known in the community.
2. At the same time, the Society should develop appropriate alternative services for children and families, paying due regard to each of three major concerns, namely, the need for locally and regionally based services, and the importance, at the local level, of mutual help groups and community participation in social service systems.
3. To assist in the implementation of recommendations 1 and 2, and to develop the long-term welfare capacity of the Society, the Society should appoint a Director of Welfare Services to head a newly-organised and coordinated Welfare Department. The Director would have a general responsibility for the range, cohesion and quality of welfare services provided by the Society in its various activities.

These recommendations were seen as interdependent, with the appointment of a Director of Welfare Services being an immediate priority since this was crucial to achieve what needed to be done.¹²

The final section of the Report set down the views of the review committee on what would be involved in order for the Benevolent Society to implement

11 I had been asked to draft this. Professor Edna Chamberlain complimented the Benevolent Society, when she saw the advertisement.

12 Letter, members of the Scarba Review committee to the president, Professor M. Chaikin, November, 1979.

successfully the three main recommendations, dealing with the financial and other implications which would arise from each stage of the proposed plan.

After the board meeting which received our report, I can recall Syd Einfeld congratulating me on the report, but then saying: 'You know, John, you have put me in a very awkward position. I have been telling my constituents for years what wonderful work was being done at Scarba!'¹³

On 30 January, 1980, the president of the Society wrote:

On behalf of the Board of Directors, I wish to express sincere gratitude for your work as Chairman of the Scarba Review Committee.

The Committee's deliberations and final report, together with the supporting documentary records, provide a most comprehensive review of the Society's activities in child and family welfare and, in particular, the operations of Scarba House. I feel sure that the future development of the Society's child and family welfare services will be significantly influenced by the work of your Committee.

With the appointment of a Director of Welfare Services, as recommended by your Committee, the Society will be taking a most important step towards increasing its contribution within various areas of welfare service.

Please accept my thanks for your contribution as Chairman of the Scarba Review Committee, which carried out its brief in a most competent manner.¹⁴

7.13.3 Director of Welfare Services¹⁵

This 'senior and challenging' position, was advertised throughout Australia. 'The appointee should have professional social work qualifications and extensive relevant experience.' Applications were due on 25 February, 1980. Details and full job specification were available from the chief executive.

1. General Statement of Responsibilities

The Director of Welfare Services will be responsible to the Society's Board of Directors through the Chief Executive Officer and will have general responsibility for the range, quality and cohesion of welfare services provided by the Society in its various activities. He/she will be responsible for providing professional advice on the welfare planning and the organisation of the welfare policies of the Society. In carrying out this responsibility, the Director will liaise with the other senior officers of the Society.

2. Specific Duties

- (a) The coordination and development of the Society's Welfare Department,
- (b) The encouragement of the members of this department to make an active and informed contribution in professional and social welfare circles,

13 Syd was a much-loved Jewish community leader and the local member in the state parliament (in Bondi and then Waverley). He was minister for consumer affairs in the Wran Labor government 1976–84.

14 Letter, M. Chaikin to R.J. Lawrence, 30/1/80.

15 On 29 February, the Society was informed that it would receive from the community services fund of YACS, a grant of \$15,000 towards the cost of employing a director of welfare services. The salary offered for the position was \$21,000, but could be higher depending on qualifications and experience.

- (c) Monitoring community and policy trends in the social welfare field and keeping the Society informed about these,
- (d) Helping the Society to clarify and develop its goals and objectives in its welfare activities and to meet these effectively and efficiently,
- (e) Making recommendation on the most effective committee structure for the development of the Society's welfare activities,
- (f) Ensuring that the Society achieves and maintains a high and justified reputation for its welfare activities,
- (g) As a matter of the highest priority the Director of Welfare Services will examine the report of the Scarba Review Committee and advise the Board on matters raised in that report.

Five board members (the president, the treasurer, Professor Lawrence, Mrs Cox, and the chief executive officer) interviewed the applicants and selected Pamela Roberts, one of the best known and highly regarded social workers on the Sydney scene. Mary Siddle, senior social worker, Royal Hospital for Women, had apparently persuaded her to apply. In her letter of application, she pointed out that she had remained a reasonable length of time in the positions she had held. This had given her the opportunity to think through, initiate and follow up change, when this had been necessary and appropriate. 'The position with your organisation offers a stimulating and wider challenge which I believe my previous experience has equipped me to face.'

Her three referees could not have been more enthusiastic about their considerable experience of her work and their assessment of her suitability for the position. Mary Siddle noted Pam Roberts had been mainly concerned with children and families, but she was also very concerned for social work education, and certainly had the capacity to broaden her interest to encompass the various facets of the Society's work. Beth Stevenson (formerly director of social work field education, UNSW; now social-worker-in-charge, the Royal Women's Hospital in Melbourne) said she was her role model in her present job. Dr John Murray (gynaecologist) knew her when he was medical superintendent at Crown Street, and also since at the Children's Hospital. He described her personality as 'strong but flexible', a woman of 'immense moral courage and character'. She had demonstrated 'a tremendous ability to get along with all classes of society in a manner that makes none of them threatened and in a manner which allows them all to work harmoniously'. It was characteristic of Miss Roberts that when she felt she had achieved all that she could in a particular field she moved on. He was not at all surprised that she now wished to move on into 'what sounds a most exciting and innovative field'. 'I can think of nobody better suited to such a job or one who could bring to it greater expertise, enthusiasm and a genuine desire to cooperate with all groups who would necessarily be involved.' In addition, Richard Gould reported his discussions about Miss Roberts with two of his colleagues, who had been successive chief executive officers at Crown Street. Both gave unqualified praise and believed she would cope very well with the duties of director of welfare services at the Benevolent Society. Both stressed the very high credibility she had in the social work and hospital fields.

Pamela Roberts

Pam's social work qualifications were British – a diploma of social studies, University of Southampton (1949), and a certificate of the Institute of Medical Social Workers, London (1950). For six years, she was a caseworker in a general hospital in Middlesex, had supervised students, and had become deputy social-worker-in-charge. Since 1956, she had been resident in Australia. Initially, she worked in Melbourne, as a caseworker in the social work department of the Alfred hospital. After a period of non-social work jobs in the Northern Territory and Queensland, she settled in Sydney, working as a social worker at the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children in Camperdown, 1958–64.

From 1964 to 1976, she had been social-worker-in-charge of the Crown Street Women's Hospital, initially carrying a high case-load of clients, in addition to administrative responsibilities. With the increase of staff from three to eight by 1971, she had been able to spend more time in planning and administration, and contributing to policy-making, both within and outside the hospital. In 1967, she had been awarded a Churchill fellowship to study facilities for unmarried mothers, and their children, in the UK.

Student and staff education and development were seen as an integral part of the department's function. Students were received from both of the university schools of social work in Sydney. In 1971, I had successfully negotiated with the hospital to establish a UNSW student unit in the social work department. It had been particularly successful, to a great extent due to the support and knowledge of Pam Roberts. Through her work at Crown Street, at NCOSS, and from overseas study, she had become a respected national social work authority on adoption and single parenthood. She had established regular monthly meetings of social workers in the obstetric field, and had encouraged staff to attend conferences and seminars. She herself attended professional conferences, relevant seminars and workshops, (including the short course in social welfare administration at UNSW in 1970), and had attended the first world conference on adoption in Milan in 1971, and the first national conference on the battered child in Perth, 1975. She was chairman of the organising committee for the first Australian conference on adoption at UNSW in 1976. This hastened new initiatives in adoption services and the active approach to the placing of children with special needs, such as the physically handicapped.

In 1976, she returned to the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children as its senior social worker. The social work department there had grown to 20 social workers, and she had responsibility for other workers (parent quarters coordinator, aboriginal health worker). She had had increasing responsibility over the past two years in general policy and planning of the hospital.

Pam Roberts was a contributing member of the AASW, her professional association. Currently, she was a member of its professional education advisory committee.¹⁶ She chaired the NCOSS standing committee on adoption, 1968–77. She was well connected with the NSW Department of Youth and

16 My first memories of her go back to the 1960s when we worked together on the membership committee of the AASW, and we spent time visiting schools recruiting for the profession.

Community Services, as a member of the child welfare advisory council from 1969, and was appointed in 1974 to the minister's child welfare legislation review committee.

Pam Roberts was without a university degree, but she was widely-read and keen on continuous learning – a thoroughly committed professional in the best sense.

I visited Pam in a hospice shortly before her untimely death in 1998. In a subsequent letter to Basil Thorne, her partner in more recent years, I wrote:

... Thank goodness her suffering is over ... She was a valued colleague and friend to so many of us. ... We were delighted when someone of Pam's professional standing and experience applied for the position (director of welfare services at the Benevolent Society). I continued as a Board member of the Benevolent Society until 1986, and have rich memories of the many, many discussions we had together about effecting change in the organisation, about trying to reform the state Department of Community Services, and about child abuse inquiries. Also during this period, Pam taught a child welfare final year elective in the School.

... Pam's commitment and contribution to her profession have been outstanding and she will be greatly missed by all of us who had the privilege of working with her and getting to know her.

My deepest sympathy to you in losing Pam and having your time together cut short.¹⁷

In his reply, Basil said his memories of the past few years were 'not of a skilled, caring professional but the charming, humorous, gentle, loving Pamela – the friend and helpmate of people in need. She made and kept so many friends.'¹⁸

The Process of Organisational Development

At the end of 1981, the president of the Benevolent Society reported continued pursuit of the course of critical self-review, set in train by the 1979 Board Seminar which had highlighted the need to give particular consideration to the overall effectiveness of its welfare programs, its public relations and fund-raising capacities, and the need to review thoroughly its goals and objectives.

Very considerable progress had been made in each of these areas in the past twelve months.

Last July, the Society established an Objectives Committee under the Chairmanship of one of our Directors, Professor R. J. Lawrence. It was given the task of reviewing the Society's objectives and proposing mechanisms which might be established to ensure that these objectives would become the subject of ongoing review.

At its November meeting, the Board endorsed the recommendations of this Committee and a revised statement of goals was adopted for the Society. A new fund raising and public relations committee had been very active and the

17 Letter, John Lawrence to Basil Thorne, 17/9/98.

18 Letter, Basil Thorne to John Lawrence, 22/9/98. Basil's friendship with Pam dated back their teen years in England.

director of a fund raising department was now part of the Society's management team. During the past year, the very real benefits of the appointment of Miss Pamela Roberts as the society's director of welfare services had become evident:

Our welfare team is now playing a prominent role in the Society's activities with regard to both service planning and delivery. Many initiatives have been taken in this area not least of which has been a complete review of the objectives and policies which guide our programmes of caring for senior citizens as well as a thorough reassessment of the effectiveness of our family welfare services.¹⁹

7.13.4 The Objectives Committee 1981

As indicated, arising from its 1979 seminar, the board had resolved that the Society should review its objectives. The Scarba review committee report to the board in November 1979 recommended the appointment of a director of welfare services. Since this person was to have general responsibility for the range, coherence and quality of welfare services provided by the Society in its various activities, it seemed sensible to defer the Society's general review of its objectives until this appointment had been made and the person had had time to settle into this new position. By early 1981, this point had been reached.

At its May meeting in 1981, the board established the objectives committee, whose task was: 'To review the objectives of the Society both generally, and in terms of each of its services and activities'. The committee consisted of Professor R. J. Lawrence (chairman), the president and other members of the board's executive and finance committee, a former member of the Scarba review committee, a board member with special expertise in management consultancy, the CEO, the deputy CEO, the general medical superintendent, and the director of welfare services. (I formed a working party with the CEO, and director of welfare services, to prepare a discussion paper which was central in the process.)

The Report was in two parts – the rationale and framework for determining the objectives, and the substantive content of the objectives.

REPORT OF THE OBJECTIVES COMMITTEE²⁰

Part 1. THE RATIONALE AND FRAMEWORK FOR DETERMINING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE BENEVOLENT SOCIETY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

PREAMBLE

In setting up the Committee the Board has chosen the word 'objectives' rather than one of the other possibilities like 'goals', 'aims' or 'purposes' as the most suitable umbrella term to cover the various types of ends and means to be pursued by the Society.

19 Benevolent Society of New South Wales, 168th *Annual Report 1981*.

20 Benevolent Society, 'Report of the Objectives Committee', November 1981.

The task of the Objectives Committee is to develop and suggest to the Board an overall ends-means framework which covers all the work of the Society, and which will serve as a continuing tool for giving direction to the work of the Society. To serve this purpose, such a framework will:

- be logically coherent and intelligible to all those who work for, and in connection with, the Society. (This requires consistency of definitions, and clarity in relating general abstract objectives to more specific objectives and courses of action).
- to have both periodic review points and sensitivity to changing circumstances.
- take into account needs in the community which are not being served by other organisations including governments, and needs in the constituency which the Society is currently serving.
- take into account the resources needed by the Society in order to accomplish its short, medium and long term objectives. ('Resources' are the available means to attain the Society's ends – funds, staff, board members, time, facilities, knowledge, skills, organisational structures.)
- take into account possible constraints on the Society. (These are factors other than resources which may restrict the pursuit of specific objectives; for example, the existence of other organisations providing similar services, attitudes to voluntary organisations generally and to this particular one, and specific strings attached to particular forms of funding.)
- reflect both an inductive approach (working up from the experience of existing programmes), and a deductive approach (working down from the more general objectives to specific plans). Too much reliance on the first can lead to missing the opportunity for creative new services, while over-emphasis on the second can lead to ambitious plans not matched by capacity.
- have the commitment of those who work for the Society.

RATIONALE FOR DEFINED OBJECTIVES

There are many advantages for an organisation having defined objectives. Clearly stated objectives:-

- provide general direction and purpose for the organisation.
- set down guidelines for organisational activity.
- identify short and longer range goals for the organisation's programs.
- constitute a source of legitimacy for the organisation's existence and particular activities.
- support bids for the use of scarce community resources and gain general sanction for specific agency activities.
- establish for sponsors and clientele expectations of what the organisation aims to achieve.
- provide standards against which the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation can be assessed.
- provide a basis for its accountability to its clientele and its sponsors.
- help the organisation to remain primarily service-oriented rather than reflect the organisation's needs.

- make possible more effective planning and coordinated community service systems.
- provide a basis for comparative evaluations between agency programmes and of the same programmes over a period of time.
- provide a basis for those connected with the organisation gaining a better defined sense of purpose and achievement.

THE FRAMEWORK OF OBJECTIVES

There are a number of ways of organising a coherent framework of objectives for an organisation. It is suggested that the Society uses a framework with four levels of specificity, each with its particular time, or forecast period.

1. **The General Goals of the Society.** These provide the frame of reference within which the Society operates. Everything the Society does should fit under the statement of its general goals. It is a comprehensive statement of why the organisation exists, and what it is attempting to do as an organisation. An organisation's general goals are not usually expected to change rapidly or frequently, even though subordinate objectives may do so. A periodic six-yearly review does, however, seem warranted; or more frequently if the Society's circumstances were to change suddenly.
2. **Programme Objectives.** To fulfil its general goals, the Society runs a number of programmes, each of which has a stated objective. These programme objectives can be expected to be reasonable stable, but a periodic three-yearly review would seem to be warranted; or more frequently if circumstances were to change suddenly.
3. **Policies.** These provide continuing guides on how the Society aims to pursue each of its programme objectives, and also how it will determine which programmes it should mount in pursuit of its general goals. These policies can be expected to come under at least annual review.
4. **Planning Objectives.** These specify the ways in which the Society's programme objectives and policies are to be pursued over a specified period, using available resources. This is the most specific level of action planning. Its timing needs to be tied to both annual reporting in terms of previous activities and their objectives, and to budgeting considerations for the forthcoming year.

Part 2. THE SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE SOCIETY

1. THE GENERAL GOALS

An organisation's charter or constitution is an obvious place to look for a statement of its general goals. The historic objects of the Society – 'the relieving of poor, aged and distressed persons and others requiring such aid' dating from its inception in 1818, have never been formally revised. They were repeated in the 1902 Benevolent Society of New South Wales Act of Incorporation, and they are still the only formal objectives referred to in the Society's annual report. In that report, the Society is described as providing a range of health and welfare services (obstetrics, gynaecological and neonatal-care, residential and temporary care for children, day care for children to the age of five years and family day care, independent residential accommodation for senior citizens, nursing home care for senior citizens, and community health and welfare services) through thirteen establishments.

In the 1902 Act (Preamble), the Society is described as 'entirely unsectarian in character'. Ministers of religion, however, have free admittance to their flock, who are 'inmates of the Society's hospitals and asylums' – no minister of religion can be a director of the Society (Section 11).

The Act makes it legal for the Society to amalgamate with or to absorb any other organisation having similar objects. The Act also makes it lawful for the Society to make provision for the instruction of medical students and for the establishment and support of nursing and training staff (Section 16).

In 1965, the Society's Royal Hospital for Women became a teaching hospital in obstetrics and gynaecology for the University of New South Wales. In the Agreement entered into by the Society and the University to cover this development, it is stated: 'The common endeavour of the Society and of the University will be constantly to improve standards of patient care, teaching and research'.

The historic 1818 statement of the Society's general goals, 'the relieving of poor, aged and distressed persons and others requiring such aid' is, for a number of reasons, far from satisfactory for contemporary use:-

- i. It virtually makes no reference to the work of the Royal Hospital for Women, yet this is and has been for many years a major part of the Society's activities. This particular activity gives the Society greater strength and credibility, which benefits the other welfare and health activities in which it is engaged.
- ii. Its description of who is served is vague and very broad. 'Distressed persons' could cover a multitude of possibilities.
- iii. It is too confining in its reference only to 'relieving'. Relief-giving still has its historical association of provision of food, clothing, shelter and possibly money for financially destitute people. A modern social welfare service, especially if it is concerned with disadvantaged and vulnerable people, should be concerned with much more – for example, with accurate assessment of psychological and social needs, with developing community resources, with preventing social problems and harmful conditions, with providing greater living opportunities for people, with ensuring a greater range of choice for people, with developing and disseminating relevant knowledge, with long-term as well as short-term objectives, with working our mutually agreed goals with the clientele, with avoiding stigmatising conditions of service provision, with developing mutual aid, with enhancing the self-respect of the service recipients, with working with service providers to make the community system of service more effective.
- iv. The language is anachronistic, and tends to reflect or be associated with attitudes which are not acceptable in present-day society. This is especially apparent if one looks at the fuller historical statement of the Society's general goals, adopted by the Society's foundation General Meeting in 1818 – 'That the object of this Society be, to relieve the poor, the distressed, the aged, and the infirm, and thereby to discountenance as much as possible mendacity and vagrancy, and to encourage industrious habits amongst the indigent poor, as well as to afford them religious instruction and consolation in their distresses'.
- v. The 1818 statement was drawn up at a time when the Society was virtually

the only welfare organisation, government or non-government, operating in New South Wales. No geographic restriction within New South Wales was stated, and the implication was, and is, that the Society's service is for all members of the named groups wherever they live in New South Wales. Yet the current reality is that at present the Society actually services only a limited number of geographic communities. These are mainly in the Eastern suburbs of Sydney, but some of the services of the aged are more widely based in Sydney and the Royal Hospital for Women draws some of its more specialised patients from throughout the State. Amongst the multitude of government and non-government organisations that now exist for the well-being of the people of New South Wales, the Society is a non-sectarian, voluntary organisation which confines its services to people and communities that it considers it has a capacity to serve effectively.

It can be argued that historically the Society was assigned a role to be concerned about the especially disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in New South Wales. Should the Board now wish to re-assess that role, this would require the Society to be particularly concerned in its future directions of development with the greatest community needs which are not being served by other organisations, including government.

To bring this about, as an independent voluntary organisation, the Society would need to strengthen greatly its fund-raising capacity. Continued heavy reliance on government ear-marked funding could distort the Society's judgement about community priorities.

Bearing all this in mind, the following revised general goals statement for the Society is suggested:-

The Benevolent Society of New South Wales is a non-sectarian voluntary organisation which recognises the worth and dignity of every person. It aims –

1. *To enhance the quality of life of groups of disadvantaged or vulnerable citizens in the community whose needs are not being adequately served by other organisations within New South Wales.*
2. *To enhance the quality of life of disadvantaged or vulnerable senior citizens, disadvantaged or vulnerable families, and other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups who are served by the Society.*
3. *To enhance the quality of life of expectant mothers, women with diseases and disorders of the reproductive organs, and newly-born children, through maintaining a high quality university teaching hospital in obstetrics, gynaecology, and neonatal paediatrics.*

Please Note:

Acceptance of the emphasis on disadvantage, vulnerability and the absence of adequate services in (1) above would involve some re-orientation of the Society's approach of recent years. Its implications, especially in terms of its feasibility, will need to be carefully considered by the Board before it can be endorsed.

2. PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES AND OBJECTIVES

The Society has a number of programmes through which it pursues its general goals.

Programmes related to General Goal 1:

As the Society develops its capacity to deal with its first general goal, the programmes listed under the second general goals are likely to be added to and/or modified.

Programmes related to General Goal 2:

1. The programmes which aim to improve the lives of senior citizens who are or are likely to be living in accommodation provided by the Society
2. The programme which aims to improve the lives of children and families living mainly in the Eastern Suburbs of Sydney, especially those in vulnerable and crisis situations.
3. The programme which aims to improve the lives of people living in Peakhurst and surrounding suburbs, with particular emphasis on those who have experienced psychiatric illness, who are socially isolated, who are mentally handicapped, who are single parents of low income, and senior citizens.

Programmes related to General Goal 3:

4. The programme which provides pre-natal, delivery and post-natal health services for mothers, about half of whom are resident in the Southern Metropolitan Health Region, and which prepares the mothers and, where possible, the fathers, for the birth of a child and their future family roles.
5. The programme which provides care and treatment for children, mainly up to four weeks of age, of parents living mainly in the Sydney metropolitan region.
6. The programme which provides comprehensive health care and treatment for women with diseases and disorders of the reproductive organs.
7. The educational and training programmes for undergraduate and postgraduate medical personnel, nurses and other health services personnel.
8. The research programmes into obstetrics and gynaecology, reproductive physiology, neonatal paediatrics and related areas.

In each of these cases, the description of present activities can easily be converted into a statement of each programme's objectives, if present activities are intended to continue into the future. The Board and its relevant staff and committees need, however, to determine what ought to be in each programme's objectives in the future.

3. POLICIES

Selecting Whom to Serve

Every three years, or more frequently should circumstances change suddenly, the Society reviews which population groups its programmes should be serving. It does this, both independently and in collaboration with the relevant statutory and voluntary bodies and community groups, by :-

- (a) assessing the relative needs of groups not currently being served by the Society, and groups of disadvantaged or vulnerable citizens whose needs are not being served by other organisations within New South Wales. (In making judgements of relative disadvantage, a population group should be assessed in terms of the group's standards in such areas as income, health, housing, education, employment, recreation, family well-being, and civil rights, as compared with other groups in the community. In making judgements of relative vulnerability, a population group should be assessed in terms of its

- access to reasonable community standards relating to these matters, and the security of its standards in these matters.), and
- (b) assessing the kind of contribution the Society can make to enhancing the quality of their lives, as part of the community's system of social welfare services, taking into account the Society's resources, capacity, constraints, existing service commitments, and its general objectives.

Each of the Society's programmes, built around a population group whom it sees as its clients or potential clients, is guided by the following policies:-

Helping to Develop and Maintain a Suitable Community System of Services:-

1. In collaboration with the relevant statutory and voluntary bodies, community groups and the clientele, to make ongoing assessment of the needs of the selected population group.
2. In collaboration with the relevant statutory and voluntary bodies, community groups and clientele, to help to develop and maintain a suitable community system of services for the clientele. The Society sees such a system as –
 - (a) being based on a recognition of the worth and dignity of every person, and avoidance of any patronising or stigmatising attitudes,
 - (b) having an appropriate range of relevant services which maintain and develop realistic and satisfactory choices for the clientele,
 - (c) having a reasonable balance between remedial, rehabilitation and preventive services,
 - (d) being reasonably coordinated at both policy and individual case levels,
 - (e) paying due regard to sustaining the clientele's primary group relationships – with families, friends, neighbours and work groups,
 - (f) being based on a sound knowledge of the needs of the clientele at their particular age stage, and their particular social, economic and political circumstances,
 - (g) encouraging various forms of participation by the clientele,
 - (h) having adequate procedures for initial and periodic assessment of the individual, family and community circumstances of the clientele, and adequate procedures for effective referral to the most suitable service or services,
 - (i) being regularly reviewed in the light of the needs of the clientele and the resources available.

Running a Programme

Within the relevant community system of services, each programme run by the Society aims:-

1. To assist people to gain access to appropriate services,
2. To provide a number of high quality services, with an appropriate balance between remedial, rehabilitative and preventive services,
3. To relate, where appropriate, the services in the programme to services in other programmes run by the Society,
4. In addition to ongoing review, to evaluate annually the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme as a whole, and of each service in the programme,
5. To adapt the existing range of services in response to the evaluation of its services, shifts in the needs of the clientele, re-assessment of need, and changes in

- other parts of the community system of services for the particular clientele,
6. Where appropriate, to develop and test out new services in a programme,
 7. To monitor policy and knowledge trends generally in the fields relevant to the clientele in New South Wales, Australia and countries similar to Australia,
 8. To contribute to policy discussion and planning at local, State and national levels, using knowledge gained from operating the Society's programmes,
 9. To contribute to the education of workers in various disciplines involved in the provision of services to the clientele,
 10. To conduct and encourage studies and research into areas relevant to the service of the clientele of the programme,
 11. After consultation with interested parties, both inside and outside the Society, and evaluation of existing services, to establish planning objectives for the programme and for each of the services within the programme. Such planning is tied to both annual reporting and budgeting for the ensuing year. Short-term (up to 1 year), middle-term (1-3 years) and long-term (4-6 years) planning objectives are periodically revised, the short-term in the course of a year, and the longer-term annually.

Program - Specific Policies

In addition to the above common policy objectives to be pursued in each of the Society's programmes, the Society may find a need to develop programme-specific policies, that is, policies which relate only to a specific programme. For example, there could well be more specific policy statements that elaborate on the eligibility criteria (age, socio-economic status, geographic area) used to define more specifically the Society's actual clients in a particular programme.

4. PLANNING OBJECTIVES

These are the Society's specified operational objectives, which reflect the Society's objectives in specified periods of time; short-term, middle-term and long-term. They are what are judged to be feasible and desirable of attainment in the time specified, using the available and attainable resources and capacity of the Society. See 3(11) above. The present half-year separation of the Society's annual reporting and its financial year may need to be revised to make the planning process within the Society more effective.

The committee reported in November 1981, and as indicated, its recommendations were endorsed by the board in the same month. Already before this report, the board had endorsed three important statements. Two of these, produced by Pam Roberts, covered the Society's purposes in its family and children's work at Scarba, and in its work with senior citizens; the third dealt with the role of the Royal Hospital for Women. Also, the CEO had obtained statements of objectives from each of the managers of the Society's establishments. Key staff were already being encouraged to think about the purposes of their work. The committee's report encouraged this thinking to be done consistently and systematically in its organisational and community contexts, but I was aware of the limitations of an objectives approach.

Tony Vinson reminded me of these in commenting on the policies section of the committee's report. 'In the final analysis there is no substitute for wisdom

guided by general agreement about basic purposes'. Tony had read the section of the report dealing with general goals with great interest. He only had one query, should the goals include 'preventing social problems and harmful conditions'? This intention could be inferred from the three stated goals but it might be as well to make it clear that 'this large, influential and concerned voluntary organisation is not content to simply help piece together the broken lives of those it attempts to serve'.²¹ Tony liked the programme activities and objectives.

As chairman of the Objectives Committee, I was kept informed by the CEO of progress towards full implementation of the planning system which the board agreed upon in November 1981. We started well, with the managerial staff in the Society's programmes congratulating the board on the report of the Objectives Committee, and the staff were very interested to develop the planning system envisaged. The CEO Richard Gould wrote to me in the USA in September 1983 to bring me up to date on the progress made on 'defining our various service objectives'.

The review of our objectives (both service and management) has occupied a substantial part of the attention of our Administration during 1983. We have not found the task of defining our service objectives in the agreed format an easy one and, consequently, we are behind our schedule of completing the project in time for the commencement of the 1983/84 financial year. Our aim now is to have the project completed in time for your return at the end of the year. We would very much appreciate the benefit of your comments on these before they are submitted to the Board through its various committees. Although we are behind schedule in completing this project our staff at all levels have been actively involved in the exercise and I am sure we have all benefited greatly and will continue to do so from the project. ...

... You will, I know, be interested to learn that we have commissioned some 'market research' to ascertain what the 'public' know and think about the Society. This comprehensive survey will, I feel sure, provide us with valuable data, including the reaction to our name. ...

On a sad note, Professor Bob Walsh passed away recently, as did Mr Eric Callaway.

Looking forward to your return.²²

I thanked Richard for bringing me up-to-date on the objectives project:

I was very pleased to hear that, even though you are behind schedule, you will have proposals completed by the end of the year, and that the staff feels that it is benefiting from the process. I am sure that in a many ways this first time round is the most difficult, and for that reason it has been best to take longer over it. Once this way of thinking has become established and experience has been gained on its implementation, I am sure it will be far less time consuming – there are, of course, enormous potential pay offs – in better service, better evaluation of service, better use of scarce resources, and in the areas of staff and board morale.

21 Notes, TV to JL, 3/1/82.

22 Letter, Richard Gould to John Lawrence, 13/9/83.

You, Pam and Carol,²³ I know, are fully aware these.

I look forward to hearing the results of the public survey on the Society and its work.

I was very sorry, indeed, to hear of Eric Callaway's death. However one might assess his contribution, he certainly made a tremendous personal commitment to the Society. I had not heard about Bob Walsh's death and it came as rather a shock. He shall be missed in many community and university activities. I certainly will miss him personally, for we had come to know each other reasonably well. ...

It has been a rewarding year – a lot of teaching, reading and the stimulus of new places and people.

My best wishes to you, Carol and Pam, and to friends and colleagues on the Board. In no time now, this year will have flown and I will be back amongst you. No matter how good experience in foreign parts is, it is always good to be home.²⁴

In November 1983, the board received a major report from Pam Roberts after research by Mrs Frances Taylor, an experienced social worker, into current needs of families and children in the local area, and consultations with YACS and non-government agencies in the area.²⁵ The rising numbers of suspected cases of child abuse was of real concern. A high quality service to 'at risk' and abused children and their families needed skilled staff. There was still need for the residential component of Scarba's service to continue, but to have this provided in group homes in the community. Future services should be supportive and preventive, with the aim of keeping families intact and functioning well.

New Senior Staff

Richard Gould resigned as CEO of the Benevolent Society in mid-June 1984, to become the CEO of the Sutherland District hospital. In this position, he would also be responsible to the regional director of health for the operation of the community health programme in the Sutherland Shire. He sent a general letter to the board directors thanking them for the support and assistance they had given him during the past nine years. At the bottom of mine, was a handwritten note:

John,

I find it hard to add to our conversation of Wednesday. Let me simply say that I have valued our relationship greatly and will continue to do so.

Dick

I do not recall or have a record of that conversation. I certainly was very disappointed when he left. We had worked together particularly well and I had thought his continuing commitment and undoubted professional capacity would be an important part of the Society's developing future.

The new CEO was Mrs Carol Davis, BA (Georgia), MSW (Washington), LHA. After graduation she had worked in the United States and Africa in

23 Mrs Carol Davis, BA, MSW, LHA, was appointed deputy chief executive officer in 1981.

24 Letter, John Lawrence to Richard Gould, 23/9/83.

25 Pamela Roberts, 'Scarba Services Review', November, 1983.

the early 1970s, and had travelled extensively in Europe, Africa and Asia prior to moving to Sydney in 1975. When she was appointed deputy CEO of the Benevolent Society in 1981, she had worked in senior administrative positions at St Margaret's and Rachel Forster Hospitals and in hospitals' policy, planning and project work with the Health Commission of New South Wales.

In December 1984, John Davoren, BA, MS (Soc Admin), DipSocWork, was appointed deputy CEO. He had a background in social welfare policy and administration, and was especially interested in research into and evaluation of the quality of services provided. I had known John since he had chosen administration as his specialty in his final year in the Department of Social Work at the University of Sydney and I had been asked to take responsibility for supervising his field work. His master's degree was from Case Western Reserve University in Ohio. As a catholic priest professionally qualified in social work, he had been appointed administrator of Centacare and was also responsible for the Catholic Adoption Agency. Immediately prior to joining the Benevolent Society, he was full-time chairman, alternative care committee, responsible to the minister for youth and community services. He was a member of the board of the United Dental Hospital and of the Institute of Family Studies, and was a former chairman of the board of St Margaret's Hospital, Darlinghurst.²⁶ He had successfully sought papal permission to marry Anne Clark, who was in catholic education.

These appointments meant that for the first time, the senior administrative staff (the CEO, deputy CEO, and director of welfare services) were professionally qualified in social work, except, of course, John Greenwell, the general medical superintendent of the Royal Women's Hospital for Women.

7.13.5 Full Implementation of the Planning System

In February 1985, I sent a paper to members of the board and the CEO, which reminded the board of some important developments in the past five years in the Society's handling of planning issues, and suggested the time had come for the Society to implement fully the planning framework and procedures agreed upon by the Board in 1981. To the latter end, five specific recommendations were made for the board's consideration.²⁷

After setting down the planning framework adopted in 1981, the paper made these observations and comments on its implementation:

The General Goals

The Objectives Committee commented that the Society would need to strengthen greatly its fund-raising capacity, as an independent voluntary organisation, if it was to deal effectively with the first goal - 'To enhance the quality of life of groups of disadvantaged or vulnerable citizens in the community whose needs are not being adequately served by other organisations within New South Wales'. The Board is

26 For biographical details of Carol Davis and John Davoren, see Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *171st Annual Report 1984*, p. 16.

27 Professor John Lawrence, chairman of the board's objectives committee, 'Our Next Step in the Development of the Planning System of the Society', 8/2/85.

now keenly aware of this – especially since its endorsement in principle of moving to group home care for very troubled children, a resource-intensive area of need not being adequately served by other organisations. The Society has as yet not been in a position to give systematic attention to pursuing Goal 1. It in fact requires considerable research capacity to identify the groups of disadvantaged or vulnerable citizens whose needs are not being adequately served by other organisations within New South Wales. Also required is a Planning Review Committee within the Society to examine the competing claims on the Society's resources of the various existing programmes and possible new programmes under the Society's Goal 1. Such a committee would make recommendations each year to the Board about the Society's ongoing priorities in the light of existing commitments, community needs, and available resources. (See recommendation 3 below).

Programme Objectives

The Objectives Committee Report identified 8 separate programmes run by the Society – 3 in connection with Goal 2 (senior citizens, children and families, Peakhurst community health), and 5 in connection with Goal 3 (obstetric services for women, medical services for young children, gynaecological services for women, an educational and training programme, a research programme). Building on work already done before the Objectives Committee Report, senior administrative and other staff working in the various programmes have been developing programme objectives for each of the 8 existing programmes.

Policies

The Board endorsed in November 1981, a series of general policy objectives to be pursued in the establishment and maintenance of the Society's programmes. (These were provided in an appendix to the paper.)²⁸ These policies were grouped – 1. Selecting Whom to Serve; 2. Helping to Develop and Maintain a Suitable Community System of Services for the Population Being Served; and 3. Running a Programme.

In addition to general policy objectives which applied in each of the Society's programmes, it was also agreed that there was a need to develop programme-specific policies which related only to the specific programmes – for example, particular eligibility criteria for defining actual clients in a programme.

As I understand it, again considerable work has been done by senior administrative and other staff to consider the common policy objectives and programme-specific objectives in relation to each of the Society's various programmes. The task had been a particular challenge for the Hospital-based programmes.

Planning Objectives

As yet the Society had not generally developed specific operational objectives for each of its programmes, which reflect the Society's policy objectives in specified periods of time – short-, middle-, and long-term. There continues to be a half-year separation of the Society's annual reporting and its financial year.

At the conclusion of the Report of the Objectives Committee, a possible timetable for implementation of the proposed planning system was mentioned. It was, however, fully recognised that it the Board endorsed the Committee's recommendations,

²⁸ See pp. 473–5.

implementation of them had to rest with the Chief Executive Officer.

As Chairman of the Objectives Committee, I have been kept informed by the former Chief Executive Officer of the progress towards full implementation of the planning system which the Board agreed upon in November 1981. We started well, with the managerial staff in the Society's various programmes congratulating the Board on the Report of the Objectives Committee, and the staff have been interested to develop the planning system envisaged. Progress has, however, been slow for two reasons – the novelty of the approach for many of the participants, and the immediate service pressures on senior administrators. Richard Gould assured me that the whole process was proving invaluable and that there was steady movement towards the implementation of the planning system which the Board has agreed upon.

After this review of the recent past, the paper turned to the future.

In late January, 1985, I have had long and fruitful discussion about the Society's planning with the present senior administrative staff. Their view, which I share, is that it is now realistic to move to full implementation of the planning system the Board endorsed in 1981. Before making specific recommendations to bring this about, I would like to suggest in general terms what is needed for the Society's planning system to be effective.

The Elements of an Effective Planning System

- Administrative and decision-making structures that make clear and possible the respective planning roles of the workers – administrative staff, other employees, board members – at different levels in the organisation.
- Senior administrative officers who have a sound grasp of planning principles and processes – including the long-term and broader community contexts of the Society's work. (I believe the Society's Chief Executive Officer, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, General Medical Superintendent, and Director of Welfare Services appointments will serve us well in this respect.)
- Middle-management who have a sound grasp of planning principles and processes relevant to their level of responsibility,
- Direct-service staff who are aware they are implementing the Society's policies and plans in their work, and are encouraged to contribute their experience to the planning process.
- Board members who understand the role and responsibilities of the Society's governing body in the Society's planning system
- Programme committee members who have substantial knowledge to contribute to the planning process in the area of the committee's responsibilities.
- Effective information systems which inform the Society's decision-making about
 - the inputs, outputs and outcomes of its own programmes
 - the activities of other welfare organisations engaged in similar areas of service
 - the needs of various population groups
 - the availability of relevant resources.

- At the Board meeting just prior to the planning and the financial year, which coincide,
 - (a) An annual review by the Board of the planning objectives and resource budget of each of the Society's programmes and each service within each programme.
 - (b) The periodic review, as designated by policy, of the Society's policies, programme objectives, and general goals.

The paper then set down five recommendations, for endorsement by the Board, which would implement fully the planning system endorsed in principle in 1981:

Recommendations

1. That at the June Board meeting in 1985, the Board carry out:
 - (a) its first annual review of the planning objectives and resources budget of each of the Society's programmes and of each service within each programme, and
 - (b) its first periodic review, as designated by policy, of the Society's policies, programme objectives, and general goals.
2. That the senior administrative staff in consultation with relevant staff and committees, prepare a draft of a consolidated planning document to enable the Board to carry out the review prescribed in recommendation 1.
3. That before this draft goes to the Board it is reviewed by a Planning Review Committee consisting of: the President, the Treasurer, three Board members with a responsibility to take an overview of the Society and not identify with any of its particular programmes, the Chief Executive Officer, the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, the General Medical Superintendent, and the Director of Welfare Services. Having due regard to the Society's overall objectives, its existing programmes, proposed new programmes, and the availability of resources, the Planning Review Committee decides on the final form of the consolidated planning document presented to the Board for its consideration.
4. That beginning from 1 July, 1985, the reporting and planning year of the Society coincide with the financial and budgeting year. This would mean the next Annual General Meeting would be held in about August 1986, and would report on an 18 months period, January 1985 to June 1986.
5. That the structure and composition of the present committees which are responsible to the Board for the various existing programmes of the Society be reviewed to ensure that each programme is adequately reviewed and developed from a planning view-point. A strong case can be made for each programme, or related programmes, to have a mix of Board members, staff and others who can make an especially informed contribution in the service area in which the programme is operating.

The paper concluded with:

A Final Comment on Resources and Planning

To achieve its objectives, the Society, like any other organisation, must plan. It has no choice. The issue is how well does it plan. With creative administrative and

Board leadership, I believe most of the requirements for effective planning can be achieved within our present resources. However, as we gain greater understanding of what is necessary for us to achieve our objectives as an organisation, we could well in future need to provide additional expert staff assistance to help our senior administrative staff to

- develop the necessary information systems,
- facilitate and coordinate the extensive on-going consultations necessary in the planning process, and
- prepare relevant documentation for their planning responsibilities.

As already mentioned, we as a Board have become acutely aware of our need to strengthen our fund-raising capacity, if we are to give substance to the general objective we have agreed upon.

At the moment, we seem to be caught up in a vicious circle. We cannot do important new things without financial resources, and yet without being able to demonstrate that we are doing important new things we cannot expect to get more money. The planning system and processes recommended for implementation will make it much more possible for a cogent case to be made for the Society to receive a greater amount of public funds. The more we can, with substance, claim that we are a progressive, well-informed, dynamic voluntary welfare organisation, the more chance we have of lifting our funding onto a completely new plane. A major reason for the continuing financial viability of the Brotherhood of St Laurence in Victoria has been that it has won such a reputation through the demonstrated worth and substance of its work.

On my reading of the situation, the Society is moving into a new phase of its historical development. I hope we as Board members will do all we can to ensure the success of this development.

Board Seminar, July 1985

The Board agreed that beginning from 1 July, 1985, the reporting and planning year of the Society would coincide with the financial and budgeting year, an important change.²⁹ I was a member of a steering committee³⁰ for planning a day-long seminar on Saturday, 27 July, 1985, to consider issues that needed greater consideration than could be given at a routine Board meeting, to enable directors and executive staff to jointly consider issues central to the Society's future development, and to determine the main thrust of activities into the future. My paper on the planning system (8/2/85) was one of the background papers attached to the papers for this seminar. Other background papers, prepared specifically for the seminar, included one on 'Priority Planning' by the senior administrative officers. This pointed out that the planning framework had not yet been implemented:

The Society is currently working towards but has not yet achieved a comprehensive set of goals and programmes which is considered to be worthwhile, relevant,

29 See Benevolent Society of New South Wales, *Annual Report* 1984–85.

30 David Elsworth, chairman of the hospital committee, was its chairman.

urgently needed, realistic, achievable, and capable of being easily and effectively dramatized to enhance the organisation's image and to facilitate the achievement and funding from both private and public sources. It is hoped that the Seminar will serve to clarify and point the general direction for the organisation's future.

The president Malcolm Chaikin stated the purpose of the seminar, and then four sequential sessions examined, with the assistance of specially prepared papers:

1. Background and Perspectives of the Society Today
 - The Society's historical highlights (R. Rathbone)
 - A brief look at the Benevolent Society Today (C. Davis)
 - A look at how the Society compares with some other voluntary organisations (J. Davoren)
 - Current trends in the provision of health and welfare services (P. Roberts)
2. A Look at the needs of some vulnerable groups not adequately served by the Benevolent Society, other organisations, or by government, and consideration of community responses to these needs.(D. Elsworth)
 - An overview of the needs of the community in the 1980s. (J. Davoren)
 - Discussion about the needs of various vulnerable groups, with executive staff participation.
3. How can the Society effectively respond?
 - Guidelines for the Society's efforts to be meaningful.
 - Consideration of three broad options/ways in which the Society might respond:
 1. Maintain the status quo
 2. Undertake a major change of direction
 3. Provide new programmes to meet identified needs but extend from existing bases. (D. Elsworth)
 - Discussion in relation to these broad options included considerations of the implication of each option for the Board, management, and resources required – physical, financial, and human. Discussion also related these options to the Society's existing objectives. (J. Lawrence)
4. Where do we go from here?
 - This session enabled participants to consider how the Society could maximise the way it evaluated how it is going, determines priorities, plans for the organisation's future development, and implements agreed plans.

Decisions Reached at the Seminar³¹

1. Of the three broad options outlined for the Society's future development, option three (developing into new areas of need mainly from existing bases) was positively endorsed by the board. Maintaining the status quo (option 1) would not give the organisation a sense of purpose or direction for future development in accord with the Society's first and main objective, to focus on areas of greatest need. A major change of direction (option 2) at this time in

³¹ 'Benevolent Society Board Seminar – 27th July 1985, Summary of Decisions Reached'.

the organisation's development would not be the most effective way to achieve its first objective. Developing into new areas of need mainly from existing bases (option 3) entailed continuing with objectives 2 and 3, 'including upgrading and rationalisation of services to a reasonable extent but concentrating significant management efforts, Society's funds, and Board attention on developing the necessary realistic plans for activities to meet objective one, and then on the necessary funding activities, and then on the implementation.'

Moving into areas of need mainly from existing bases was seen as enabling the organisation to build on its current strength and to achieve high quality and credibility in innovative programmes.

In broad terms, Option 3 entails the development of a planned and coordinated response to identified vulnerable groups of people. Such groups would be determined by the Planning Committee but could entail such vulnerable groups as newborn babies and children at risk of neglect or abuse, adults who are having difficulty with parenting, women who are severely depressed after childbirth, and families of children with special and severe needs. Option 3 could entail the Society moving deliberately into such areas of need as children who are severely or emotionally disturbed, children who have developmental disabilities, adolescents who are vulnerable and have special needs, and into more innovative pilot programmes for the vulnerable frail and needy aged.

It was agreed that a small planning committee of the board be established by the president, that proposed terms of reference and a timetable be submitted for consideration by the board at the September meeting, and any director interested in being involved in the planning committee should advise the president.

The Planning Committee

These guidelines for the planning committee were endorsed at the board seminar:

- i. In considering areas of need to which the Society could respond the Planning Committee should identify areas in which it considers the Society could be particularly effective.
- ii. The Committee should give active consideration to areas of severe need.
- iii. The Planning Committee should give consideration to areas of need where the size of the problem is significant or if the size of the problem is too large for the Society to impact on a significant portion of the problem area, for consideration to be given to the Society being a leader in identifying areas of urgent need
 - developing effective programmes for coping with the urgent need, possibly on a pilot basis.
 - Influencing governments regarding their own future action in these areas of need

In the first instance the Planning Committee should give active consideration to services and programmes which could meet the identified needs and should only as a secondary consideration concern itself with the funding implications.

- iv. The Planning Committee should be open to consider approaches made to the Society from Government or private enterprise for use of the Society's management expertise for other initiatives but should generally restrict its consideration to requests for assistance in areas where the Society already has some expertise.

The initial planning committee consisted of Malcolm Chaikin (chairman), David Elsworth, Malcolm King, John Lawrence, Judith May,³² Alf Paton, and Ron Rathbone. After discussion, we proposed to the September board meeting, terms of reference for the planning committee, how it would function, and that the CEO, deputy CEO, and the general medical superintendent should be full members of the committee:

Terms of Reference

1. To ensure that the organisation has an effective and efficient planning system, which includes
 - (a) Knowledge of community needs and various ways of meeting the needs.
 - (b) Clearly stated goals, programme objectives, and policies – periodically reviewed.
 - (c) Relevant organisational structures to achieve the organisation's goals.
 - (d) The most appropriate utilisation of resources.
2. To pay due regard, but not be bound by the planning framework suggested by the Objectives Committee and endorsed in principle by the Board.
3. To play a key role in the organisation's planning system by making recommendations to the Board about planning priorities on the basis of monitoring and reviewing the work of the organisation and relevant community needs.

How the Planning Committee Proposes to Function

The Planning Committee will:

1. Function as a working committee/ideas committee with broad scope.
2. Will consider and recommend areas of need into which the Society should move using guidelines determined by the Board Seminar and information provided by executive staff.
3. Will recommend changes to the organisation and management structure which are required to achieve the Society's goals.
4. Will report to the Board through the Executive and Finance committee until such time as changes to the committee structure are proposed and approved.

Staff Involvement in Planning

Ideally, all staff will be actively involved in the planning process. It was considered that the senior executives had a special responsibility for planning and it was resolved to recommend that the Chief Executive Officer, Deputy Chief Executive Officer and General Medical Superintendent should be members of the Planning

³² Mrs Judith May had joined the board in 1981 and served on its senior citizens service committee. She chaired the first session of the 1985 board seminar, and took over from Malcolm Chaikin when he retired as president of the Society in 1988.

Committee. As planning proceeds the Committee may invite presentations from other staff members.

The need for the appointment of a person with planning skills was recognised and the Committee resolved to delegate this to the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.³³

Subsequent Planning

In December 1985, a consultant prepared for the senior staff and the Society's newly established planning committee a report on the need for family and children's services in five local government areas in the vicinity of Scarba House (City of Sydney, Waverley, Randwick, Botany and Woollahra). This report contributed to a process of continuing discussion between Pam Roberts, John Davoren and myself, in the early part of 1986, which eventuated in my paper to the board, which made firm recommendations about the future welfare programs and services of the Benevolent Society, with detailed proposals for its family and children's services. The proposals were endorsed by the board, and constituted a crucial step in the development of the Benevolent Society as a progressive social welfare organisation well attuned to its contemporary community circumstances. Continuing responsibility for the Royal Hospital for Women was still a major impediment, however. During 1986, associated with state government health initiatives, the governance and structures of all of the state's hospitals came under close scrutiny. This became an active issue, with one of the options being to sell the hospital and use the proceeds to return to and strengthen its prime traditional function as a social welfare organisation.

In this strategically important 1986 paper, due regard was given to the views at the July 1985 board seminar – that at least at this stage, the Society should build upon its experience in family and children's services and services for senior citizens, rather than move into completely new areas of service; and greater linkages could be made between the work of the Royal Hospital for Women and the Society's welfare program for families and children. The main content of the paper:

THE PRESENT PROPOSALS

It is now urgent for the Board to make decisions about the future of Scarba House and the services that have been based there. This report makes firm recommendations about the Society's future Family and Children's Welfare Program. These recommendations link up with the Early Intervention Service being planned in connection with the Royal Hospital for Women. (General recommendations about the future development of the Society's other major welfare program, the Senior Citizen's Program, use similar welfare principles as those which guide the Family and Children's Program.)

Although based on the Society's past experience, the proposals constitute new and imaginative developments which we believe fulfil the following highly desirable criteria:

33 Minutes, Planning Committee, Hardwick House, 17 September, 1985.

1. They meet the first of the stated objectives of the Society in that they take seriously the challenge of really enhancing 'the quality of life' of especially disadvantaged and vulnerable groups of citizens through a process of careful assessment and ongoing concerned commitment, not typical of other 'help' available to them.
2. Each program would be likely to capture the interest and involvement of the people concerned.
3. The Society's two main welfare programs would be likely to have the commitment and enthusiasm of the professional and other staff, the members of the Board, the members of the Society, the providers of funds, and the community's social welfare agencies.
4. They would give the Society as a non-sectarian voluntary organisation, an important and independent welfare role in the community.
5. They would be attractive for fund-raising purposes.
6. The Family and Children's Program would have some links with the Royal Hospital for Women, and especially with its proposed Early Intervention Service, but the Society's Family and Children's Program would not be dependent on the Society continuing to be responsible for the Hospital and any outreach services which may be organised from the Hospital.

The Family and Children's Program

Vulnerable Families

All families experience crises, unaccustomed events and pressures which cause considerable anxiety and stress. With the support of friends, relatives, and judicious use of professional and other services, a family can live through and overcome a crisis or a bad patch without permanent damage, and may, indeed, be strengthened.

Vulnerable and disadvantaged families often lack the support of friendship and relatives, and have little experience in the effective use of professional and other services. In these circumstances a crisis can severely disrupt family life, and can leave permanent damage for the family as a whole and for its individual members, especially its children.

Families are vulnerable if there is a lack of:

- secure job/income adequate to their needs
- secure and suitable housing accommodation
- family and friendship supports
- formal education to a standard that enables them to understand and have the ability and confidence to use community resources and facilities
- homemaking and parenting skills.

The type of life event that can cause such families to experience crises can be:

- loss of employment, and therefore a secure, adequate income
- loss of accommodation/eviction
- sickness/handicapping of a family member
- death of a family member or close friend
- unwanted pregnancy
- birth of a handicapped child
- marital disharmony resulting in desertion of one parent

It is obvious that complicated political, economic, social and personal factors contribute to a family's vulnerability and continuing capacity to cope adequately.

There is a growing awareness of the existence of vulnerable families, because of the massive recent increase in notification to the Department of Youth and Community Services of 'abused' children or children seen to be 'at risk of abuse'. That Department is giving highest priority to situations labelled in this way, and so too are many community agencies. Indeed, an obvious way now for a vulnerable family to receive community help is for a parent or parents to indicate they fear abusing their children – which places on parents a further intolerable burden on top of already difficult circumstances. This excessive focus on 'child abuse' or even preventing 'child abuse', to the neglect of providing adequate community opportunities and supports for vulnerable families needs to be urgently rectified by the social welfare community.

From all the available evidence it is clear that in the local geographic areas which at least at present, can reasonably be served by the Society, there are a considerable number of vulnerable and disadvantaged families whose ongoing needs are not being met adequately, either by other organisations or by the existing services of the Benevolent Society. At present a vulnerable family may receive some assistance with a particular aspect of their circumstances especially if the question of 'child abuse' has been raised, but the assistance is fragmented and sporadic. No agency accepts a responsibility to support vulnerable families and to help the quality of their life as a whole, and on an ongoing basis.

The Concept of a Family Centre

It is proposed that a new facility called a Family Centre be established by the Society to meet this important need. This would be located at Scarba House and would aim to serve the families in the Centre's local area and neighbourhood. The development of the Centre would be carefully monitored and evaluated.

An attractive feature of the whole concept of a Family Centre is its local relevance in supporting vulnerable families, yet the idea of the Centre can be transferred, for example, to nearby developed housing areas, or areas outside the traditional area of the Eastern Suburbs which has long been where the Society has concentrated most of its services. Each Family Centre would aim to respond to the identified needs of its own area.

The aims of the Family Centre at Scarba would be:

1. To enhance the quality of life of vulnerable families in the locality by:
 - (a) Careful assessment of the needs and capacities of families.
 - (b) Helping families and family members to take effective responsibility for their lives.
 - (c) Providing ongoing support for families.
 - (d) Providing services appropriate to the needs of families.
 - (e) Helping families to take joint action to meet their needs.
 - (f) Ensuring that families make full and effective use of community services, including services run by the Society.
2. To monitor and evaluate the experience of the Family Centre in terms of its application in other localities, and to contribute to the discussion of general social policies for the support of vulnerable families.

The Staff and Their Functions

The Family Centre will consist of an initial core of social work staff of at least 4 workers. All should be selected on the grounds of their relevant experience and ability. They will need to have a commitment to the concept of the family as the key unit in society for the nurturing and raising of children, and at the same time a recognition of the need for family relationships and functions to be fulfilling for all family members. Amongst the staff would need to be skills in intake and assessment of individual families; family casework/family therapy and individual casework; social group work; community work; and research and policy development.

Intake and Assessment. All new referrals, whether self-referred or from another agency or from the Royal Hospital for Women or one of the other units of the Society, would undergo a skilled assessment process. This may well result in acceptance into the appropriate service at the Family Centre or, possibly, referral to a more appropriate alternative agency in the community. The intake worker would need to have experience and skill to make speedy, accurate initial assessments; to have credibility with local community resources and agencies, and wide knowledge of these; the ability, following assessment to then introduce the family to the appropriate service within Scarba, if this is the outcome of the assessment, and transfer the role of primary worker to the case worker for the service concerned.

Alternatively, if the situation is best dealt with by another agency, good and skilled transfer and referral to the other agency should be able to be undertaken by this worker, in such a way that the family will be linked up with and receive the help they require from the other agency.

Family Case Work/Family Therapy and Individual Case Work. When intake and assessment reveals that a family or a family member would benefit from ongoing assistance through these various forms of professional help provided by the Family Centre, appropriately qualified staff would receive such referrals.

Social Group Work. Various groups of an educational, recreational, therapeutic or task-focused nature would be set up by the staff at the Family Centre. These would be the responsibility of staff experienced in social group work.

Community Work, Research and Policy Development. These professional functions are essential for the Centre to monitor and assess local needs, to work effectively with other agencies, to initiate appropriate local groups, and to facilitate community planning ventures.

Any social work service provided in connection with one of the present specialised children's services run by the Society, for example, one of the day care services, would be provided by a social worker based in the Family Centre.

The future staffing of the Family Centre would develop from the basic core of staff already mentioned depending on the services being mounted in response to the identified needs in the local community and area.

The Present Specialised Children's Services

A brief assessment of the present specialised children's services provided by the Society is given in an appendix. Once the Family Centre is established, these services will be regularly assessed in terms of meeting the needs of local families.

There has been considerable discussion about whether, amongst the Society's special services, there should continue to be some form of residential service. Particular attention has been given to the possibility of providing respite care for parents of developmentally delayed children. In view of the great cost of running a residential service, compared with the very limited benefits, and the alternative uses to which these resources could be put, it is recommended that the Society's residential service at Scarba House should cease to operate at the end of 1986.

Links with the Royal Hospital for Women and Services Based There

It is now recognised that a modern obstetrics hospital has, in addition to the need to provide a high quality medical service around the physical and emotional aspects of pregnancy, delivery, and care of the newborn child, a responsibility to promote the future well-being of that child within the family. As a result, time and energy have been invested in parent education which prepares a couple not only for the birth of their baby, but for the experience of parenting.

First there needs to be acknowledgement of the changes that parenthood will bring into the lives of both parents, and the need for the acquisition and understanding of the skills of 'parentcraft'. However, much as these technical skills are necessary, they are not synonymous with 'parenting'. Parenting involves feelings, and more and more parents are recognising this and seeking and expecting discussions and help on these issues; and similarly, staff in obstetric settings are acknowledging, need to acknowledge, that more time and skills need to be spent on addressing these matters; hence the emphasis on family-building, that is the thrust of the current developments at the Royal Hospital for Women, which include the proposal of an early intervention service. This is seen as addressing some of the difficulties and issues that can arise and are accessible to intervention around the time of the birth of a child.

This is a significant time in both a woman's life, and also that of her partner and, in encouraging bonding and attachment, timely intervention may be necessary for those couples or families who are identified as being in need. In order to be successful, such a service will need to rely heavily on quick, brief, yet succinct assessment of the couple's needs on the part of ward staff, social workers, and medical officers at the Royal Hospital for Women. This group of families (they may not be new, but having a new addition to the family) will hopefully receive significant help at the E.I. Service. There may well emerge a smaller group who are going to need continuing family support, and it is suggested that, while this will not be the exclusive source of the referral, many of these families could be referred to a Family Centre, to be established at Scarba House. Work will need to be done on the smooth integration of these services, and ease of referral, etc.

The Future Use of Scarba House

Especially with the closing down of a residential service, Scarba House could be converted into a local community facility, which provides accommodation for the Family Centre and various associated services and group activities. It would become

widely known in the locality as the place to go for families who wished to have help, support and stimulus.

The Financial Implications of These Proposals

The approximate cost of the 4 core professional appointments in the Family Centre plus supporting staff would be about \$150,000 per annum. In the 1984–85 financial year, \$346,000 was spent on the residential service at Scarba. The proposed Family Centre would constitute a much more cost-effective service, not only in itself but in making the associated services much more effective in the lives of the families involved. This being the case, it seems reasonable to argue that Health Department funding might be maintained by being channelled in future to the Family Centre, and also, using similar arguments, to the Hospital's Early Intervention Service.

If the \$150,000 for the Family Centre is not forthcoming from the Health Department, this is a feasible target for the Society's new fund-raising activities, and we believe the Family Centre concept is likely to be very attractive for this purpose.³⁴

Substantial Progress

The proposals were endorsed by the board, and constituted a crucial step in the development of the Benevolent Society as a progressive social welfare organisation well attuned to its contemporary community circumstances. Continuing responsibility for the Royal Hospital for Women was still a major impediment, however. During 1986, the board, and especially its hospital committee, was forced by state government health initiatives to think very seriously about the continuance of this responsibility. One of the options raised in our discussions was to sell the hospital, using the proceeds for the development of its social welfare activities. In 1992, this was, in fact, achieved.

Substantial Change Under Way

In the Society's 1986–87 annual report, the president described the year as one 'in which many months of planning came to fruition with the introduction of new programs. During the year the Society's 'Scarba House' became 'Scarba Family Centre' with strengthened programmes for vulnerable families and their children'.

The year saw a dramatic change in the organisation of health services in the State with Area Health Services being established in Metropolitan Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong. Area Boards are responsible for planning and providing health services to a defined geographical population. The Royal Hospital for Women and Scarba Family Centre are linked with the newly established Eastern Area Health Service ...

The Society's Early Intervention Programme and other programmes planned through the Scarba Centre in Bondi have been endorsed by the Minister and the Department of Health and are being achieved by a redirection of existing resources and the commitment of Society funds. The renaming of Scarba House for Children was undertaken to emphasise our commitment to working with children

34 'Future Directions for the Society's Welfare Programs and Services'.

as well as their families. A social worker, very experienced in work with families and children, was appointed to the new and challenging position of Director of the Family Centre. ...

During the year staff at the Scarba Family Centre provided services to over 140 children and to some 100 families.

On December 31 (1986), the residential programme at Scarba closed after 69 years ...

It had taken seven years after our Scarba Review Report to close down the residential program and put in place this program of family and children's services based at Scarba. Effecting social change through this old, 'establishment' social agency, had been slow and complicated, but certainly not without hope, otherwise I would have disengaged from my membership of the board.

7.13.6 Change the Name of the Organisation?

As indicated at the outset of this account of my nine years on the board, on 20 November 1986, I formally advised the president of my intention to resign at the end of the year. The organisation had certainly come a long way since I joined, but there was still the issue of its name. Mistakenly, I thought that with all the real progress that had been achieved, the obvious next step would be finally to change its historic name. To this end I gave notice, that I would be moving a motion at the board meeting on 27 November:

That henceforth for operating purposes the Benevolent Society of New South Wales shall be described as –

'The Macquarie Society: In the Service of the Community'

These points supported my notice of motion:

1. The 1981 Revision of the Society's Goals

In 1981, the Board formally adopted a new statement of operating goals for the Society, and the organisation is now described in the following terms: ... (See above.)

This statement in effect replaces the historic object of the Society –

the relieving of poor, aged and distressed persons and others requiring such aid contained in the organisation's 1902 Act of Incorporation. The Society's original 1818 object was – to relieve the poor, the distressed, the aged, and the infirm, and thereby to discountenance as much as possible mendacity and vagrancy, and to encourage industrious habits among the indigent poor, as well as to afford them religious instruction and consolation in their distresses.

The Report of the Board's Objectives Committee which led to the 1981 revision of the Society's goals pointed out that the language of the Society's earlier statement of objects was anachronistic, and tended to reflect or be associated with attitudes which are not acceptable in present-day society. It could now be considered patronising, even offensive, to refer to those receiving its services as the poor, distressed, or even the aged.

The language of the 1981 revision of the goals and objects is modern, democratic and progressive. The revision can be seen as a reasonable attempt to

recognise existing service commitments and to give the Society a continuing meaningful role in the vastly changed circumstances of contemporary society.

2. The Society's Planned New Developments

The revised goals of the Society have provided it with an appropriate framework for reviewing and assessing its future. A number of new developments in service to the community are now well advanced in planning and the Society's by-laws and organisational structure have been revised.³⁵ The Society appears to be on threshold of an important new phase in its long history as Australia's oldest welfare organisation. Almost everyone at the Board seminar in 1985 agreed on the urgent need for the Society to develop new programs especially in connection with its first stated goal, and, for the Society to develop greater community support, including financial support.

3. The Need to Change the Name Under Which We Operate

In line with, and as part of the development of the organisation, the next obvious step is to operate under a new name and discontinue using its anachronistic, nineteenth century original name.

At best 'benevolent' means 'wishing well' or 'meaning well'. It focuses upon the intentions of the service providers, not on the outcomes for the service receivers. The term historically has become associated with patronising 'do gooding' by the upper classes for 'the lower orders'. Members of modern societies may be willing to receive community help, but their self-respect is not enhanced if they see themselves as being on the receiving end of other people's 'benevolence'. In recognition of this, almost all nineteenth century welfare organisations which were originally designated benevolent or charitable, have long-since changed their names and become 'family welfare bureaus', 'citizen welfare services', 'community service societies' – with a shift away from good intentions of the providers to a focus on the well-being of the recipients as full and equal members of the community. What is involved is not just changing fashions in the use of words, but basic shifts in the philosophy of what welfare organisations ought to be about.

Professional social work staff in particular feel very uncomfortable working for an organisation that still calls itself a 'benevolent society'. In my own experience as a member of the Board I have felt a constant need to explain away the organisation's name by reference to it being Australia's first welfare organisation. Without some such explanation, my continued association with this name has been frankly a professional embarrassment.

4. A Desirable New Name

I believe the proposed operating description – 'The Macquarie Society: In the Service of the Community' – will be fully acceptable to people on both sides of the community service relationship. It signifies a primary concern of on-going service to the community and at the same time provides a constant reminder of the unique historic origins of this particular Australian welfare organisation.

The Society was founded in the second decade of the nineteenth century as

³⁵ I had served actively on both the by-laws and organisational structure sub-committees of the Society's planning committee, so was very aware of these significant revisions.

the penal colony under Governor Lachlan Macquarie began to accept some of the features of a civilised community. Governor Macquarie gave special help and support in the founding stages of the Society. The name of Macquarie is widely known and respected in New South Wales and is associated in many people's minds with the building of the community in the early stages of European settlement. It also has the considerable advantage on not acquiring changing meanings and attitudes, which inevitably occurs with a descriptive name for an organisation.

5. The Need to Change the Act

The proposal for a new operating name for the Society does not entail changing the Act under which the Society operates. There are serious problems in trying to change the Act, but on legal advice, this does not mean we cannot adopt a new operating name.

6. Reference to the Former Name

In order not to confuse the public, the future letter-head of the Society can include in parenthesis (Formerly the Benevolent Society of New South Wales 1813–1986).

7. A New Logo

In conjunction with the change of operating name, the Society needs a new logo to project a new, progressive image.

R. J. Lawrence

Member of the Board 1977–86

Professor of Social Work, University of New South Wales

At the board meeting which discussed my motion, I added these further points:

8. At least a couple of directors have said to me they hated or disliked the name at first but they had got used to it. I ask them to remember the reasons for their original reaction and to re-affirm the validity of that reaction.
9. It has been put to me that rich, potential contributors are more likely to respond to requests from an organisation called 'The Benevolent Society', than one called 'The Macquarie Society: In the Service of the Community'. This is because they see their actions as 'charity' or 'benevolence'. In reply, I would comment:
 - (a) In the recent past the traditional name has been singularly unsuccessful in attracting rich donors.
 - (b) If the Society wishes to project a progressive image, it cannot continue to see itself and encourage others to see it as a charity or benevolent institution. It is, in the words of its revised objectives, 'a non-secretarian voluntary organisation which recognises the worth and dignity of every person'. Whatever may be the views of some Directors and of some donors, the language of charity and of benevolence is in sharp conflict with a progressive image. Crucially important is the fact that the clients and potential clients as well as key professional staff, do not use that language and often positively dislike it. All donors, modest as well as rich, should be encouraged to give their financial support not out of charity,

but because the Society is doing important and worthwhile community tasks which are not being done by governments or other voluntary organisations.

10. I have heard the comment, 'What's in a name? What is important is what's done under the name.' I am suggesting to you, for the reasons I have outlined, that in this particular instance our continued use of the Society's historical name is a major impediment to the work of the Society and it's time to do something about it.
11. Changing the name, designing a new logo, and mounting a large-scale publicity and fund-raising campaign in connection with new programs for families and children, and senior citizens, would make an impressive Bi-centennial project for the Society in 1988.

I commend the motion to you for your support.

My motion was not endorsed at the November 1986 board meeting. I recollect Professor Darty Glover, appointed dean of medicine at UNSW in 1985, did not support the motion, because he personally liked the word 'benevolent'³⁶ The board decided to set up a committee to give the matter further consideration, but I could not be on it because I was resigning from the board and would be overseas in 1987. The name I had proposed was obviously not the only suitable possibility. 'Community Service Society (CSS)' could be another. Without my continuing advocacy, however, I was not confident that change would be achieved.

Since that time, periodically the issue of the name has been raised but no change has been achieved. In recent years, 'charity' language seems to have become more, not less prevalent. Commonly the voluntary welfare sector is being described as the charitable sector, and individual welfare agencies as 'charities'. For all the reasons I cited in 1986 and earlier, I see this as regrettable.

36 He had replaced Professor Pitney on the board in 1985. His actual involvement in the work of the board was largely in the Royal Hospital for Women committee and sub-committees.

Chapter 8

Family Photos

FAMILY 1969-74



*With Catherine and Dean Berry - 'Wingfield'
Adelaide, December, 1969*



Grave, Alfred Barker, S.A. pioneer



*Eric and Kathleen Russell and family, Beaufort, Vic. Jan. 1970. (Cousin Kathleen, d., Addie and
Ralph Civil.)*



*Constructing Mirror sailing dingy - our garage,
Jan. - Feb. 1971 - family project*



*Above and below: After formal launching on
Pittwater of 'AMY' by Dean Berry (named after
his mother)*



The Mirror rigged on our front lawn





*Walking in the Warrumbungles national park,
550 km NW of Sydney, Sept. 1972*



Caravan camping ground – Warrumbungles



Margaret Berry and Trish



With Dean and Catherine Berry – West Head



Family group (including the Gordons, and my parents visiting from Adelaide) – our house, 1972. Peter in a go-cart ('Blue-bird')



'Amy' sailing with a spinnaker



South coast beach



The family with Joe Reid from the USA (distinguished child welfare expert), 1972



Visiting, with my parents, sister Margaret Southward, and two of her children – Adelaide



RJL and Derek Broadbent canoeing, Smith's Lake, north of Sydney



GPS regatta on the Nepean River, 1974. David rowed in a Shore school four



'Baldina', Anthony and Peggy Barker, and family, The Burra, S.A.



Lawrence family group – Jim and Sheila's home, Kensington, Adelaide, Jan. 1974

FAMILY 1975-78



Setting up camp, Lake Brou (270km SSW of Sydney), Dec 1975



Lake Brou



David and Peter - successful fishing on Lake Brou. Nearest town - Narooma



David, Trish, Peter, Ruth, and the Linklaters (James, Fully [Anne], Janet and Peter)



Preparing Christmas dinner



Beach and rocks



David, Ruth, Trish and RJL - beach and Lake Brou



Rocky shore-line



The way out by car from Lake Brou



Peter's School Certificate sculpture, 1976



Camping, Lake Meroo National Park, December 1977



Surfing beach, Meroo National Park, Jan. 1978



Peter Linklater, Trish and Fully – Blue Mountains lookout, 1978



Sculptural musical instrument by David, 1978 – Sydney College of the Arts



Above and below: Peter's sculpture – HSC exhibition, Art Gallery of NSW, Nov. 1978



FAMILY (and some friends) 1978-82



Andrew, Jim, Chris and Sheila Lawrence - their new home, Turrramurra, 1978



In formal attire - PDL in Thai silk



Leigh and Jill Wilson visiting us, Sept. 1978



David's wedding to Ruth Rosamond, Dec 1978 - the wedding party, St James' church



RJL, Pat Rosamond, David, Ruth, and PDL



Outside the church-Margaret Sutherland, Jim, Geoff Sutherland, and Lucy Lawrence



Cricket, Lake Turmeil campsite, Jan. 1978



PDL and RJL on the beach, Lake Termeil



Mainly family group - Ruth R, Ruth L, Jason Berry, RJL, Penny, David, PDL, Mary Berry, Sheila, Colin Tregenza, Susie, Prue, Murray and Anne Gordon, Warren, and Michael Tregenza



Rodney McDonald, Trish, RJL and Ruth - camping, Lake Termeil, Dec. 1979



Our two Volvos in the garage, Dec. 1979



With my mother, Christmas 1979



Family group, Dec. 1979



Murray, Claire and Janet Stonier, Penny, Anne, Prue, Trish and Ken Stonier – Gordon's house, Bateman's Bay 1980



Climbing Pigeon House, 1980



Nearby mountains



Ruth (violin), Peter (piano), David (trumpet)



Fred and Gay Cox (Michigan U friends) - climbing Barrenjoey, 1980



Camping, Termeil Lake, Dec. 1980 - PDL, Janet Linklater, Rodney McDonald and Peter



Betty Davis (my first secretary at UNSW) and PDL, Jan. 1981 - Byron Bay (her home)



Werner Boehm and Joyce Milner - North Head Lookout, Sydney, mid-1982



Entertaining, Sept. 1982



R.J.L., Mem and Ron Fenig (good neighbours) - near Fenig boatsheds, Hawkesbury, after lunch in son's restaurant



Ruth and Trish, October 1982 - apple-blossom time in the front garden

FAMILY (and some friends) 1984-88



Natalie Soubution, Margaret Berry, Sir Walter Crocker, Dr Savoy-Soubution, Dean Berry, Trish – lunch, North Adelaide restaurant, July 1984



RJL and PDL – at home in Sydney, 1984. (beneath George Winnen painting, Petrel Cove & coastline, S.A.)



RJL with Naomi, our first grand-child, 1985



Holger Buck – Bavaria, Germany, Dec. 1985. Good friend of Peter, and of us



Karen Luland & Ruth, Kusciosko National Park, Jan. 1986



Peter - Santorini, Greece, May 1986 (holidaying, working, Max Plank Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Heidelberg)



Rug for my mother's room in All Hallows nursing home, Westbourne Park, Adelaide, 1986 - designed and hooked by RJI, wool dyed by PDL



Margaret Berry's 80th birthday



Naomi, Murray, Margaret Berry, Anne and Trish - Pearl Beach house, 1986



Ruth and Trish, Oct. 1986 - crab apple blossom time in our front garden



Kate and Priscilla Brown (friends, distant cousins of Trish), Trish, Naomi, Ruth R, and David



Elsa Oyen (SPRC visitor from Bergen, Norway) and PDL - Pearl Beach Jan. 1987



Phyllida Parsloe, Ragnild Rees, Trish, Rees child, Jenny Wilson, and Stuart Rees - Pearl Beach look-out, Feb. 1987



Friend of Jason, Mary Berry, Trish, Jason Berry, Feb 1987 - Encounter Bay, S.A.



Our last visit to my mother, All Hallows, Feb 1987



Good Friday hot-cross buns, Jim and Sheila's



Ruth's graduation, U of Sydney (1980-86, BA 1st class honours, major in education; BSW 1st class honours), June 1987



Ruth Rosamond, Jonathan (our second grandchild), David, and Naomi, Aug 1987



Four old social work friends - Millie Mills
Joan Lupton, Mollie Esch [Booth], and Mary
McLelland, Aug 1987 - just before we left for a
year in New York



Women from St James' church - (Susie Hirst,
Teresa Rawstorne, Megan Chippindale, Trish
Johnson, Margaret Smith and Ann Leask,
Nov.1988

Index

A Cumulative Index for the autobiography is at the end of Volume 6 and is also available on-line.

A

- AASW News*, 50
- Abbott, T., 188
- Aboriginal Legal Service (ALS)
 - foundation council, 297–8
 - history, 296–302
 - submission to Commonwealth Government (1971), 298–300
- ACOSS Quarterly* (journal), 312
- Adams, C., 235, 238
- Adams, P., 420
- Adler, D., 408
- Alcorn, B., 346
- Allen, P., 235
- Alley, D., 428
- Anderson, D. S., 318
- Angliss, M., 365, 368
- Armour, L., 242
- Arnold, L., 359
- Association of Teachers in Schools of Social Work (ATSSW), 56–7, 58–9
- Australian Assistance Plan (AAP), 142, 143, 144, 160, 347–8
- Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW)
 - 1947 to late 1960s, 47–8
 - 1970–75, 48–51
 - committee for social planning and action (SPAC), 49
 - Commonwealth arbitration court
 - registration, 66–7
 - conferences, national
 - 1969, 47, 63–6
 - 1969–75, 62–3
 - 1979, 434–41
 - education (minimum standards)
 - course details, 53–8
 - operating principles, 53
 - establishment, 24–5
 - industrial function, 66–7
 - journal, 62
 - membership eligibility, 53
 - national education standards, 53
 - overseas qualifications assessment, 61–2
 - plebiscite (1975), 50
 - professional education and accreditation committee (PEAC), 57–8, 68, 205, 208, 248
 - professional education responsibilities
 - minimum requirements, 53–8
 - national councils, 58–60
 - national standards, 53
 - state registration, 60–1
 - tertiary sector, 51–2
 - social planning and action network (SPAN), 50
 - work value case for social workers (1968–69), 67–8
- Australian Child Care Conference, Melbourne (1972), 365–8
- Australian Citizenship Convention, Canberra (1970), 258
- Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS), 303–4
- 'Agenda for Action', 1975/76 budget
 - submission, 350–1
- Board of Governors (1973–77), 346–7, 353–8
- Brown, Joan (1970–74), 303–4
- conferences and events
 - National, Canberra (1970), 317–28

- National, Hobart (1974) – ‘Action for Social Change – Whose Responsibility?’, 348–9
- Congress of Members (1973–77), 346–7
- Constitution
- original, 334–5
 - revised, 335–40
- funding restoration campaign (1975), 351–2
- international responsibilities, 358–64
- national inquiry into social welfare, proposal (1972), 340–3
- Pennington, Ed (1974–75), 349–50, 351, 352–3
- Poverty Inquiry, evidence (submission) (1972), 304, 343–6
- programme features, 1970s, 312–15
- publications, 303, 312
- ‘Regional Structures and Strategies’ (1974), 347–8
- secretary-general (1974–75), 349–51
- Submission to the Commonwealth Government for a Triennium Grant 1969–72, 305–16
- Government’s response, 317
 - Task Force report (1976), 355–7
 - Yates, Ian (1976–79), 353, 354, 357
- Australian Department of Social Security, 143–4
- The Australian Journal of Social Issues* (ACOSS), 303, 312
- The Australian Journal of Social Work* (AASW), 62, 155, 208
- Australian National University (ANU)
- Urban Research Unit (Research School of Social Sciences)
 - political influence, 276–8
 - The Politics of Urban Growth* (1972), 266–76
 - urban seminar series (1969–73), 265–6
- Australian Social Welfare* (ACOSS journal), 303
- Australian Social Welfare Commission
- political support lost, 143
 - social welfare manpower (1973), 62, 437
 - social work/welfare education (1973–75), 59, 60
- Australian Social Welfare Union (ASWU), 50
- Australian Social Work* (AASW journal), 62
- B**
- Bagdikian, B. H., 388
- Baker, K., 178, 179, 181–2, 188, 189, 191, 192
- Baker, R., 92, 95, 117, 121, 122, 131, 162, 165, 176, 177–93, 197, 198, 227
- Bandler, F., 297
- Barlcay, Dr, 438
- Barnet, H., 192
- Barr, D., 301
- Barwick, N., 426, 429
- Baume, P., 235, 238, 239, 240, 242, 435, 436
- Baxter, P., 26, 28, 40, 41–2, 43, 153
- Bayley, L., 367
- Becker, H., 253
- Belcher, B., 50
- Bell, R., 235
- Bellamy, D., 165
- Bellear, S., 298
- Benevolent Society of New South Wales
- 1968–71, 280–7
 - 1978–88, 450–1
 - Board, 451–3
 - Board Seminar (1979), 453–5
 - Board Seminar (1985), 482–4
 - family and children’s services
 - consultancy report (1985), 486
 - Objectives Committee (1981), 468–77
 - organisational development, 467–8
 - Planning Committee, 484–6
 - planning system implementation, 478–82
 - annual report (1968), 281
- BSW field program, 82–3
- Community and Social Welfare Department, 293–4
- history, 278, 279–81
- Royal Hospital for Women, 278, 281, 282, 287–8, 292, 293, 450, 451, 453, 454, 463, 471, 472, 486, 489, 490, 491
- Scarba Family Centre, 491–2
- Scarba House for Children, 281, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 294, 475, 477, 486, 488, 489, 490–1
- Family Services Unit, 452
 - Review Committee, 186, 187, 248, 451, 452–3, 455–6
 - Review Committee report (1979), 456–68, 492
- UNSW, 281, 287
- School of Social Work, 281, 282–93
 - William Charlton Homes, 281
- Benjamin, C., 50, 51, 67, 68
- Berfenstam, R., 419, 421, 426
- Bernard, S., 214, 245
- Berreen, R., 205–6
- Berry, Dean (father-in-law), 36
- Berry, Mary (sister-in-law), 36
- Bevan, J., 429
- Bicknell, P., 235

- Birt, M., 122, 127
 Bisno, H., 60, 245
 Borrie, W. D. 'Mick', 317, 369, 406
 Boss, P., 180, 457
 Boyle, G., 457
 Bradshaw, C., 457
 Brazier, J., 442, 448, 449
 Brennan, F., 196
 Brennan, T., 27–8, 29, 30, 58, 119, 165, 209,
 210, 266, 318, 320
 Brewer, G., 235
 Brigg, J., 353, 354, 355
 Briscoe, G., 296, 297, 300
 Bromham, K., 153
 Broomfield family, 11
 Brown, J., 55, 141, 303–4, 329, 335, 338, 340,
 344, 346, 347, 348, 349, 358, 359
 Brown, L., 34
 Brown, M., 25, 26, 27, 40, 90, 157, 194
 Brown, R., 32, 144, 259, 318
 Browne, E., 90, 121, 204–5
 Browne, L., 205
 Bryson, L., 165
 Buchanan, B., 353
 Bucher, R., 380, 381, 386–7
 Buckley, F. S., 452
 Bull family, 13
 Bunday, C., 33, 132, 144–6, 157, 161, 172,
 175
 Burgess, B., 457
 Burniston, G., 318
 Burrows, R., 457
 Butlin, N. G., 318
 Byrne, J., 354
- C**
- Caldwell, G. T., 318, 434, 435, 436
 Caldwell, J., 35, 36, 133, 172–3, 284, 285,
 286
 Callaway, E. L., 286, 293, 294, 451, 476, 477
 Campbell, M., 180
 Capper, W., 68
 Carpenter, D., 33
 Carpenter, G. G., 367
 Castley, S., 235
 Cawte, J., 297
 Chaikin, M., 287, 288, 292, 451, 452–3, 483,
 485
 Chamberlain, E., 49, 143, 144, 154, 181, 218,
 225, 241, 245, 334, 434
 Checkley, B., 457
 Cheers, C., 399, 412
 Chisholm, R., 296, 297, 354
 Churven, P., 457, 458
- Clark, C., 266
 Clayton, H., 303, 305, 335
 Coe, P., 296, 297, 298, 301
 Cohen, Mrs, 452
 Colby, K., 33, 132, 283, 284
 Coleman, M., 144
 Collins, P., 335
 Colliver, S., 28, 135–44, 150, 157, 160, 167,
 175, 223, 227, 229, 231, 245, 281–2, 284,
 305, 318, 335, 367
 Colwell, M., 442
 Commonwealth Committee on Overseas
 Qualifications (COPQ), 62
 Commonwealth Professional Officers
 Association (POA), 67, 68
 Congalton, A., 90, 268
 Connor, A., 160–1
 Cook, H., 398, 399, 412
 Cooper, E., 35
 Cornwell, M., 49, 154–6
 Court, C., 398
 Court, M., 354
 Cowan, Z., 321, 419, 434
 Cowen, Lady, 434
 Cox, A., 272
 Cox, D., 359, 361
 Cox, E., 235, 293, 294, 451, 455–6, 465
 Cox, I., 148, 155, 230, 366
 Coyle, A., 35
 Craig family, 10, 11
 Crawford, D., 346, 354
 Crawford, R. M., 32, 140, 279
 Crosby, H., 429
 Crowe, M., 429, 433
 Curtis, L., 436
- D**
- Dahl, R. A., 374
 Dasgupta, S., 360, 361, 439
 Davidson, J., 354
 Davies, L., 235
 Davis, B., 26, 226
 Davis, C., 477–8, 483
 Davoren, J., 236, 238, 354, 429, 478, 483, 486
 Dawkins, J., 197
 Dax, C., 397
 de Leon, C., 187
 Deeble, J., 318fn, 354
 Delacombe, R., 366
 Della Bosca, R., 282, 287, 294, 450
 Delore, A., 278
 Department of Urban and Regional
 Development, 160, 277
 Desai, A., 187

Deveson, A., 398, 399
 Dickey, B., 32, 279, 280
 Dinerman, M., 244
 Disney, J., 364
 Dixon, C., 298
 Dixon, D., 295
 Donnison, D., 267, 437, 438
 Donovan, F., 166, 236, 439
 Dowell, R., 429
 Downing, R. J., 254, 259
 Doyle, R., 132, 162, 164–5
 Drane, N., 304, 343
 Duguid, A., 236
 Dumpson, J., 222
 Dyer, M., 426

E

Easteal, B., 236
 Einfeld, S., 452, 464
 Einspinner, P., 276fn
 Eisen, Professor, 425
 Ellicott, Mr, 424, 425
 Elsworth, D., 452, 483, 485
 Encel, S., 27, 33–4, 90, 408
Encyclopedia of Social Work (Glasser ed.), 216, 217
 English, B., 132, 166–9, 170, 171
 Epstein, N., 398
 Erikson, E., 152
 Erlich, J., 223

F

Family and Health Conference (RACGP 1977), 397–9
 Fauri, F., 119, 213, 221
 Fellin, P., 219, 227
 Fenig family, 12
 Ferguson, A., 133, 210, 211
 Fernandez, E., 133, 174
 Field, M., 457
 Fishburn, J., 133, 170
 Fitzgerald, R., 364
 Fitzpatrick, A. 'Fitzie', 27
 Fletcher, B, 31
 Foley, G., 297
 Ford, B. F., 318
 Francis, G. H., 267
 Fraser, D., 34
 Fraser government, 23, 143, 351, 357, 364
 Freeman, Mrs, 452, 453
 Fry, E., 267

G

Gamble, A., 36
 Garrett, B., 346, 354
 Garside, J., 413, 415, 416
 Geddes, M., 56, 133, 157–60, 346, 354, 355, 356, 364, 440
 Gibson, M. *see* Lewis, M.
 Gilbert, C. R., 346
 Glasser, L., 215, 217, 221, 222, 226
 Glasser, P., 139, 161, 174, 215–27, 228, 232, 245
 Glover, D., 495
 Golding, R., 109, 114, 122, 175, 186, 187
 Goodnow, Professor, 421, 423
 Gordon, R. R., 309, 335, 338
 Gorman, A., 449, 457
 Gould, R., 450, 452, 455, 456, 465, 476, 477, 480
 Grace, D., 206
 Graycar, A., 242, 243
 Green, J., 305, 335, 346, 354, 364, 367
 Greenwell, J., 283, 285, 286, 293, 453, 478
 Grichting, E. and W., 241
 Griffith, J., 30
 Gross, P., 435, 436
 Guilfoyle, M., 417, 428

H

Hall, D., 236
 Halliwell, L., 156, 163
 Hamilton, L. Bruce, 142, 146, 147, 148, 149, 154–5
 Hamilton, Mr, 138
 Hamilton, S., 236
 Hamilton-Smith, E., 54–5, 59, 68, 200
 Hamilton-Smith, J., 200
 Hammer, G., 28–9
 Hancock, W. K., 318
 Hansen, P., 411
 Hapgood, A., 236
 Hardwick, C. A., 286, 287, 293
 Hardwick, M., 288, 451
 Hare, R., 128
 Harrison, P., 265, 267, 277
 Hart, P., 457
 Hartshorn, A., 33
 Hasluck, P., 317, 366
 Hatfield Dodds, L., 364
 Hayden, B., 142, 143
 Hayes, F., 194
 Hayes, L., 346
 Heading, A., 346
 Hecht, S., 147–8

- Henderson, R., 29, 32, 259, 271, 304, 343
 Henderson Poverty Inquiry, 304, 343–6
 Hennessey, B., 318
 Hickey, B., 279
 Hill, J., 11
 Hoban, R., 32, 140, 279
 Hodge, M., 387, 390
 Horne, A. V., 367
 Horne, D., 403
 Horne, S., 346, 354
 Horsburgh, M., 133, 141, 207–10, 232, 236, 280, 282
 Hounslow, B., 364
 Howard, D., 64–5, 121
 Howie, D., 239, 242, 243
 Huggins, P., 452
 Hughes, C. A., 267
 Hughes, T. E. F., 318
 Hukins, A., 114, 175, 187
 Hukins, M., 114
 Huntington, J., 120, 121, 132, 142, 187, 200–4, 399, 411
 Huxley, L., 317
- I**
 Ife, J., 236
 International Council on Social Welfare (ICSW), 358
 conferences
 The Hague (1972), 358
 Hong Kong, regional (1975), 359
 Jerusalem (1978), 363
 Manila (1970), 358
 Melbourne (1979), 361–2, 363
 Nairobi (1974), 358
 Puerto Rico (1976), 359
International Social Work (journal), 312
 International Year of the Child in Australia 1979, 417–19
 ‘The Child, the Family and the Community’, conference, 419–27, 428–33
 Irwin, L., 68
Issues in the Evaluation of Social Welfare Programs: Australian Case Illustrations (1980), 242
- J**
 Jamrozik, A., 228, 230, 240, 245, 367
 Jayasuriya, L., 354
 Jeffreys, M., 203
 Jeffries, E., 240, 242, 245, 419
 Johnson, A., 364
 Johnson, E., 236
 Johnston, M., 236
 Joint Committee on Social Welfare
 Education, 57, 59, 314
 Jones, D., 190
 Jordan, P., 236
 Joseph, R., 450, 452, 453, 457
- K**
 Karmel, P., 31
 Katz, J., 366
 Keating, P., 302
 Kelk, N., 132, 133, 135
 Keller, M., 354
 Kelly, A., 236
 Kendall, K., 77
 Kennedy, J., 41
 Kennedy, M., 33
 Kewley, T., 142, 147, 150, 218, 254, 271, 279, 280, 303
 Kidston, W., 236
 King, A. W., 305, 335
 King, M., 452, 453, 485
 Kirby, M., 187
 Konopka, G., 419, 420, 421, 422, 427–8
- L**
 Lagay, B., 449
 Landa, P., 298
 Langshaw, W. C., 335, 367, 418, 440, 442, 449, 457
 Lanigan, P., 234, 240, 417, 419, 433
 Lawrence, David (son), 243–4
 Lawrence, James ‘Jim’ (brother), 384–5
 Lawrence, John
 AASW
 President (1968–70), 24, 48, 52
 work value case, 68–74
 Aboriginal Legal Service (ALS) Council (1970–74), 295, 301–2
 ACOSS
 Board of Governors (1973–77), 346–7, 354
 Commonwealth Government for a Triennium Grant 1969–72, 305
 deputy president, 364
 funding restoration, letter (1975), 352–3
 national inquiry into social welfare, proposal and letter (1972), 340–3
 Poverty Inquiry (1972), 343–4
 ‘Regional Structures and Strategies’ (1974), 347–8

- Task Force report (1976), 355–7
 ACROD, social planning consultancy
 1973–74, 413–16
- Association of Teachers in Schools of
 Social Work (ATSSW)
 secretary/treasurer (1967–68), 58
- Benevolent Society of New South Wales
 Board 1968–71, 280–94
 Board 1978–86, 450–5
 Objectives Committee, Chairman,
 467–77
 over-view comments (2008), 278
 Scarba House for Children Review
 Committee, Chairman, 186, 248,
 451, 452–3, 455–68, 492
 Social Work School's field education
 statement, 288–93
 Social Work School's relationship,
 letter and response, 282–7
 community activities (1969–1991),
 247–51
 conference and seminar addresses and
 papers
 'A Review of the Conference and the
 Way Ahead' (1972), 367–8
 'The Australian Family ... Who
 Cares?' (1977), 399–411
 'Landmarks in the Study of the
 Australian Family' (1977), 411–12
 'Medicine and Related Professions'
 (1970), 369, 379–84
Mr Gortlam fantasy (1970), 319–28
 Norma Parker Address (1969), 63–6
 'Organised Action for Migrant Social
 Welfare' (1970), 258–64
 'The philosophy of social welfare in
 the 1970s' (1970), 318–28
 'Professional Responsibility in a
 Changing World' (Squibb Lecture
 1972), 384–97
 'Regional Structures and Strategies'
 (1974), 347–8
 'Retirement as a Social Issue' (1969),
 251–7
 'Service to People in the 1970s' (UWA
 1970), 369–78
 'Social Policy Planning' overview
 (1979), 434–41
 'The Child, the Family and the
 Community' (1979), 420–7
 'The Role of Social Welfare in
 Australian Social Development'
 (1971), 329–34
 conference follow-up, ICSW conference,
 Manila (1970), 328–9
 editorships
- Australian Children 1972 – The Welfare
 Spectrum*, 368
Australian Journal of Social Issue, 303
 International Year of the Child in
 Australia (1979)
 conference follow-up and proceedings,
 428–33
 overview paper RJL, 420–7
 Lowther Park Ave residence, Turramurra,
 7–21
 Montcalm Inquiry (1982), 442–9
 publications
Professional Social Work in Australia,
 69, 200
 'Social Welfare and Urban Growth'
 (chapter), 267–76
 School of Social Work, UNSW
 application, first chair, 26–30
 graduation address 1969, 78–81
 head of school (1968–1982), 77
 accountability statement (1977),
 115–17
 appointment, letter to Michigan
 university colleagues, 213–14
 interactions with Michigan
 university colleagues, 213–45
 National Seminar on Program
 Evaluation proposal, 231–2
 'Policies and Procedures' (1969),
 114–15
 report on student placement
 (1978), 117
 roles and tasks (1978), 117–19
 statement to Vice-Chancellor
 (1981), 122–7
 seminars and symposiums
 'Retirement as a Social Issue'
 (ANZAAS, 1969), 251–7
 urbanisation ANU (1965–73), 265–7
 Social Welfare Commission, research
 advisory committee (1974–75), 249
 Social Welfare Research Centre
 (SWRC), proposal stage discussions,
 229
 submission – 'Social work – specialising
 in social and behavioural science
 approaches to social work practice'
 (1972), 220
 University of Sydney, resignation, 29, 30,
 36–7
- Lawrence, Lucy (née Butlin) (mother)
 on John's appointment, UNSW, 36
 Lawrence, Peter (son), 244
 Lawrence, Robert (father)
 on John's appointment, UNSW, 36
 Lawrence, Ruth (daughter), 244

- Learner, E., 60
 Lebeaux, C., 259, 320, 379
 Leeder, S., 385
 Lewis, D. H., 135
 Lewis, F., 359
 Lewis, M. T. (née Gibson), 132, 148–51, 187
 Lewis, V., 32, 359
 Lippmann, W., 305, 346, 354, 363
 Longbottom, T., 297
 Loveday, P., 267
 Lupton, G., 90, 133
 Lynch, P., 258, 377
 Lyons, M., 364
- M**
- Mackay family, 10
 Mackinnon, A., 367
 MacMahon, J., 236
 Macmillan, D., 37–8
 Macquarie, L., 279, 494
 Maddison, D., 195, 272, 384, 385, 391–2, 397
 Maddox, G., 256
 Mahoney, D., 452
 Marshall, C., 132, 174–5
 Martin, E., 236, 244, 280
 Martins, J., 236
 Mathews, R., 277
 Matthews, R., 434–5
 May, J., 485
 Mayes, B. T., 286
 McCallum, A., 364
 McCallum, D., 205–6, 224
 McClelland, K., 167, 211
 McClintock, J., 304, 349, 353, 355, 362, 364
 McCosker, J. F., 335
 McCouat, M., 132, 154, 283, 284, 285, 286
 McGovern, M., 457
 McIntyre, B., 457
 McKenna, R., 297, 298
 McKenzie, B., 364
 McLelland, M., 29, 36, 50, 62, 120, 187, 455, 456
 McLeod, K. H., 318
 McPaul, P., 133, 174, 210–11
 Mechanic, D., 376
 Menzies, C., 354, 364
 Miles, N. T. G., 275
 Miller, J., 318
 Minahan, A., 92
 Mitchell, Megan, 364
 Mitchell, Merle, 364
 Molloy, N. G., 367
 Montcalm Inquiry report (1982), 248, 442–9
 Montgomery, P., 439
 Moore, J., 33, 132, 210
 Moore, M., 451, 452
 Morey, E., 136
 Morris, R., 221
 Mowbray, M., 157, 162, 165–6
 Moyle, P., 237
 Mune, M., 54, 237
 Murdoch, E., 366
 Murray, G., 172–3, 214–15
 Murray, I., 214–15
 Murray, J., 465
 Myers, I., 44
 Myers, R., 29, 41, 42, 43, 44, 120, 175, 188, 193, 229, 286, 434
 Myers, R. 'Bob', 160, 161, 164
- N**
- Nadas, Y., 120, 132
 National Seminar on Program Evaluation, 231–8
 book, 242
 manuscript to publishing, 239–43
 participants and case study topics (1978), 235–9
 planning, 232–5
 proposal, 231–2
 Neely, D., 232, 237
 Nettheim, G., 296, 297
 Neumann, E., 301
 Neutze, M., 265, 277
 Newmann, E., 297
 Niland, J., 197
No Charity There: a Short History of Social Welfare in Australia (Dickey), 280
 Norton, P., 230
 Noweland-Forman, G., 364
 NSW Council of Social Service (NCOSS)
 historical perspective from: *The Politics of Urban Growth* (1972), 273–6
- O**
- O'Collins, M., 163
 O'Connell, C., 346
 O'Farrell, P., 30, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 128
 O'Flaherty, K., 144, 223, 225, 226, 245
 Ogden family, 10–11
 Olesen, V., 389–90
 Ongel, E., 169–72
 Owen, J., 232
 Ozanne, E., 228, 245

P

- Parker, N., 25, 26–7, 30, 33, 34, 51, 59, 63–4, 66, 81, 144, 145, 151, 157, 173, 194, 280, 283
 Parker, R. S. 'Bob', 265, 267
 Parkin, C., 279
 Parkinson, C., 237
 Parsons, T., 387
 Paton, A., 452, 453, 485
 Paul, A., 335, 346
 Pavlin, F., 132, 151–4, 157, 285
 Pavlin, H. (née Friday), 151, 153, 154
 Payne, W., 457
 Pearce, D., 52
 Pearce, E., 354
 Pennington, E., 349, 350, 351, 352–3, 359
 Perkins, C., 297
 Perrott, J. (née Brooker), 281, 283, 284, 285, 286, 293, 294
 Picton, C., 180
 Pincus, A., 92
 Plamenatz, J., 385–6
 Poverty Inquiry (Henderson), 304, 343–6
Proceedings of the First Konopka Lectureships: On the Occasion of Gisela Konopka's Retirement from the University of Minnesota (Konopka), 428
 Purcell family, 11, 12, 13

Q

- Quirk, P., 457

R

- Ramsay, A. M., 318
 Rankin, G., 353, 355
 Rapaport, L., 35
 Raper, M., 364
 Rathbone, R., 278, 451, 453, 483, 485
 Reed, Mrs, 452
 Rees, S., 120
 Regan, S., 132, 244
 Reid, J., 366, 367
 Reilly, L., 49, 155
 Rennison, A., 33, 90, 132
 Rice, D., 398
 Rice, P., 441
 Richmond, M., 135
 Roberts, P., 34, 449, 465, 466–8, 475, 477, 483, 486
 Roberts, R., 191, 197–200
 Robinson, F., 237, 238–9
 Rosenblum family, 11–12
 Rowe, T., 451, 452, 455, 456

- Royal Hospital for Women. *see* Benevolent Society of New South Wales
 Rudd, K., 302
 Rundle, F., 287, 288, 292, 452
 Ryan, H., 34–5

S

- Saint, E., 144
 Samuels, G., 38, 127–8, 297
 Sarri, Rom, 230–1
 Sarri, Rosemary, 119, 147, 218, 219, 227–31, 232, 233–4, 235, 237, 238, 239, 240, 242, 243, 244, 245
 Sax, S., 33, 202, 398
 Saxby, H., 287
 Sayer, J., 398
 Scarba Family Centre. *see* Benevolent Society of New South Wales
 Scarba House for Children. *see* Benevolent Society of New South Wales
 Scarr, J., 252
 Schlosser, M., 133, 162
 School of Social Work (UNSW)
 1979–84, 109–28
 Bachelor of Social Work (BSW)
 1971–82, 89–102, 110
 existing, 77–82
 field program revision, 82–3
 revised, 82
 revised 1970, 84–9
 staffing implications, 83–4
 becoming a faculty, 39
 colleagues in the School, 131–211
 community work teachers, 156–7
 death of Yvonne Nadas, 120–1
 field education staff, 172
 graduate statistics (1968–1982), 77
 graduations, 127–8
 Master of Social Work (MSW)
 course work, 103–9, 127
 research, 102–3, 127
 'Policies and Procedures' handbook, 114–15
 postgraduate qualifications, 102, 127
 research teachers, 166
 staff appointments
 1969–82, 131–4
 processes, 134
 staff qualifications, 135
 student unrest (1980), 120
 Schottland, C., 359
 Scott, D., 303, 346, 347, 349–50, 351, 352–3, 354, 357, 359, 362, 363
 Scotton, R. B., 259, 318

Selle, H., 270
 Sharp, G., 265, 266
 Shaw, B., 392
 Shaw, J., 164
 Shelton, H., 359, 362
 Shipp, G., 335
 Siddle, M., 465
 Skolnick, A., 408–10
 Smith, H., 152, 318
 Smith, S., 404
 Smith, S. 'Mum Shirl', 298, 301
Smith Report, 327
 Smith School of Social Work, USA, 35
 social history, writing, 278–80
Social Security in Australia 1900–72 (Kewley), 303
 Social Welfare Commission. *see* Australian Social Welfare Commission
 social welfare education, 51, 52. *see also* Joint Committee on Social Welfare Education; social work education
 attempts to establish national council, 58–60
 social welfare manpower (1973–75), 62
Social Welfare: Values, Means and Ends (Howard), 64–5
 social work education, 51–2, 53
 AASW professional standards, 53–8
 attempts to establish national council, 58–60
 expansion (1964–75), 61
 international surveys (1950–74), 77–8
 postgraduate qualifications, 102
 social workers
 shortage (1970s), 110–11
 state registration, 60–1
 Sorrell, D., 303
 Spalding, B., 354
 Speedy, Dr, 424, 425
 Spencer, S., 439
 Spigelman, J., 318, 335
 Splane, R., 154
 Steigrad, J., 33
 Stephenson, M. O., 346, 354
 Stevenson, B., 132, 173–4, 191, 465
 Stewart, K., 442, 448, 449
 Stockbridge, T., 181
 Stoller, A., 367
 Strauss, A., 380, 381, 386–7
 Stretton, H., 269, 273
 Stubbings, L., 358, 359
 Suggang, B., 187, 455, 456
 Sullivan, M., 359
 Szekeres, E. and G., 44

T

Tankard, R., 457
 Tarail, T., 161–3, 164, 165
 Taylor, F., 477
 Taylor, G., 417–18
 Taylor, J. E., 133
 Taylor, L., 440
 tertiary educational sector (1950s–1960s), 52–3
 Thomas, E., 35, 221
 Thomas, P., 132, 169–70
 Thornton, J., 38
 Thorp, G. M., 451
 Throssell, H., 33, 366
Through a Glass Darkly (Baume report), 242
 Tierney, L., 27, 31–2, 57, 59, 136, 138, 139, 151, 221, 225, 226, 228, 230, 245, 318, 366
 Timms, N., 135, 179, 181
 Tonkin, J. E., 318
 Toohey, J., 132, 133, 162, 163–4
 Travers, P., 363, 364, 439
 Tregenza, J., 279
 Troy, P. N., 265, 277, 318
 Tuckwell, Mr, 285
 Turner, C., 387, 390

U

University of Michigan
 School of Social Work, student unrest (1969), 119
 University of New South Wales (UNSW), 26. *see also* School of Social Work (UNSW)
 Board of Vocational Studies, 26, 27, 39, 78, 81, 102, 103, 138
 Department of Social Work, 26–7, 30–1 (*see also* School of Social Work (UNSW))
 disciplines, 39–40
 Faculty of Professional Studies, 39, 42, 127, 197
 history, 37–8
 student politics and unrest, 38, 42–4
 Tharunka, 38, 43, 120
 Unisearch Ltd, 37
 vice-chancellors, 41–2, 122
 University of Sydney
 Department of Social Work, student unrest (1976–77), 119–20
 Urban Research Unit. *see* Australian National University (ANU)
 Uren, T., 276, 277

V

- value of social work
 1930s, 69–71
 1960s, 71–4
 1968 case, 67–8, 74
 Vaughan, G., 440
 Vinson, T., 26, 95, 122, 127, 131, 132, 154,
 157, 161, 164, 193–7, 209, 384, 449,
 475–6
 Vinter, R. ‘Bob’, 27, 28, 119, 218, 219, 221
 Voigt, L., 457
 Vowels, R., 122, 287, 288, 292, 294

W

- Walker, F., 449
 Walsh, R. J., 452, 453, 476, 477
 Ward, Elizabeth ‘Beth’, 34, 50, 304, 335
 Warham, J., 438
 Watson, P., 457
 Watts, Professor, 426
 Weatherall, F., 252
 Webb, E., 155
 Webster, R., 226
 Weir, H., 346, 439
 Wentworth, W. C. ‘Bill’, 148, 298
 Western, J., 318
 Wheaton, A., 54
 White, Mr, 453
 Whitlam, E. G., 23, 24, 143, 258, 266, 276
 Whitlam, M., 24
 Whitlam government. *see also* Australian
 Assistance Plan (AAP); Australian Social
 Welfare Commission
 economic issues, 350
 Henderson Poverty inquiry, 304, 343–6
 impact on social democracy, 23–4
 key initiatives, 60, 143, 300, 347, 348, 398
 social research, 168, 403
 urban planning, 276–7
 Whitmore family, 7, 8, 10
 Whittaker, E., 389–90
 Wilensky, H., 320, 379
Wilful Obstruction (Vinson), 195
 Willard, J., 215
 Williams, C. J., 132
 Williams, G., 296, 297, 298
 Williams, T., 297–8
 Willis, A. H., 27, 29, 38, 39, 40–1, 138, 162,
 164, 175, 211, 218, 224, 229
 Wilson, J., 132, 133, 171, 174
 Wilson, W.B., 68, 74
 Winston, J., 237
 Wood, J., 33
 Wootten, H., 295–6, 297, 298, 301

- work value case for social workers (1968–
 69), 67–8, 74
 historical documentation, 69–74
 Wright, D., 35
 Wryell, M., 142, 146, 147, 148, 155, 196,
 218, 229
 Wyman, K., 51

Y

- Yates, I., 353, 354, 355, 357, 359, 363, 364
 Young, C., 407
 Young, M., 457, 458
 Young, P., 167
 Young, R. W., 346
 Youngusband, E., 78

Z

- Zulfacar, D. (née Wright), 132, 133, 172, 206

This volume covers the main professional activities of the author within Australia after taking up the chair of social work in late 1968. In the initial period to the mid-1970s, social institutions were being challenged to justify their existence. It was a turbulent time - especially for those heading university schools and professional bodies avowing social concerns. Cutbacks, pessimism and disillusion followed the frenetic Whitlam years. In addition to developing a social work school in this environment, the author was engaged professionally in a variety of community activities, such as with the Australian Council of Social Service, the Benevolent Society of NSW, the Aboriginal Legal Service, the Australian Council of Rehabilitation of Disabled, the International Year of the Child, and Australia's first child abuse inquiry in 1982. Key papers reflect the author's thinking and work on professions, on social work and social welfare generally, and in particular fields.



John Lawrence has taught social policy for thirty years, taking a special interest in the ethical justification of policy and professional intervention. He is a graduate of the Universities of Adelaide and Oxford, and the Australian National University. Australia's first Professor of Social Work, he headed the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales for fourteen years, chaired the University's Faculty of Professional Studies, was a member of the University Council, and was directly involved in the development of its Social Policy Research Centre, a national centre directly funded by the Australian Government. A former federal president and life member of the Australian Association of Social Workers, he served on its National Ethics Committee. For eight years, he was an elected member of the Executive Board of the International Association of Schools of Social Work. He has had membership of the governing bodies of community agencies, including a vice-presidency of ACOSS (Australian Council of Social Service). He is a firm advocate of international experience, and has spent almost seven years away from his native Australia, studying, researching, teaching and acting as a consultant in England, the United States, Canada, Thailand and Sweden. This has been assisted by various awards – a Rhodes Scholarship, Fulbright senior awards, the Moses Distinguished Professorship at Hunter College in New York, and a Canadian Commonwealth Fellowship – and university study leave and exchange arrangements. He is a member of the Order of Australia.