

SEEKING SOCIAL GOOD: A LIFE WORTH LIVING

An Autobiography in 6 Volumes



JOHN LAWRENCE

Volume 5

**WORKING WITH
INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

**WORKING WITH
INTERNATIONAL
ORGANISATIONS**

WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Volume 5 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 book 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 978-0-9953949-0-2

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 5. Working with International Organisations / John Lawrence.

ISBN: 9780995394902 (ebook: volume 5)

Notes: Includes index.

Subjects: Lawrence, R. J. (Robert John), 1931–
Social workers—Australia—Biography.
Social work—International cooperation.
International Council on Social Welfare
Rehabilitation International (RI Global)
International Association of Schools of Social Work.
International Federation on Ageing.
United Nations. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.
UNICEF.
Social service consultants.
International Social Work Journal.
Ethics.

*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	A Global Social Welfare Organisation – ICSW	5
Chapter 2	ICSW World Conference 1970 – Manila	11
Chapter 3	World Rehabilitation Congress 1972 Sydney	35
Chapter 4	Program Planning, ICSW World Conference 1972 – The Hague	73
Chapter 5	Objectives of ICSW Conferences, 1973	77
Chapter 6	ECAFE/UNICEF Consultancy, Bangkok October – December 1972	87
Chapter 7	Social Welfare and Development Centre for Asia and the Pacific (SWDCAP)	115
Chapter 8	International Association of Schools of Social Work 1970–78	131
Chapter 9	ICSW 50th Anniversary Monograph	167
Chapter 10	50th Anniversary World Meetings 1978 Jerusalem	179
	10.1 Sight-Seeing and Social Occasions	179
	10.2 IASSW Board	184
	10.3 19 th International Congress of Schools of Social Work, 14–17 August, 1978	186
	10.4 ICSW 19 th International Conference on Social Welfare, 20–27 August, 1978	199
	10.5 International Federation on Ageing	203

Chapter 11	Regional Joint Seminar, Melbourne 1979	211
Chapter 12	IASSW 1979	223
12.1	Planning the Hong Kong 1980 Congress	223
12.2	Significant Issues	226
Chapter 13	AASWE Membership of the IASSW?	231
Chapter 14	IASSW Advisory Committee on Discrimination in Member Schools	233
Chapter 15	World Meetings 1980 – Hong Kong	241
15.1	20 th International Conference on Social Welfare 16–22 July, 1980	244
15.2	IASSW Board of Directors	252
15.3	20 th International Congress of Schools of Social Work 23–26 July, 1980	255
Chapter 16	IASSW – Revised Fees, Pressing Issues	265
Chapter 17	Equivalency of Qualifications Across National Borders	271
Chapter 18	Mistaken Nomination For IASSW Vice- Presidency	281
Chapter 19	World Meetings 1982 – Brighton	283
19.1	Inter-University Consortium for International Social Development	283
19.2	21 st International Congress of Schools of Social Work, 23–27 August, 1982	287
19.3	My Final Board Meetings	290
19.4	21 st International Conference on Social Welfare	295
Chapter 20	A Challenging Assignment	305
Chapter 21	First Visit to Ireland, 4–8 July, 1984	309
Chapter 22	Oxford – Family Matters 8–21 July, 1984	315
Chapter 23	IASSW/Hunter College International Seminar – New York 21–27 July, 1984	319

Chapter 24 World Congress 1984 – Montreal	333
24.1 22 nd International Congress of the Schools of Social Work, 31 July-4 August, 1984	335
24.2 Younghusband Memorial Lecture	338
Chapter 25 World Meetings 1986 – Tokyo	361
Chapter 26 Nomination For IASSW Presidency 1988–92?	369
Chapter 27 The Social Work World Meetings 1988	377
27.1 24 th International Congress of Schools of Social Work – Vienna	377
27.2 10 th International IFSW Symposium Stockholm	380
Chapter 28 Nomination for IASSW Presidency 1992–94?	389
Chapter 29 The 1994 Katherine Kendall Award Selection Process	393
Chapter 30 <i>International Social Work</i> – A Joint Journal	401
Chapter 31 Designated ‘A Faithful Angel’	415
Index	423

Preface

Previous volumes concentrated on periods I spent on sabbatical leave and other extended times working and living in other countries while located in overseas universities – at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor (1967), at York University in England (1974), Rutgers University at New Brunswick, in New Jersey, USA, and at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, USA (1983), at Hunter College, City University of New York, USA (1987-88), and at Wilfrid Laurier University, in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, and Stockholm University, Sweden (1990). This was obviously an important part of my whole working life, and was integral to the pursuit of my dual interests in social work education and social policy. Parallel with these particular international work commitments was experience in working with the two bodies centrally concerned internationally with my two prime interests - the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IAASW), and the International Council on Social Welfare (ICSW). In addition was occasional work with other more specialised international bodies like Rehabilitation International (RI), ECAFE/UNICEF, SWDCAP and the International Federation on the Ageing (IFA).

Working with International Organisations

In summary, my main involvements internationally, additional to the living and working overseas, consisted of the following:

- chairman, pre-conference working party, 15th International Conference on Social Welfare (ICSW), Manila, 1970
- chairman and chairman of the planning committee, international seminar on 'Social planning for the physically and mentally disabled', Brisbane, August 1972
- member, Social Commission of Rehabilitation International, 1971-73
- member, council of the 12th World Rehabilitation Congress, Sydney, August, 1972
- consultant and chief rapporteur, ECAFE/UNICEF seminar on developmental aspects of social work curricula, Bangkok, 14-25 November, 1972; October to December 1972

- overseas editorial adviser, *Journal of Social Policy*, London, 1972-81
- member, ICSW committee on objectives of international conferences, 1973
- participant, experts' preparatory workshop on the workplan of the Asian Centre for Training and Research in Social Welfare Development, Manila, February 18-25, 1974
- making an invited contribution to the 50th anniversary monograph of ICSW
- International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW)
 - member, Executive Board, 1974-82
 - member, Steering Committee, 1978 Anniversary Congress Program, 1975-78
 - member, Program Committees, 20th and 22nd International Congresses, 1979-80, 1982-84
 - chairperson, Candidate Selection Committee for Katherine Kendall Award, 1994

I was convinced that social work education and social welfare activities needed to be understood and developed at all levels of social organisation and society, not just locally and nationally, but also regionally and increasingly globally. Both intellectually and practically it was inevitable that I should become engaged in work at each of these levels, including the international.

Chapter 1

A Global Social Welfare Organisation – ICSW

A booklet on the historical development of the International Council on Social Welfare (ICSW) up to 1975 described it as the ‘only international organization concerned with all aspects of social welfare’ since its birth in 1928.¹

It was founded in response to a long felt need for an international forum in which all those concerned with human need could meet, exchange information and learn from each other. During the latter half of the 19th century and early 20th centuries a number of international voluntary organizations serving particular aspects of health and welfare organizations had sprung up in Europe. Working with them, and with national welfare organizations on both sides of the Atlantic, Dr Rene Sand of Belgium, who during its first quarter was to inspire the growth of ICSW, was instrumental in bringing about its establishment and first meeting, in Paris, in July of 1928.

ICSW began life as the International Conference of Social Work: its purpose was the holding of international conferences. For some years it was essentially a North Atlantic organization, despite some membership from other regions. ...

In the post second world war years it participated in the sweep around the world of professional social work with the deep moral commitment it created, and the scepticism that arose to meet it in some quarters for its intellectual and ideological underpinnings.

In the wake of this growth ICSW found a rapid acceptance in many countries, and, absorbing from their differing cultures, goals, ways of life and problems, began to reach into the whole range of activity affecting human welfare, that led to its reorganization as the International Council on Social Welfare in 1966, a Council that could foster and assist human welfare as well as discuss it.²

The booklet mentioned that a number of forces, often loosened by

-
- 1 *The International Council on Social Welfare – Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: A Short History*, International Council of Social Welfare, New York, 1975, pp. 34. A Canadian, John Macdonald, had major responsibility for writing this booklet during his assignment as program consultant at ICSW headquarters in New York.
 - 2 *International Council on Social Welfare*, 1975, pp.1–2.

development, combined to call for 'new social emphasis that would deeply mark ICSW':

- Growth of consciousness of one world society with its interdependent need to exchange knowledge, its dependence on common institutions ranging from transport and communication to international organisations, and on the resources of a finite earth;
- The proliferation of populations, which in many countries intensified the burden of reaching acceptable standards of living; slow growing consciousness of a massive poverty in many countries;
- The absolute poverty in which great masses of the world's population still lived, despite a quarter of a century of development;
- Growing disparity in wealth between rich and poor countries, as well as between the rich and poor in countries;
- The many failures of the international aid apparatus and especially failure to achieve effective social inputs into it, and slowness in achieving a truly integrated, participatory development policy responsive to third world aspirations;
- Realisation that effective participation by people in developing the services they needed was necessary not only as a means but as a goal of development;
- Lingering shadows of colonialism and racial discrimination reflected in third world problems;
- Questioning whether human welfare could longer be served by a professional and middle class welfare apparatus, the transfer of middle class values, and development based on middle class economic needs;
- The sudden and urgent awareness of the new impact of man on his environment in the industrialised countries, environmental resistance to development in all countries, requiring change in attitudes and goals.

This 'appallingly complex and philosophical turmoil' had marked the lifetime of ICSW. 'However, it has been consistent in the steady deepening and broadening of its social concepts, and the welcome it extends to all the many groups from which its membership is drawn'.³

The booklet described the ICSW as enabling 'people of all kinds, in all parts of the world, to work together for the whole spectrum of ideals involved in human welfare. It is organized through National Committees in many countries, an international head office and regional offices covering all continents.' Its best known activity remained the international, regional and national conferences it held in all parts of the world. These provided 'a unique forum, in which people with widely varied experience, from many countries and cultures can meet in a non-institutional, non-political environment and, as private individuals, learn and impart learning'. Conferences were built around a central theme of international interest. Speakers with experience of international interest addressed it, and through commissions, exchange and special groups,

3 *International Council on Social Welfare*, 1975, pp. 2–3.

round table and informal meetings participants were given the opportunity to discuss matters of special interest to them. National Committees submitted reports on conditions in their country relating to the Conference theme. These were studied by a Conference Working Party which reported to the membership on their content. Special country exhibits and films, study tours and other visits were provided. In addition to conference-related activities, ICSW was engaged in fostering many kinds of social welfare activity, including having consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council and the UN Childrens Fund, and to FAO, ILO, UNESCO, WHO, the Council of Europe and the Organisation of American States.

The main strength and inspiration of ICSW spring from its roots in the close to eighty member countries and twenty international member organisations that contribute from their experience to its work.

It is ultimately on this structure, based on the National Committee that ICSW rests. Its strength depends directly on the strength of its National Committees and on the comprehensiveness and immersion in the mainstream of their countries' welfare.⁴

Under its new constitution, implemented in 1967 when it changed its name from International Conference of Social Work to International Council on Social Welfare, its purposes were:

- to provide a world-wide forum for the discussion of social welfare and related issues;
- to foster the development of social welfare throughout the world
- to promote the exchange of information and experience among social workers, social agencies and others interested in social welfare throughout the world;
- to facilitate and promote cooperation among international organizations related to the field of social welfare.⁵

By 1985, membership of ICSW had expanded to 85 national committees and more than 25 international organisations. Its international conferences had a heightened importance because no specialised intergovernmental agency for social welfare existed.⁶

ICSW CONFERENCES

After its founding in 1928, ICSW held international conferences at Frankfurt-Am-Main (1932) – theme, Social Science and the Family, and at London (1936) – theme, Social Work and the Community. A conference in Prague in 1940 was planned but was never held. After its post-war rebirth, its international conferences were held at Atlantic City and New York (1948) – theme,

4 *International Council on Social Welfare*, 1975, pp. 26–7.

5 The new ICSW constitution is printed as an appendix in *International Council on Social Welfare*, 1975.

6 Dorothy Lally, 'International Social Welfare Organizations and Services', *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, 17th Edition, Vol. 1, 1987, pp. 969–986.

Social Work and the United Nations; Paris (1950) – theme, Social Work in 1950 – its Boundaries and its Consequences; Madras (1952) – theme, the Role of Social Work in Raising Standards of Living; Toronto (1954) – theme, Promoting Social Welfare through Self-Help and Cooperative Action; Munich (1956) – theme, Industrialisation and Social Work; Tokyo (1958) – theme, Social Work in a Changing World;⁷ and Rome (1961). The booklet on ICSW's history provided a brief account of the main concerns of each of the conferences. By 1961, participants came from 64 countries. Change was in sharp focus. 'Questions were raised as to the extent that social work was really involved in social change, and how much it was actually able to pioneer and modify conditions of human welfare. ... An essential dialogue within ICSW was of reconciliation between the broad view of social welfare and the traditional far narrower functions in which social workers were largely employed.'⁸ The widespread social questioning and turmoil of the 1960s was inevitably reflected in the ICSW conferences of the period. The 1962 conference at Rio de Janeiro – theme, Rural and Community Development, marked the first significant involvement of Latin Americans. At the Athens conference in 1964 – theme, Social Progress through Social Planning, it was suggested the purpose of ICSW should be redefined 'with particular reference to fostering social welfare, attaining a greater capacity for action and a clearer identity, strengthening the role of National Committees'.⁹ The 1966 conference in Washington – theme, Urban Development – Implications for Social Welfare, highlighted that urbanisation was outdistancing the economic, social and physical resources required to service it. At this conference, a new name, constitution, terms of reference and goals were adopted for ICSW. The Helsinki conference theme (1968) was Social Welfare and Human Rights, indicating the extended scope of ICSW concerns. At the Helsinki meeting, Kate Katzki was appointed secretary-general and Charles Schottland was elected president.

During the 1960s, as a social policy teacher and researcher, a social work and social welfare historian, and as an active member of ACOSS which served as the Australian National Committee for ICSW, I was very much aware of the ICSW international conferences and the associated professional conferences of the IASSW and the IFSW. From being just a very interested observer, I was just about to become a participant throughout the 1970s and 1980s in at least some of the activities of these organisations. What follows is an account of my various involvements in the course of this period.

7 For the first time, a Preconference Working Party met and National Reports were instituted.

8 *International Council on Social Welfare*, 1975, p. 15.

9 *International Council on Social Welfare*, 1975, p. 17.

Chapter 2

ICSW World Conference 1970 – Manila

Chairman, Pre-Conference Working Party

In October, 1969, I was invited by ICSW president Charles Schottland to serve as the chairman of the Pre-Conference Working Party for the 15th Conference in Manila:

As you can imagine, for this type of group, we want a person with broad knowledge in the international field, but also a person who can lead discussion and help the Working Party members come to constructive conclusions. It was agreed at the ICSW Executive Committee meetings in Dijon that with your social welfare experience and your admirable personal qualities, you have the qualifications to handle such a responsibility. ... All of us are convinced that you would make a genuine contribution to the Pre-Conference Working Party and, in this way, to the success of the Conference itself. On the basis of my personal participation in previous groups, I can assure you that you would find the experience a challenging and satisfying one.¹⁰

On 24 November, 1969, I wrote to the Kate Katzki, secretary-general of ICSW:

Your letter of November 7 was most helpful in putting my mind at rest concerning the possibility of an Asian Chairman of the Pre-Conference Working Party.¹¹ I now accept the task and will do all I can to make productive the work of this multi-national group. You may anticipate my presence in Manila from August 23 until the end of the Conference on September 12.¹²

10 Letter, Charles I. Schottland to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 24/10/69.

11 I was keenly aware that being an Australian, albeit with some international experience in Britain and North America and academic knowledge of the social welfare systems of various other countries, my appointment would be seen as yet another example of European cultural dominance – a major part of the problem to be addressed at the conference. Certainly geographically Australia was in the Asian and Pacific region, but its dominant culture was still European-oriented, reflecting the European origins of most of its population. Australians at that time would never describe themselves as Asians.

12 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Kate Katzki, 24/11/69.

Schottland was right. The experience was certainly challenging, and it also proved to be ultimately satisfying – for the reasonably good report we managed to produce for the conference under very difficult circumstances, for the good-will and dedicated work which produced it, and for meeting the professional challenge the task involved. For me it was an extraordinary practical initiation into responsibility to contribute to global social welfare discussion and action by the diversity of people and cultures of our world. Schottland described our task in these terms:

Prior to each of our Conferences, there has been held a week-long meeting of a Working Party to prepare a Conference document reflecting the best possible thinking about the state of social welfare throughout the world and about emerging issues on which the ICSW and its members should be active in the immediate future. The Working Party, which in 1970 will be held in the Philippines from 24 to 30 August, is composed of one member named by each National Committee and international organizations in membership, plus representatives from inter-governmental organizations. These delegates are free to bring into their deliberations the substance of their respective National Committees' Reports or of other such Reports, but the Working Party will not be limited to issues raised in these reports.

The theme of the 1970 Conference is: **NEW STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT – ROLE OF SOCIAL WELFARE**. Special attention will be focused on **INNOVATIONS** – new or changed practices, new forms of organizations, and new policies, or, older practices, organizations and policies adapted to new situations to which they were not previously applied.¹³

On 19 January, 1970, Schottland invited national committees, international member organisations, and intergovernmental organisations, to select their representatives on the working party. The subject of the conference 'will need the best thinking we can bring to it at the international level'. Those participating in the working party should be carefully chosen for their knowledge and analytic thinking, and have these qualifications – familiarity with problems regarding new social welfare strategies in their own country or their own organisation; familiarity with their own country's national report (if they were representing national committees); inclination to study the national reports of other countries, distributed to them in advance; willingness to participate in the working party from the beginning to the end; and ability to understand English well enough to follow discussion.¹⁴ Two rapporteurs – for English – and French – would assist the chairman in the final formulation of the report. It was suggested that, wherever possible, members appointed should not have participated in two or more past working parties, although a certain amount of continuity among members was desirable. 'This is a stimulating intellectual experience which should not be limited indefinitely to the same individuals'.¹⁵

13 Letter, Charles I. Schottland to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 24/10/69.

14 Interpretation would be provided for members who wished to speak French, but the working party would have to be conducted mainly in English, for technical reasons and to assure 'direct and informal exchange of opinion'.

15 Letter, Charles I. Schottland to ICSW national committees and international member-organisations, 19/1/70.

Kate Katzki enclosed this letter when she wrote to me on 29 January together with a memorandum sent to national committees concerning the pre-conference working party, commissions and exchange groups. She could not yet give me the name of a vice-chairman and had written to Mr Gokhale the ICSW regional executive officer for suggestions. Did I know someone from Asia who would be suitable? She was happy to advise me that Morris Fox, a UN expert currently in Indonesia, had accepted to be English language rapporteur. He was an American citizen with considerable international experience, an analytically thinking person ('I don't mean psychoanalysis) and an excellent writer.¹⁶ Morris Fox sounded a most suitable rapporteur and I thought Mr Gokhale should know the possible field for a vice-chairman.¹⁷

ACOSS served as the ICSW national committee in Australia. As already indicated, I had been strongly associated with ACOSS for some years and currently chaired its international committee. The ACOSS executive was 'extremely pleased' to hear of my invitation to chair the Pre-Conference Working Party and was 'most desirous' that I should accept it. It agreed to meet my travel, accommodation and registration for attendance at Manila, and saw this as a very appropriate use of funds allocated by the Commonwealth government for ACOSS's international activities.¹⁸

On 16 April, Kate Katzki sent suggestions on how we might proceed and enclosed a possible time schedule and structure for the Pre-conference Working Party for my consideration, based on previous experience.¹⁹ Could I prepare a discussion outline for distribution? It was best not to follow the outline of national reports or the topics of the commissions, to avoid the danger of doing the work of the commissions in advance. She enclosed a copy of a memorandum she was about to send to members of the Pre-Conference Working Party to assist them in making their plans. The working party would be held at the Sulo Hotel in Quezon City, Philippines, a suburb of Manila. Members should plan to arrive in Manila on Sunday, 23 August. As chairman of the working party, I would prepare a memorandum outlining the proposed plan of work for the group and this would be distributed in advance. The vice-chairman would be P. D. Kulkarni,²⁰ the rapporteur Morris Fox,²¹ and the French language rapporteur Miss Monique Esnard.²² The preliminary program for the Manila conference was enclosed. National reports would be sent as they were received. 'We expect that you are fully acquainted with the contents of the report prepared by your own National Committee. While this is important resource material for the Working Party, we feel that your knowledge,

16 Letter, Kate Katzki to R. J. Lawrence, 29/1/70.

17 Letter, John Lawrence to Kate Katzki, 5/2/70.

18 Letter, Hope Clayton to R. J. Lawrence, 5/3/70.

19 Letter, Kate Katzki to R. J. Lawrence, 16/4/70.

20 Regional social development adviser, social development division, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, UN Bangkok, Thailand.

21 UNDP Indonesia.

22 Assistant director, Health and Social Service Bureau, League of Red Cross Societies (a world federation), Geneva, Switzerland.

experience and thoughts are just as important.²³

Having now made definite bookings, on 10 June, I sent Kate Katzki my program as I then understood it. I would be flying to Singapore on Tuesday, 18 August and staying with Mr J. M. Gordon, 13 Napier Road, Singapore. (Trish would be with me and would continue staying with Anne and Murray Gordon and their family while I was in Manila. Murray Gordon, an ABC executive, was now working there for a period.) I would arrive in Manila on 22 August and that afternoon would have a discussion at the Sulo Hotel, Quezon City, with Kate Katzki about arrangements for the Pre-Conference Working Party. In the afternoon on Sunday, 23 August, I would welcome members of the working party and there would be an informal reception in the evening. The working party would meet as scheduled, 23 August until 12.30pm on Sunday, 30 August. I would move to the Manila Hotel in the afternoon of 30 August to stay until 12 September. I was registered for the XVth Congress of IASSW, Monday, 31 August to Wednesday, 2 September. (I had, however, declined an invitation by Joan Eyden, the chair of the program committee, to participate in a panel discussion on 31 August, in case I was still needed in connection with the working party report.) I was registered for the ICSW Conference, Sunday, 6 September to 12 September and would make a presentation on the working party's report to the plenary session on 7 September. I would leave Manila at 10.30pm on 12 September, and arrive at Sydney airport at 8.30am the next morning.²⁴

After heavy involvement in national conferences of the Association of Teachers of Schools of Social Work in Australia, and of ACOSS where I presented the opening plenary paper, by the second week in June I could concentrate on the Manila assignment, but national reports were slow to arrive. In mid-July, I sent my suggested discussion framework to Kate Katzki for distribution to the working party members and sent it direct to Morris Fox, Monique Esnard and P. D. Kulkarni, whom I thought should be invited to chair one of the discussion groups.²⁵ I wrote to Morris Fox:

I am delighted that we will have as our main Rapporteur, a person with your international experience ... In view of our respective roles, I thought you might appreciate the chance of getting to know something of my thought processes as revealed in 3 of my recent papers to very different audiences.²⁶

... It would be a sensible idea if you could bring to the Working Party a draft Introduction of the Working Party Report. I had to prepare the Preamble of the enclosed Memorandum in order to provide the Working Party with a beginning framework, but in its preparation I partly had in mind the Introduction of the

23 Kate Katzski, 'Plans for the Pre-Conference Working Party', Memorandum to members of the Pre-Conference Working Party, 17/4/70.

24 Letter, R.J. Lawrence to Kate Katzki, 10/6/70.

25 I thought he should have a significant active role as vice-chairman, as well as being a valuable consultant for the chairman.

26 'Philosophy of Social Welfare in the 1970s', the opening paper at the 1970 ACOSS national conference; 'Service to People in the 1970s'; a plenary paper for a national medical conference in Perth, 1970; and 'The Consumer Perspective in Social Welfare', the first Norma Parker address at the AASW national conference in Hobart, 1969. I sent copies of these by airmail under separate cover.

Report. In preparing your draft Introduction you might, therefore, like to use the Preamble, with any additions and amendments which you wish to make. Once you have a draft Introduction it would be useful to share it with Miss Esnard, the French language Rapporteur, before handing it to me just prior to our meetings.

The national reports and other material we are meant to have digested are coming through rather late, I am afraid. Fortunately we will not be tied to them alone in our discussions. ...²⁷

Morris Fox thanked me for my letter and ‘the very interesting and informative papers you enclosed.’

They contained much useful background information and certainly helped me think through some of the issues we will be considering at the Pre-Conference Working Party. I think the ‘Preamble’ is most helpful and can serve as a basis for the preamble to the report.

I am looking forward to meeting you and working with you at the Conference.²⁸

Miss Esnard appreciated receiving directly my suggested framework for discussion and was convinced that under my chairmanship the working party ‘will achieve a considerable amount of work in the short time available’. However, due to ‘family circumstances’ she was no longer able to attend the Manila conference. She hoped Mrs Katzki had been successful in finding another French language rapporteur for the working party.²⁹

Vice-president of the working party, P. D. Kulkarni, accepted my proposal for him to act as chairman of sub-group 1. He had read my preamble on the conference theme and found it ‘an adequate basis for a good discussion at the Pre-Conference Working Party’.³⁰

My memorandum to members of the working party on a suggested discussion framework took this form:

Conference Theme: NEW STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT – ROLE OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Preamble

The wording of the Conference theme immediately raises a number of questions. What is understood by the concept ‘social development’? What are the possible referents of ‘strategy’, and what constitutes a *new* strategy as relating to social development? What comes under ‘social welfare’, and how does this relate to strategies of social development?

‘**Social development**’. Whether we are talking in a large or a small context, this concept in some way refers to:

1. *people* in relationship to each other, or *social systems* through which people

²⁷ Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Morris Fox, 14/7/70.

²⁸ Letter, Morris Fox to R. J. Lawrence, 15/8/70.

²⁹ Letter, Monique Esnard to R. J. Lawrence, 29/7/70. In the event, we had to proceed without the benefit of a French rapporteur in the working party. This was obviously unfortunate, not least because both French and English were the two official languages of the ICSW.

³⁰ Letter, P. D. Kulkarni to R. J. Lawrence, 4/8/70.

interact with each other in relatively ordered fashion for purposes which can be specified, and

2. *changes* in these social relations or systems in directions judged, on balance, to be 'improvement' or 'advancement' or 'development' in terms of valued criteria. Such changes (a) may occur without having been consciously directed, or (b) may have been influenced in varying degrees by deliberate planning. (Planned action in social affairs often, of course, has unintended as well as intended consequences, which means the planner's social development calculus frequently needs revision along the way if the resulting changes are to be judged, on balance, as 'development'.)

Social affairs are never in fact static. Even in traditional societies, norms, values, and forms of social organization are continuously being shaped, at the very least, by the personalities and biological characteristics (longevity, etc.) of the occupants of the society's roles. This social change perspective as a feature of all societies emphasizes the need to specify what precisely is changing, at what pace and why? Questions about social development are, then, relevant for any human society viewed in a time perspective. They can, however, only be settled by reference to both facts and values.

The determination of which values are paramount in organized action for social development will depend on the culture under discussion and its political arrangements and processes.

'New Strategies' The word 'strategy' comes from the Greek word meaning 'general' and in its original military context it refers to 'the *science and art* of conducting a military campaign by the *combination and employment of means on a broad scale* for gaining *advantage in war*.' In the context of the Conference theme, 'strategies' refers to broadly organized action which is directed at achieving improved social conditions. Such action is concerned with continuing goal clarification and putting goals into operation through policies and programs – through dividing responsibility, structuring administrative arrangements, manpower decisions, and monitoring and evaluating results. (See Alfred J. Kahn, *Theory and Practice of Social Planning*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.)

The British Beveridge Report spoke of an 'attack' on five giant evils, Want, Disease, Ignorance, Squalor and Idleness, and recent leaders have talked about 'war' on poverty, and 'war' on racial discrimination. Use of this type of language implies the existence of a common important enemy that can only be defeated through considerable organized resources to this end. Whether the emphasis is on what is being fought against rather than for, the idea of strategy implies a degree of agreement on what is the goal, and the appropriateness and feasibility of broadly organized arrangements to attain this goal. What are the broad social goals which give justification, both moral and technical, for particular clusters of organized arrangements to be called 'strategies for social development'?

'Strategy' is sometimes used merely to mean 'skill in management', but to have meaning the activity must still be goal-directed. In other words, management is for some end. In the Conference context, the end is social change judged to be social development.

What is a *new strategy*? People who are social development-minded and

strategy-conscious are not likely to give special attention to innovation for its own sake. Their focus will be on the effectiveness and efficiency of the strategies used – always in terms of the goals being pursued and always, necessarily, in specific actual social environments. Under conditions of relatively rapid social change, it may be advisable to stress the construction of new strategies and the need for innovation within long-established ones, but an old strategy under changed circumstances may well be serving new goals and values, and, to the extent that this is explicit, this technically makes it a new strategy. We are involved here in means-ends choices and chains, a subject-area which may be made especially complicated under conditions of rapid social change. Recent interest by social scientists and social policy experts in the development of value analysis should assist to clarify what and whose interests are at stake in various possible social arrangements within cultures and across cultures. This type of analysis holds the key to clarifying the Conference theme of ‘new strategies for social development’.

‘Role of Social Welfare’. We are here referring 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. In practice, they have mainly concentrated upon achieving standards of at least minimum well-being for vulnerable social groups and have not been greatly involved in the development of optimum social conditions for their clients, let alone for the citizenry at large – although a social reform tradition is in their historical ideology.

If social development is essentially concerned with social conditions across society, what role can and should the social welfare institution play? What resources has it for a broader role? Can it realistically become engaged in large-scale social change? What value-consensus is there within itself to guide social development? Social welfare activity as defined here is undertaken under multiple auspices – at all levels of government and by numerous religious and secular bodies. How do and can these interrelate for social development purposes? Social welfare claims to be especially concerned with humanistic, humanitarian and moral perspectives on social development. Who else in society makes similar claims? Will ‘development’ be viewed merely within economic planning, physical planning, and other frameworks, which stop short of including within the framework the effects of change on people and their social relationships? Will the boundaries of social welfare need to be radically re-defined as all major social institutions become more socially aware? Are societies at similar stages of industrialization likely to share similar attitudes to the possible roles of social welfare, irrespective of other differences in culture?

I suggested that the working party should divide into four sub-groups, with each concentrating on discussion at a particular level of social organisation – international, national, sub-national (provincial, regional, city, local), and family. Bearing in mind the comments in the preamble, each would examine and report on – at its level of social organisation, and in the light of what had happened in the 1960s – social change in the 1970s, social development goals in the 1970s, strategies to attain these goals, anticipated impediments, anticipated assets, and social welfare’s possible roles. A possible structure for the final report was indicated.

Each member of the working party would be expected to be concerned with all sections of the final report. Only some of the time would be spent in the separate discussion sub-groups. All participants were asked to prepare themselves through reading and digesting within our proposed discussion framework, not only the national committee reports received and reports of the various international bodies, but *other relevant literature*.

Our task, according to the Conference programme, will be to:

- prepare a Conference document reflecting the best possible thinking about the state of social welfare throughout the world and about emerging issues on which the I.C.S.W. and its members should be active in the immediate future.

In his study of two earlier Conferences, David Smith refers to participants coming together because of 'a conviction about the worth of human beings that runs deeper than any of their individual or cultural differences'. This conviction, coupled with adequate preparation, should ensure that our Working Party will be stimulating and productive.

I am very much looking forward to sharing in the experience with you.³¹

The Working Party

The working party consisted of: R. J. Lawrence (Australia) chairman, P. D. Kulkarni (ECAFE) vice-chairman, Morris G. Fox (USA) rapporteur; representatives of national committees – Joan C. Brown (Australia), Helena Junqueira (Brazil),³² Richard B. Splane (Canada), Patrick P. C. Hu (China), Renate Langohr (Germany), Jesse Clements (Hong Kong), Kailish Chandra (India), Totaro Okada (Japan), Ellya Carola de Ruzo (Peru), Soledad Florendo and Tranquilino Capobres (Philippines), Carlos A. F. De Almeda (Portugal), Joan L. M. Eyden (United Kingdom), and Raleigh Hobson (USA); representatives of international non-governmental organisations – Joan Eyden (IASSW), Charlotte Floro (International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled), and Nancy Hulett (Salvation Army); observers – Aida Gindy (United Nations)³³ and George M. Emery (WHO); staff – Kate Katzki (ICSW) and Sharad D. Gokhale (ICSW).

Chaired by Petra R. de Joya, the Philippine committee for the working party consisted of 46 people in three sub-committees – arrangements and accommodation (13), reception and social activities (13), and printing and secretarial services (20).

At the plenary session where I presented highlights of our report, I said:

You will notice that at the end of the Pre-Conference Working Party's Report we have listed the members of the Philippine Committee who made all the arrangements and took care of us during our meetings. We have done this not as a polite gesture to our hosts, but out of deep-felt regard for their contribution.

31 John Lawrence, 'A suggested discussion framework for the Working Party', Memorandum to members of the Pre-Conference Working Party, XVth International Conference of Social Welfare, 1970.

32 An ICSW vice-president.

33 Chief, social welfare section, Social Development Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

... I can say without reservation that the meticulous and smiling around-the-clock service of the Secretariat was vital to the completion of the Working Party's assignment. ...

Sometimes convention demands that people say 'thank you' when they do not really mean it. This tends to worry me, for it depreciates our social relations currency. In the present instance, it is sheer pleasure to say thank you in the soundest currency of all – that is the currency of sincerity and honesty. To the extent that all Conference members gain some benefit from reading the Working Party's Report, I want you to be aware of the role this Philippine committee who supported us so ably. It would, however, be quite unfair to blame them if any of you don't like the outcome. They were, if you like, a necessary but not sufficient condition in the production of the Report.

Again, I would like to express a sincere personal thanks to my Vice-Chairman, P. D. Kulkarni, and to every member of the Working Party for their time and very real talents. The Party was only too aptly named – it was, indeed, a *working* party.

Incidentally, we began to weld together so well as a working group that very early our most able chief rapporteur, Morris Fox, began writing in our running record – 'Chairman Lawrence' and 'The Party'. We suddenly realized this might be misconstrued and hastily eliminated such language.³⁴

Highlights of the Pre-Conference Working Party's Report³⁵ – an Address to the First Plenary Session of the Conference³⁶

All Conference members have received the Report and we will be disappointed if you do not find the time to read it carefully. My remarks are no substitute for the original. We will not be disappointed if, in reading the Report, you are provoked and stimulated to think about its inadequacies for in the process you will be thinking about our Conference theme – New Strategies for Social Development – Role of Social Welfare.

We see our Report essentially as a rather rough working document to stimulate thought, discussion and problem solving. Thought and discussion not carried through to problem solving has its place in academia, but most of us involved in this Conference are not just trying to gain a better understanding of our societies and the changes occurring within and between them – important though this understanding is. We are not, in other words, merely neutral observers – a group of social scientists, recording and reporting on trends and causal relationships, trying to measure better what is happening, and making predictions and projections on the basis of carefully stated assumptions. (Actually, even if we were our neutrality would these days be in question, because of increasing awareness of value assumptions in social science activity.) We in this Conference are self-consciously 'doers', 'problem-solvers', 'practitioners', 'interveners', 'change agents'. As citizens, as parents, as administrators, as professional practitioners, as people performing

34 A hand-written record in my personal archives.

35 *NEW STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT – ROLE OF SOCIAL WELFARE*, Quezon City, Republic of the Philippines, August, 1970 – Report of the Pre-Conference Working Party to the XVth International Conference on Social Welfare of the International Council on Social Welfare.

36 A hand-written record in my personal archives.

a whole host of social roles, our future *actions* are implicated by our Conference theme and Conference discussions. It is our world, our lives that we are discussing.

We in the Working Party believe, in the words of our Report's Introduction, that 'the level of achievement of this Conference will not be measured by how much expertise is carried back home, but by the (subsequent) impact each participant makes on the social development around him'.

A relevant highlight to mention first before examining the Report's contents is the very existence of the Report. It was produced by a group of people who at the outset of their week-long meeting were in most cases strangers to each other drawn from the four corners of the earth. In advance, I had asked myself, 'How can such a group, tackling a vast topic, and meeting for such a brief period agree upon a final document?' I know now how our particular group managed to do it, and I think our experience is worth sharing briefly with you.

It was clear that members had not been randomly chosen by their countries or international organizations. Their experience was generally relevant to the task, and their capacity to see the wood for the trees was especially important with such a broad theme. We could, for example, have become bogged down in discussing definitions but very early agreed upon a series of working frameworks which allowed us to come to grips with substantive issues. Definitional discussions are, of course, important, especially when linked with organizational questions, but they can get out of hand especially when there is an urgent job to be done.

A necessary strategy which we used to accomplish our objective was to divide the topic into reasonably manageable parts – parts which were logical but at the same time matched a reality we could all relate to. Sub-group discussion in which each member heavily participated enabled us to move systematically through the main dimensions of the topic as we saw it, and plenary sessions and the final writing process were used to integrate the result. This study device of analysis and synthesis is, of course, a common one for dealing with a large, complex topic. We do not claim to have done more than alert people to possible major dimensions of the topic. Perhaps more than any other attribute required in looking at social affairs in the round, which is what a social development perspective seems to demand, is a sense of balance – balance between the claims and interests of different social groups, between people in different localities, between the age groups, between the sexes, between the short-term and the long-term, between the various aspects of people's lives, between the various cultural values which give meaning to our existence.

Worried about our balance of effort in the Working Party, one of our members at one stage asked, 'How much time have we for the family?' Some wit spontaneously shot back – 'A lifetime, I hope.' That exchange was a tension-breaker, and was paralleled many times during our labours. You will notice that in the Report we have not included 'humour' either amongst our suggested social development goals or amongst our strategies. Perhaps this is a pity, for I believe it is hard to get our perspectives in balance without our seriousness being spiced with humour. Humour has always tended to have doubtful status in social welfare circles, yet capacity for humour is peculiarly human and a rich resource, especially under trying circumstances. If the awesome difficulties we face plunge us into humourless gloom, we will contaminate our problems and in fact become part of the problem rather

than part of the solution. 'Dead serious' is an expression worth thinking about.

In the first section of our Report, we make a forecast of significant dimensions in social change in the 1970s. This has been based on our reading of the national reports, and other literature on social conditions in the 1960s and possible conditions in the '70s. Some members queried the use of the word 'forecast', until 'weather forecasting' was mentioned, and this seemed to give our predictions the desired degree of uncertainty, especially for the longer term.

In examining social change, we started with the observation that even in traditional societies, let alone modernizing ones, norms, values and forms of social organization are, in fact, continuously under change. When do we classify such change as 'improvement', 'advancement' or 'development'? Obviously the answer lies in the things we value, but part of the problem is that our values themselves change. Experience, values, and aspirations are interlocked. It is profoundly significant that our Report's first change forecast for the 1970s is the accelerated pace of change. We have, however, also emphasized that social change is neither homogeneous nor in one direction. We are dealing with extremely complex interlocking, interacting, often loosely organized social systems, whose dynamics are not fully understood. Perhaps a safeguard against being panicked or stampeded by wild general statements about social change is to insist that the speaker specify what precisely he or she is talking about and what measures he or she is using.

Apart from the accelerated pace of change, we in the Working Party have specified – expected changes in demographic patterns; accelerating mobility – within and between countries and between social classes; increasing wealth from the applications of science and technology – of unprecedented proportions in the already affluent societies; even greater maldistribution of wealth – both within and between countries; large-scale urbanization; mounting environmental pollution; escalating consumer expectations; a growing pervasiveness of communication systems; accelerated rural reform, especially in developing countries; democratization in rural societies; changing work patterns; changes in the form and scope of trade unionism; changing attitudes towards work; and a tempering of nationalism in an increasingly interdependent world.

Other expected social changes in the 1970s include – possibly greater resort to violence to bring about and to resist change; increasing tensions between the various generations, compounded by the knowledge explosion; greater unrest and turmoil amongst youth wishing to change society in directions they favour; a growing power of professional and technical groups over the development and functioning of society; and changes in organized religions and questing for meaningful philosophies of life. Our list of forecasts of general social changes – formidable, but of course incomplete – concludes with the chilling reminder that unless substantial progress is made by nations to solve critical international problems and to limit weapons of mass destruction, the dread of universal annihilation will continue.

The dissatisfactions, dislocations, and injustices inherent in these various anticipated social changes call for policies and organized action to ensure that social change is judged, on balance, to be social development rather than social retrogression. Consequently the Working Party has set down what we see as justifiable social goals for the 1970s; we have then mentioned important possible strategies

to achieve these goals; an examination of anticipated impediments and assets follows; and we finally look at social welfare's possible roles.

You will notice that we have deliberately side-stepped the issues of what is a *new* strategy. We have concerned ourselves with what we see as *relevant* strategies, many of which will be new for different societies, but few, if any, of our strategies will be unknown.

After the opening section on social change in the 1970s, our Report is divided into three parts. Each part focuses upon a particular level social organization – the international, the national, and the family.

The Report mentions seven key international social development strategies. The first is especially pertinent for two or more countries in the same region and/or sharing common problems. It is inter-country cooperation and assistance, which can include financial aid, technical assistance, supplies of material and equipment, exchange of personnel, reciprocal agreements, joint research, and common standard setting. The strategy of extending and coordinating international technical assistance is, of course, an important one, especially when such assistance has no political and economic strings attached. It involves encouraging various international bodies, both inter-governmental and non-governmental, to collaborate in diversifying and extending technical assistance for social development. It is community work in the world arena.

A third strategy – the development of international guide-lines – has already been used to some extent through conventions, declarations and resolutions. But our report highlights the fact that action to develop world opinion needs to run parallel with the development of international guide-lines, since their adoption depends much more on persuasion than on legal sanctions.

The conscious use of national education systems and the mass media for education for world citizenship is a strategy with much unfulfilled potential. The quite specific educational strategy of international action to promote education for social policy and social administration is important and links with our next strategy – the development and dissemination of more adequate social data to provide a better empirical base for social development planning. We believe that the National Committee reports, prepared in connection with these ICSW Conferences, can make a contribution here, provided they follow a more detailed outline and are more generally read. They could be a valuable source for the study of comparative social policy and administration, and could encourage policy-makers and administrators to consult more freely with their counterparts in other countries.

Impediments to, and assets for social development which we mention are: 'the brain drain', whose effects urgently need international study; cultural diversity which enriches but at the same time divides us; international governmental mechanisms increasing in strength but still impeded by extreme nationalism and other polarizing forces; and increased availability of international technical and professional manpower, but greater attention needing to be given to its training and recruitment.

Finally in the international section, we consider the international role of social welfare. Here, and throughout the Report, we are using the term 'social welfare' to refer to all the organized social arrangements which have as their direct and *primary* objective the well-being of people in a social context. The social welfare

sector at the international level consists of a variety of international agencies, such as sections of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations and various regional instrumentalities – and their staffs.

The development of appropriate education for international social welfare service, for planning and participating in international social welfare programs, is a vital role which only the social welfare sector itself can play, and our Report mentions some concrete actions that can be taken to this end. Further, we point out that social welfare personnel can exert individual and organizational pressure to aid international efforts in such areas as literacy, health (including nutrition), human rights, community development, rural reforms, and crime and delinquency prevention. Under our conception of social welfare, such people include the social work profession and at least some members of other professions, as well as a wide variety of other types of personnel, paid and unpaid.

The Report argues that qualified social work personnel have an especially important role to play to help prevent technical assistance programs from overlooking crucial social factors. But it also points to the need for social workers' more effective collaboration with other established professional groups, together with more adequate social work education for this role.

Applying the Conference theme at the national level, first we specify in the Report a number of common social goals for the 70s, against which social change should be measured. These are in the areas of income and wealth, health, housing, employment, education, recreation, family well-being, civil and political rights, and safety. We mention the development of a sense of community as a conscious goal, and assert that the dignity and worth of man and the pursuit of world peace must be in any such list of social development goals for the 70s. We see each of these various national social development goals both as ends and also as means to the achievement of further ends. In many cases in these goal areas, we are concerned with three dimensions – an increase in the overall quantity and quality of the 'good', its more equitable spread throughout society, and the guarantee of a basic minimum of well-being, revised in response to improving living standards throughout the population.

Are our specified national goals unrealistic for the people of developing countries? One of our members challenged us to say which hopes we would deny these people. We concluded 'none' – even though many aspirations would need to be seen in a long-term perspective to keep them alive.

The Working Party's twenty major strategies for social development at the national level perhaps constitute the main core of the Report. I can only give these the briefest mention. Our first strategy emphasizes governmental socio-economic planning which involves all sectors and interest groups. Other national strategies include – using the legal machinery to enact, interpret, and enforce laws for social purposes; managing the national economy, within certain parameters like full employment, which are partly socially determined; rural reform; income redistribution through a variety of devices; provision of universal or 'non-selective' social services, sometimes called 'social utilities'; education and manpower development in all their ramifications; development of sound population policy covering birth and death rates and internal and external migration; family planning; and community self-development.

The Report mentions further possible national strategies – ‘new towns’, preventive programs, the rehabilitation strategy, mutual self-help, citizen or client participation, advocacy and confrontation strategies, and a consumer protection and rights strategy. The open communication strategy emphasizes maximum access of the general public to information about policies, eligibility provisions, appeal procedures and administrative practices of governmental and non-governmental social agencies. The use of modern management methods, suitably adapted, can be a valuable social development strategy. Finally, we mention a strategy which identifies the various ‘relevant communities’ within which people live their lives, and consciously seeks to strengthen these for common social purposes.

This list of national strategies is very diverse. Its relevance for any one country at any one time will depend upon a thorough understanding of that country’s social conditions.

Our designated national impediments and assets for social development again obviously will vary from country to country, but for possible impediments we have alerted people to – insufficient financial resources; insufficient and untrained manpower; the low status of social welfare in national priorities; inadequate use of the political process; misuse of social welfare by politicians; defects in bureaucratic organizations; the poor image of social welfare; limitations in the social work profession, a key professional group in social welfare; simplistic approaches which demand simple solutions to complex social problems; and the persistence of various types of discrimination which interferes with full accessibility to and receipt of social welfare services.

Balanced against these obstacles are – wealth and resources which can be used for social development, increased manpower potential, rising levels of education, and the growing social development awareness of the social welfare sector. In addition, we see assets in the following – the development and use of new specializations especially in multi-disciplinary teams tackling complex problems, improved management potential, greater social policy and planning potential based on advances in the social and behavioural sciences, rising expectations which reduce apathy, wide citizen participation in social welfare activities, and finally, trends in religious and humanistic philosophies which encourage large numbers of youth in particular to be actively involved in achieving a better society.

We see social welfare as having a potential role in most of the national strategies we have identified. In more detail, our Report stresses its role in a number of areas. From the basis of its knowledge and experience, and in collaboration with outside professional and community groups, social welfare can influence national priorities towards social development goals within the planning process. To do this, however, its personnel will need to understand and to utilize political processes effectively.

The extent to which political power groups will redirect resources for social development purposes will be closely related to public opinion. The Working Party believes that the social welfare field must play a leading role in interpreting social development goals to the general public, using citizen involvement, the educational system and the mass media.

Dealing constructively with areas of tension is a valuable social welfare capacity for the years ahead. So too will be social welfare’s capacity to reach out to a

variety of related groups and professions with common values and goals, so that broad collaborative action can be taken toward achieving social development objectives. The existing inter-professional and inter-sectorial arrangements within social welfare provide a basis for extending this activity.

Despite these other roles we have cast for social welfare in the 1970s, we still see it as filling an increasingly important role in its traditional area of concern for the health and well-being of the handicapped, disadvantaged and obviously dependent groups in society. It can assist these to become full community members, including participating in decisions about the provision of services. For the more inarticulate and deprived sections of the community, social welfare personnel must speak out when appropriate. Under conditions of rapid social change, all social classes, however, are likely to benefit from social welfare services.

The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights asserts that the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society. As such, the Working Party has given special consideration to it. We note that the family as a social institution will be shaped by all the general social changes we have forecast. In addition, we forecast for the '70s further specific changes likely to affect family functioning – changes in the role of women, changes in authority patterns within the family, changes in its size and structure, the increasing problem of caring for aged family members, the increased strains to which families will be subject, and the likely reassessment of the role of the family.

In giving attention to the goals for family social development in the '70s, we have first stated that the broad national policies must take the well-being of the family as a central concern. We have then listed a series of goals which have direct relevance to the family: achieving for each family at least a minimum income, providing each family with adequate health services irrespective of the family's financial circumstances, acceptance by the community of responsibility for its handicapped and aged members, housing policies geared to the needs of families and their individual members, access to family planning facilities if desired, and the provision of family counselling services to aid family functioning.

As special means of supplementing the family's strengths and assisting it in adapting to social change, we mention – educational strategies for children and adults; the provision of community information services to help families at all levels of society to make better decisions; the provision of other preventive services to assist family functioning and prevent breakdown; the extension of protective services; services to families involved in migration both within and between countries; and finally, we point to the strategy of stimulating rural industrial employment to reduce the rural-urban flow and help families remain together.

Specific impediments to family social development, alongside impediments listed in the national sphere are – nepotism, traditionalism, excessive ceremonial expenses, loss of the support of the extended family, the loss to the family of the services of single women, and the misallocation of resources. On this last point, the Report claims that it is often easier to raise funds for buildings than for personal service and preventive programs. Out-of-date unevaluated child and family welfare programs can be a significant impediment to family social development.

The Report points out that the family itself is a social asset. We say:

Its resilience and its proven ability to adapt to change can contribute

to social development. It can, with social welfare support, provide for many of its own handicapped; can take back into the home separated members; can give service in adoption and in foster care programs for children, the handicapped, the mentally ill and the aged; and by neighbourly service can contribute to the well-being of the community.

Our last look at social welfare's possible role in the '70s is in this area of family social development. The Working Party claims that one of social welfare's most vital roles will be to acquaint planners with family requirements to be considered in the course of their planning. Other roles specified are – providing services to all families who need them, not just to disadvantaged ones; improving service quality through training for all levels of social welfare personnel and using manpower resources wisely; documentation of family problems and effects of policies and agency practices on family life; evaluation of present family service programs and readiness to implement changes shown to be necessary; and our final prescribed role for social welfare, using mass media, adult education programs, and work with community groups to help parents and potential parents find satisfying roles in their changing society.

So much, then, for the contents of our Report. We may have been foolhardy, but we did not allow ourselves to be intimidated by the breadth of the Conference theme and retreat into limited definitions of 'social development'. I hope that the term 'social development' does not go the way of other useful broad terms and get cornered by particular organizations and vested interests. We badly need such aids to societal rather than sectional thinking. For some people 'welfare' still retains this breadth of meaning, and in conclusion I would like to quote the following wise words of Richard Titmuss. If you replace his word 'welfare' with the current 'in' term 'social development', he expresses the way we in the Working Party have seen our task.

Welfare is concerned with social values and human relations. It may be the embodiment, carrier and expression of a philosophy of everyman's place in society ... Those who have studied these problems of welfare have, therefore, to think of themselves not as experts but as social servants able to explain a little more clearly the choice available in terms of alternative policies and courses of action. ...

The December 1970 *ICSW Newsletter* reported:

... More than 1,600 participants from over 60 countries were in Manila ... to consider the conference theme ... They heard speeches, saw films and exhibitions and played an active part in discussion groups. They met old friends and made new ones from all parts of the world and so renewed their feeling of personal involvement in the worldwide tasks of social welfare.

It is difficult to describe the devotion and competence of the Philippine Organizing Committee which had to face more emergencies while preparing for the big event than most previous Committees had to deal with. Even typhoons and floods could not hamper the enthusiasm of our Philippine hosts.

The Pre-Conference Working Party consisting of 24 members met August 24 – 30. With Professor R. John Lawrence (Australia) as a most competent chairman, it

produced an excellent basic document. The Executive Committee of ICSW decided to have this important paper printed separately and offered for sale. It is the kind of material that should be most useful to schools of social work, universities, seminars and social planning bodies. We shall notify our National Committees and member organizations when this publication is ready.³⁷

A brief account was then provided of some of the main content of the conference and of associated meetings.³⁸

In the evening of Sunday, 30 August, 1970, I transferred to the Hotel Filipinas in Manila from the Sulo Hotel. Local typhoons and floods, the worst for 30 years, had created major problems for organisers of the three international conferences. A mild earthquake cracked the display panels in a huge tank in the Sulo Hotel where an underwater ballet for our benefit had to be cancelled. More seriously, bookings made at the Manila Hotel had to be changed, with the hope that conference delegates transferred to alternative accommodation could still access the conference sessions still being held in Manila Hotel. The Manila Hotel itself had the additional problem of an industrial dispute and strike action which disrupted its functioning. Some of the delegates sympathised with the strikers and a few even considered getting directly involved. Conference delegates located in the Filipinas Hotel could reach the conference by planks providing a way through the blocks to the Manila Hotel. Returning to the Hotel Filipinas from one of the IASSW conference sessions with my UNSW colleague Audrey Rennison,³⁹ we saw smoke and fire engines. The building besides our hotel was on fire. The weather had calmed down by the time of the conferences, but the city and many of its people were clearly under considerable stress – not a good time to host international visitors.

On Tuesday, 1 September, I wrote to my wife Trish about joining me in Manila from Singapore on an MSA flight arriving at 2.30pm on Saturday, 5 September. I had just discussed this possibility with Geoff James, the Qantas sales manager in Manila,⁴⁰ and he was contacting their people in Singapore. Qantas would try to get us on the same plane going home on 12 September. I would meet Trish at the airport. At 4pm, I had been invited to attend the conferring of an honorary degree on Charles Schottland, and I could organise an invitation for Trish. I had checked with the hotel. There was a second bed in my room and we could stay there with very little extra charge. I was sure we could afford Trish coming, and it seemed 'pretty silly to be separated'. I had, however, not checked to see what we might see together. I literally had not a spare moment since I arrived last Saturday week. Not once had I set foot outside the Sulo Hotel. I had transferred to the Filipinas Hotel on Sunday night, and had been involved in the schools' conference all Monday, and Tuesday

37 Soon after the conference, ACOSS, in fact, produced a discussion pamphlet which contained the full report preceded by my paper on its highlights. Its chief executive, Joan Brown, a significant contributor in the Working Party, was keen that it should be quickly distributed and discussed in Australia.

38 *International Newsletter*, International Council of Social Welfare, No. 6, December 1970.

39 She had been the main author of the Australian National Report for the ICSW Conference.

40 A contact given to us by Andie Mackay, our neighbour who was a Qantas executive.

morning, but was 'so utterly exhausted' by lunchtime on Tuesday, that I had to miss the afternoon's sessions (of regional meetings) and have a sleep. It also, however, gave me a break to organize her possible coming which she had already indicated in an earlier letter.

I have still to prepare an *hour*-long paper for the Monday morning session, reporting on the highlights of the Pre-Conference Working Party's Report, but I will have this done before you come. The Working Party was disappointingly small in number, only about 20, but it fortunately included some first-rate people, including the rapporteur Morrie Fox whom I hope you will meet. As it turned out, because of the quantity of the material we turned up in the discussions, we could not leave the poor rapporteur to cope by himself, so a small group (4 of us) worked very hard indeed to produce the final draft. On Friday night it was bed at 3am, and on Saturday night 2am. The Filipinos gave us wonderful supporting secretariat service – literally around the clock – and we could not have accomplished what we did without this help. The Report is, I think, not too bad – in view of the difficulties and limitations of the exercise. Schottland's first reaction to it was very favourable and I don't think he was just being polite. Anyway we will be getting a more general reaction soon. The Report is at present being printed. ...⁴¹

We were thankful when Trish arrived safely at Manila Airport on Saturday 5 September. It had very few passengers because of the weather and flooding in Manila, and nothing on the plane seemed to work. In the course of the next few days, I attended all the sessions of the ICSW Conference. Trish came to the opening session, addressed by President Marcos and ICSW president Charles Schottland, and the plenary session next morning where I made my presentation on the work of the working party. Together we participated in various other activities associated with the conference. These included the awarding of the honorary degree to Charles Schottland; a luncheon for the 18 Australian delegates at the Australian Embassy hosted by the ambassador, Peter Henderson, and his wife Heather;⁴² and an organised bus tour into the countryside to a village which had roasted pigs on spits for a feast in honour of the overseas visitors. In the afternoon of the bus tour, we visited the home and extensive estate of a very wealthy Filipino, protected by armed guards.⁴³ A boat trip up a swollen river was deemed too dangerous for us to undertake.

I have not mentioned one episode that briefly threatened to derail the work

41 Letter, John Lawrence to Patricia Lawrence, 1/9/70.

42 Daughter of Robert Menzies, long-serving Australian prime minister. The Australian delegation to the ICSW conference consisted of: Dr Edward (Ned) Icton (University of New England); Leon Stubbings (Australian Red Cross Society); Audrey Rennison and John Lawrence (UNSW); Lila Hendry (NSW Crippled Children's Society); Captain Edwin Hayes and Lt. Colonel Iris Walters (The Salvation Army, Melbourne); Major Lila Pearse and Brigadier Leslie Reddie (The Salvation Army, Sydney); Marjorie Awburn (Melbourne); Betty Dow (Royal Melbourne Hospital); Madeleine Keary (Sutherland District Hospital, NSW); Rev. Canon Guy Harmer (Mission of St James and St John, Melbourne); Joan Brown (ACOSS, Sydney); Sister Benedict Hally (Daughters of Charity, Sydney); Teresa Wardell (Melbourne); Daphne Carpenter (Commonwealth Social Services Department, Brisbane); and Beverley Job (Wheelchair and Disabled Association Australia, Sydney).

43 The owner had a large butterfly collection and wondered if we knew anyone in Sydney who also collected butterflies, but we could not help. He showed us coffins prepared for his wife and himself to go into the family mausoleum on the estate when the time came.

of the pre-conference working party. We were about two-thirds of the way into our work, when Aida Ginda arrived and expressed deep concern that the broad concept of social welfare we were using would create difficulties for her relationship with other United Nations agencies such as WHO, UNESCO and ILO. She referred the issue to the head of the Philippine Department of Social Welfare for confirmation of her more limited definition of social welfare and also to Charles Schottland, ICSW president. The former supported her; the latter, however, acknowledged the validity of our usage.⁴⁴ What was at stake was, of course, far more than just a definitional and agency demarcation dispute. In fact the persistence of the narrower view needed to be challenged; that was what a lot of the ‘social development’ talk was about. With full support of the working party, I held our ground, but said we would make very clear in the report how we would be using the term. In the final report, we stated:

The PCWP is aware that the term “social welfare” is used in a variety of ways both internationally and within nations. For the purpose of this report, we have decided to use the term to refer to:

all the organized social arrangements 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 and so on.

Although the term “social services” is often used in the above sense, with “social welfare” as a component, we have chosen to discuss social welfare in our broader sense. In doing this, we wish to make clear that our conception of social welfare for the purpose of our deliberations differs from the way some members of the PCWP use it elsewhere.⁴⁵

In a footnote we recognised the concept of ‘social welfare’ we used was broader than the one currently used by the ICSW.

44 I was confident he would because he was a social policy scholar.

45 Pre-conference Working Party Report, p. 2.

ICSW World Conference 1970 - Manila



Flying to Singapore - Australian interior



Gordon family's house, Singapore (Murray, ABC executive)



Pre-Conference Working Party, Charles Schottland (ICSW president) and Kate Katski (ICSW secretary-general) [centre of front row] - Sulo hotel, Quezon City



Working Party in session



Kate Katski, R.J.L., and P.D. Kilkarni



Dining in Sulo Hotel – John Lawrence (Australia), Helena Junqueira (Brazil), Patrick Hu (China), Kate Katski (ICSW), Jessie Clements (Hong Kong), Renate Langohr (Germany), Joan Eyden (UK), and Dick Splane (Canada)



RJL presenting Pre-Conference Working Party Report to XVth ICSW Conference



Australian delegates – Manila ICSW Conference



Conference dinner (Eileen Younghusband third from the right)



Dancing



A village feast for international visitors - roasted pigs



Daphne Carpenter (CSSD in Brisbane), PDL and other Conference delegates - island scenery in the Philippines

Chapter 3

World Rehabilitation Congress 1972 Sydney

Immediately on my return to Sydney from Manila in September 1970 was an invitation to make a contribution to international action to improve the lives of people with disabilities. Almost my first social work job had, in fact, included responsibility for assisting residents at Mount Breckan Rehabilitation Centre at Victor Harbour in South Australia, run by the Commonwealth Department of Social Services. One of the long-established areas of social service was organised action to help people with physical and mental disabilities to function in their communities. A substantial part of our new curriculum in the School of Social Work at UNSW was devoted to a comparative study of social welfare systems, using the societal social policy framework which I had developed over a number of years. Each sub-system was studied in terms of its major organisational dimensions, its efficiency and effectiveness. Physical disability and mental disability were two of the specific sub-systems designed by population category which were studied in social welfare III. Spencer Colliver was the subject coordinator for social welfare.

Rehabilitation International

The 12th World Rehabilitation Congress of Rehabilitation International (RI) was to be held in Sydney, 24–29 September, 1972, hosted by the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled (ACROD). It was the golden anniversary of RI, founded in USA in 1922 as the International Society for Crippled Children. Changes in the name of the organisation reflected shifts in social awareness and attitudes towards disability – International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, 1939, the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, 1960, Rehabilitation International, 1972. Since 1972, ‘RI’ has been the preferred designation, with the abbreviation also coming to stand for Rights and Inclusion, as the civil rights of disabled people were asserted, particularly by organised action by disabled people themselves. Until 1970, few disabled people participated in RI’s 4-yearly world congresses – as speakers, delegates, or observers, even though the discussion concerned their lives. At the 1972 congress in Sydney, a few of them participated as observers and met

separately for their own discussion. At the 1976 Israel Congress, a still small militant group decided disabled people needed an organisation of their own. At the 1980 Winnipeg Congress, 250 disabled participants (in a congress of 3,000) decided to form a World Coalition of Persons with Disabilities, soon renamed 'Disabled Peoples' International'. This off-shoot from RI met a mixed response from professional service providers.⁴⁶

RI's current mission statement is 'Advancing the rights and inclusion of persons with disabilities worldwide' and it is described as 'a global network working to empower persons with disabilities and provide sustainable solutions for a more inclusive society'. It describes itself as a non-governmental federation of national and international organisations providing rehabilitation services now in more 100 countries. The only international organisation concerned with all aspects of disability and rehabilitation, it maintains official relations with the UN Economic and Social Council, WHO, ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF, and several regional organisations.⁴⁷

Chairman, RI Social Commission World Seminar

On 4 September, 1970, John Broinowski, president of 12th RI World Congress, invited me to chair one of the four seminars in the week before the congress in 1972.⁴⁸ Each seminar covered aspects of rehabilitation for which there were world commissions in the structure of the international society. 'In Canberra we want to hold a Seminar in Social Planning in Rehabilitation'. The education seminar would be held in Melbourne (chairman, Mr Drummond, Far West Children's Health Scheme); the medical seminar in Sydney (chairman, Dr George Burniston); and vocational rehabilitation seminar (chairman, Kenneth Jenkins, Bedford Industries)⁴⁹ Each seminar chairman was expected to organise the planning and program in collaboration with the international society and the Congress Council which Broinowski was chairing. As a seminar chairman I would be a member of the program committee of that council. In case by any chance I could make it, he invited me to a meeting of the Congress Council attended by Norman Acton on 14 September in the board room of Darling and Company in Sydney.

Norman Acton

Norman Acton, secretary general of RI, was on a short visit to Australia to discuss the World Congress with ACROD and the Congress Council before a meeting in Tehran of RI's Council. In Adelaide, he participated in the annual meeting of ACROD, and was principal speaker at a public meeting in the

46 See Diane Driedger, *The Last Civil Rights Movement: Disabled Peoples' International*, New York, St Martin's, 1989, ch. 3, 'Release from the Yoke of Paternalism and "Charity"', pp. 28–39.

47 'International Rehabilitation' website.

48 Letter, J. H. Broinowski to R. J. Lawrence, 4/9/70. Broinowski, a prominent Australian businessman, was past president of ACROD and RI vice-president.

49 He was the current president of ACROD. I knew of his work at Bedford Industries in Adelaide and also that he had married Colin Gordon's widow whom I held in high regard from school days at St Peter's College.

auditorium of the Royal Children's Hospital. Norman Acton was appointed secretary general of the international rehabilitation organisation in 1967. At the University of Illinois, he had graduated from the School of Journalism, had done graduate work in sociology and anthropology, and had taught these subjects. After the Second World War, he had worked in the Far East directing programs in Japan and the Philippines. 1951–54, he was assistant secretary general of the international rehabilitation organisation, serving as its representative to the United Nations, the executive board of UNICEF, and WHO. At the same time, he was chairman of the International Non-Government Organisations Committee of UNICEF, a coordinating body composed of more than 50 organisations in consultative status with the Children's Fund. He was executive director of the US Committee for UNICEF, 1955–59, and in 1957 was appointed special UNICEF consultant to review relationships between the Children's Fund and non-governmental organisations. From 1959 to 1967, he was with the World Veterans Federation (with member organisations in 49 countries and a total membership of 20 million) – as deputy secretary until 1961, then secretary general until his appointment as secretary general of the world rehabilitation organisation.⁵⁰

Clearly, the breadth and depth of Acton's experience working internationally was impressive and gave me some encouragement to accept what was obviously going to be a tough assignment to fit into all the other demands on my time. I was aware that professional social work input into the work of RI had been weak and this was one of the reasons why it was not until 1969 that a social commission had been set up within RI. In Australia, ACROD had not been seen as a socially progressive organisation within social welfare circles, partly because of perceived medical and business paternalism.

On 19 October, 1970, Jean Garside, congress coordinator, apologised for the delay in answering my enquiry about the scope and terms of reference for the seminar on social planning. Norman Acton had been abroad for an extensive period following his visit to Australia. His deputy Mrs Dorothy Warms had, however, meanwhile tentatively observed:

The programme at the Dublin Congress contained sections on rehabilitation of the alcoholic, the drug addict, and the mentally ill, and this was at the request of the Irish themselves. Mary Switzer's plenary meeting speech considered the rehabilitation of the socially disadvantaged and served, hopefully, to widen everybody's concept of rehabilitation.

For practical purposes, Rehabilitation International is concerned with the rehabilitation problems of the mentally and physically handicapped, and I think that this is the area upon which the seminar planners would want to concentrate. The situation is somewhat different in planning the seminar for the Social Commission since the handicapped are usually socially disadvantaged as well, and I would think that Professor Lawrence would want to consider not only the specific social problems of the handicapped, but the general social conditions which exaggerate those problems.

50 'Biographical Notes on Mr Norman Acton, Secretary General of Rehabilitation International' – attached to an announcement of his Australian visit, Jean Garside, executive director of ACROD, 9/9/70.

I am sure that as soon as Mr Acton returns he will be asking the chairmen of the various Commissions to send their suggestions for the seminar to the organizers you have appointed in Australia.

Jean Garside had gathered that 'the chairmen of the seminars fairly much control the content of the programme'.⁵¹

In a very full letter to Jean Garside on 18 November, Norman Acton wrote concerning the pre-congress seminars.⁵² Enclosed were two documents produced after discussions in Australia with Messrs. Drummond, Jenkins and Burniston. One was a statement about the character of the seminars, the other 'a kind of check list that might be helpful to them in their planning and would also indicate the kind of information we need here in order to be helpful in connection with the seminars'.

With specific reference to the questions you have raised following discussions with Professor Lawrence concerning the social seminar, I can give the following information.

In planning for the Congress as well as in all of our activities, we go on the premise that the term 'rehabilitation' means the restoration of the handicapped to the fullest physical, mental, social, vocational and economic usefulness of which he is capable. This, as you know, is the generally accepted definition, and while our affiliates in the various countries may apply it with some variations, we must assume that the general definition is valid.

We understand that particularly with the social seminar there is at this time discussion in various countries as to whether the socially disadvantaged should also be included. As you know, the question was covered in Mary Switzer's paper in Dublin and in the discussion of one of the sectional meetings, but there has been no action of any kind that would give formal policy guidance as far as Rehabilitation International is concerned. I think it would be fair to state that in the opinion of most of our affiliates our objective is to stimulate the development of rehabilitation services for the physically handicapped. A smaller but growing number of affiliates would also include some degree of concern for the problems of rehabilitation of the mentally handicapped. In only a few instances are our affiliates yet directly concerned with the socially disadvantaged. It is of course recognised that social disabilities other than those of a physical or mental nature often complicate physical or mental handicap and interfere with the rehabilitation process. Consequently, it is impossible to have a meaningful discussion of the social aspects of rehabilitation without being aware of the broader question.

As was indicated in the guidelines statement and adopted on social aspects in Dublin and has been recognised by the Working Group of the Social Commission, a definition of the social problems and an identification of areas of programme activity are primarily functions of the new Social Commission. It hopes to have a meeting in 1971 for a preliminary exploration, and the meeting of the Commission in Australia will no doubt carry that further in the context of the 1971 guidelines activity. All this is to indicate that if Professor Lawrence finds it appropriate, we

51 Letter, Jean Garside to R. J. Lawrence, 19/10/70.

52 Letter, Norman Acton to Jean Garside, 18/11/70.

believe that it would be entirely logical if the pre-Congress seminar were devoted to discussions concerning the scope of activity implied by the word social in this context. On the other hand, however, if he would prefer to identify a particular problem or range of problems relevant to social aspects of rehabilitation and to concentrate the work of the seminar on that, I am sure that all concerned would regard that as an equally valid approach.

Not having had the opportunity of discussing this directly with Professor Lawrence, I would like to draw attention to the inevitable difference of approach between individuals who are primarily oriented toward social work and those whose orientation is more heavily on the side of sociology and the behavioral sciences. In our view the work of the Social Commission should embrace both, and I do not mean to imply that there is any necessary conflict, although different points of view do of course present themselves. It is very strongly our hope that the seminar would be on a broad enough base to attract both fields of interest.

I hope this will give you the information you need, but please do not hesitate to let me know if more is required.

Jean Garside sent me a copy of Norman Acton's letter and its valuable enclosures on 14 December.

We have found that this information is valuable for all seminar organisers and hope that you will find that it gives the information for which you asked.

Work on the other three seminars is proceeding well and I am now anxious to start making plans for the Seminar on Social Planning. I have written your name in invisible ink on the list of chairmen of seminars and I hope soon you will tell me that you have definitely decided to accept Mr Broinowski's invitation.

The Congress Council would like the Seminar on Social Planning to be held in Brisbane. It has been the earnest desire of the Council to spread the interest as far as possible in Australia and two of the other seminars are to be held in Melbourne and Adelaide. We wish to enlist the interest of the Queensland Government and some rehabilitation workers in Brisbane with the organisation. If you agree to be chairman and if you are happy with the idea of going to Brisbane, I am proposing to make a short visit to Brisbane in January to line up the necessary facilities and accommodation. It is important therefore that I talk with you at an early date. ...⁵³

Norman Acton wrote to me on 7 January, 1971, delighted to learn from Jean Garside that I had accepted chairmanship of the seminar on social aspects. The IR president, Jean Regniers, had requested him to invite me to become a member of the Social Commission, one of the four standing commissions of RI – until the conclusion of the 12th congress. 'The contribution you can make to the thinking of the group will have special value because of your experience with cultural and international forces'. 'I had the pleasure of hearing you present the report of the Pre-Conference Working Party at the International Conference on Social Welfare in Manila, a report which I thought did an admirable job of covering a complex pattern of topics. I was, therefore, doubly pleased when our colleagues in Australia suggested the possibility of your interest in our program.'

53 Letter, Jean Garside to R. J. Lawrence, 14/12/70.

His letter enclosed two documents – ‘Guidelines for the Future: the Social Component of Rehabilitation’, prepared at the 11th world congress in Ireland in 1969 (a working document for the use of the newly created social commission and for others concerned with the establishment and improvement of activities and programs related to social aspects of rehabilitation); and ‘Statement of Definition for the Social Commission’, September 1970 (report of a small working group of the commission preliminary to the completion of the membership of the commission. ‘You will readily see from these documents that we are frankly exploring the vast field of psycho-social relationships and processes’. It was hoped that the Social Commission would be meeting in Athens in September 1971. ‘I am sure you will agree that it will be helpful to meet with the Commission regarding the planning of the seminar in Australia’.⁵⁴

I accepted the invitation to serve on the Social Commission, but doubted if it would be feasible to meet with other members of the commission later in the year, due to other commitments and lack of possible funding.⁵⁵

Planning the Social Aspects Seminar

My first important task was to recruit a committee to help me organise the international seminar for which I had been given responsibility. The result was a seminar organising committee consisting of:

R. J. Lawrence (seminar chairman), professor of social work and head of the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales; Joan C. Brown, executive officer, ACOSS; A. S. Colliver, senior lecturer in social welfare administration, School of Social Work, UNSW; Lila Hendry, executive of the welfare services, NSW Society for Crippled Children; W. C. Langshaw, under-secretary and director, Department of Child Welfare and Social Welfare, NSW; Millie Mills, senior social worker, Marsden Hospital, NSW Department of Public Health; Lorna D. Nolan, lecturer in medical social work, University of Sydney; Joan Tuxen, director, Victorian Society for Crippled Children and Adults; Max Wryell, first assistant director-general (social security), Commonwealth Department of Social Services; and Jean Garside, representing ACROD.

I was well pleased with the composition of this committee. All but the last two were social work colleagues. I already knew Max Wryell quite well and came to know him very well in subsequent years in connection with the Family Research Project in the UNSW social work school and planning for the Social Welfare Research Centre at UNSW. It was apparently Jean Garside who had suggested that I be approached about chairing the seminar. She proved efficient and very helpful in the work of the committee although was reluctant to have her name appear ‘with the galaxy of eminent people whose knowledge will formulate the programme as I have not contribution to make in that regard’. Mr Broinowski suggested she be listed as representing ACROD.⁵⁶

At our first meeting, at ACROD headquarters, 403 George Street, Sydney,

54 Letter, Norman Acton to R. J. Lawrence, 7/1/70.

55 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Norman Acton, 22/1/71.

56 Letter, Jean Garside to John Lawrence, 15/4/71.

at 4pm on 10 March, 1970, we decided to keep full minutes of our meetings. Jean Garside reported in some detail on plans for the 12th Congress of which she was coordinator. Provision would be made within the congress program for reports from the seminars and also for the presentation of guidelines for the next three years' activity, in each of the four specific areas of interest within RI. The Social Commission would be looking to the seminar for assistance in preparing the guidelines. The seminars were planned to attract membership from among people who were determining policy and planning national programs in their own countries. It would have to be made clear that not all who applied could be accepted. A tentative size of 50–60 was mentioned for the social seminar, with an Australian representation of about 25%. After meeting in Brisbane a few days earlier, the executive committee of the congress had decided to hold the seminar in Brisbane to spread the venues of the congress as widely as possible. (Given the social policy focus of our seminar, I had favoured Canberra, the national capital.) A firm reservation for accommodation would be delayed because a new hotel, 'The Crest', offering reduced rates, would soon be opened. The Queensland premier had been approached and it was probable that a reception or dinner would be provided. The ACROD congress secretariat would be able to handle the finances of the seminar and secretarial work for the seminar.

At this first meeting, I said I had been invited to chair a seminar on 'social planning for rehabilitation' and was very attracted to this subject, but there was a fair amount of flexibility. We had to decide quickly if we agreed with this topic and what came into it. The theme of the Congress was 'Planning Rehabilitation: Environment – Incentives – Self-help'. The planning idea followed through the theme of the Congress. Currently there was a great deal of discussion on general planning in social welfare, and the time was appropriate for such a seminar. We decided to defer this discussion and determination of a theme for the seminar until a later meeting. I said, however, that it was desirable to make the seminar an issue-oriented activity with a number of important or major issues. It would be necessary to identify key issues in order to give a practical framework. There was increasing interest in rehabilitation circles in social disabilities, which opened the door to a full range of social concerns. These would be far too wide for the seminar. The subject for the seminar could be something like 'Issues in Social Planning for the Rehabilitation of the Mentally and Physically Disabled'.

Committee members made the following comments on the issues which might be discussed in the seminar:

Miss Tuxen:

- Need for cooperation and coordination in social planning to avoid fragmentation. The need of involvement of disabled people themselves.

Miss Hendry:

- Supported Miss Tuxen's view.
- Research into opinions of recipients of services.
- Accessibility of services to physically handicapped.

Mr Wryell:

- Community involvement – family, employers, unions, etc.
- Evaluation of availability of existing resources.
- Relative requirements on long and short term basis.
- Importance of recognising differences between precept and practice.
- Need of informed public opinion and social action.
- Importance of total provision – not just from vocational and employment angle.

Miss Brown:

- Consideration of the many aged people who are disabled and who have been left out of rehabilitation planning.
- Need to determine priorities and responsibilities, taking into consideration the role of the family and the disabled person.
- Training of manpower.
- Availability of information to interested people.

Miss Nolan:

- What goes into planning?
- Accessibility.
- Family attitudes.
- What happens to facilities not used properly?

Mr Colliver:

- The need to collect information, cutting across the boundaries of Government and professional disciplines: who should undertake this work?
- Need to develop a process of planning, determining priorities, who the planners are, and where the planning is done.
- What are the social goals to be achieved?
- The need for town and urban planning for disabled – this is becoming increasingly urgent.
- What is the involvement of the Government?
- What is the balance between primary and secondary groups; how much should we help the primary groups (family and neighbourhood groups)?

Mr Langshaw:

- The need to establish priorities regarding the place of rehabilitation.
- Evaluation of the roles of government and voluntary bodies in the area of financial assistance.
- The respective roles of different levels of government.

Chairman:

- Importance of defining disability and need to consider the effect of visible and invisible disabilities on the individual and on public attitudes. This is related to changes in medical science and differences in cultural circumstance, and is a crucial issue.
- To what extent do people want to be identified as disabled? The question of stigma should be discussed.
- The extent to which disabled people are integrated into the community.

- How much service is needed? Higher standards are always being sought: what is a reasonable level?
- The power dimension; what influences make disabled people act the way they do?
- To what extent have large-scale bureaucratic structures developed, and whose interests are being pursued?

A sub-committee consisting of the chairman, Miss Hendry and Mr Colliver was appointed to prepare some concise material on the issues for the committee's consideration at the next meeting. This should help to qualify the theme and broad outline of the program to be incorporated in a printed announcement for world-wide distribution. Members were reminded that all program material must be submitted to the RI secretariat for information and comment before distribution. Referring to seminar participants, I said it was important to make sure it was a world seminar which just happened to be held in Australia. It was important that Australians did not predominate. Once the key issues were determined, papers would be invited from western and developing countries. Participants would be expected to bring material from their own cultures and each would be expected to be a working member of the seminar.⁵⁷

Joan Tuxen unfortunately could not attend our next meeting at the end of March, but had received 'the masterly report of the subcommittee, and the statement of issues in social planning'. She thought it covered the field very effectively, but wondered if this and other essential material would fit onto a brochure.⁵⁸

Our sub-committee prepared this statement for the full committee on the subject-matter of the seminar and suggested it be included in the seminar announcement to be sent to all potential participants.

ISSUES IN SOCIAL PLANNING FOR THE PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY DISABLED

In this Second Development Decade of the United Nations, world-wide attention is being drawn to the need for societies to set social objectives and to plan to achieve these.

One area of social planning is concerned with the life conditions and opportunities of people who are handicapped by physical and/or mental disabilities. The Seminar will focus on a number of general issues inherent in social planning to compare and improve the well-being of such people. Participants will compare and contrast the way in which these issues are viewed and handled in their respective countries. This will mean for each Seminar member, preparation in advance and active frank participation.

The very nature of the subject area is suggestive of what might be "at issue" (that is, in question or under dispute) in any society trying to plan for its physically and mentally handicapped members. An "issues" approach will be used at the

⁵⁷ Minutes, Organising Committee, 10/3/71.

⁵⁸ Letter, Joan Tuxen to John Lawrence, 29/3/71.

Seminar not only to make it a lively and stimulating occasion, but also perhaps to encourage people to recognise questions which could be raised back in their own society but which as yet are receiving little attention.

Seminar discussions will focus on four clusters of issues – issues in defining the scope of the problem, issues in goal-setting, issues in the allocation and utilisation of resources, and issues raised by the various possible roles of the disabled themselves.

DEFINING THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM:

- What are the nature and size of the physically and mentally disabled groups in the society?
- Who are they; and where are they located in the social structure and geographically?
- What are the handicaps which arise specifically from their disabilities?
- Who should provide information on the scope of the problem, how often and using what methodology?
- What classification of disability should be used – short-term, long-term; by medical condition; according to functional disability; by degree of disability? How important to people is their disability classification compared with other social classifications in which they may be grouped?
- How does the picture presented by the disabled in contact with services differ from those not in contact?
- Is the community problem only seen in terms of the actual service users?
- Why define and measure the over-all community problem?

GOAL – SETTING

- What social goals are to be achieved through policies and programmes for the disabled?
- Who sets the goals and what values are reflected in them?
- What are the goal-setting roles of international, national and regional authorities – governmental and non-governmental (including parent groups, mutual aid groups, etc.?)
- Should the general goals be much the same for each disabled group as for the rest of the community?
- Should there be positive discrimination in favour of disabled?
- Should the goals cover all the major aspects of life – income, health, education, employment, housing, civil and political rights, recreation, family well-being, social relations, religion – or be more narrowly confined?
- Should the goals be very general guides or should they be more specifically related to the circumstances of time and place in the particular society?
- How often should the goals be revised – period plans, rolling plans?
- Should short, medium and long-term goals be differentiated and on what time scales?
- How should priorities be established amongst the various goals?
- What is the relationship between community goals and actual policies and programmes?
- Who can coordinate and with what legitimacy, the multiple policies and programmes in order to achieve the social goals?

RESOURCES – THEIR ALLOCATION AND UTILISATION:

- What resources (financial, manpower, and technological) are available to achieve the social goals – in the short term, in the medium term, in the long term?
- What is the competition for these scarce resources within the various fields of disability as well as in other sections of society?
- Do economic values rather than a full range of social values guide the use of resources?
- Is there public accountability in the use of resources?
- What are the full social costs and benefits (including economic costs and benefits) which accrue from different policies and programmes for the disabled?
- How can community resources be allocated more effectively and efficiently?
- How accessible, effective and efficient are existing community services?
- Is there an emphasis on using resources for preventive programmes?

THE ROLES OF THE DISABLED:

- What roles do the disabled themselves play – in goal-setting, in shaping policies and programmes, in expressing their needs, in criticising “services”, in working for and with their fellow disabled?
- What roles are “permitted” by the dominant culture?
- What are the family roles of the disabled?
- What influence and power can the disabled bring to bear on their lot?
- Must they rely heavily on sympathetic citizens and professionals?
- What is the nature of their entitlement to service – legal, contractual, financial, discretionary or professionally determined?
- What should it be?
- Should service vary according to where a person lives?
- What are the social and psychological costs borne by the disabled in return for services received?

“Planning is policy choice and programming in the light of facts, projections, and application of values.” (Alfred J. Kahn)

By mid-April 1971, a draft of the brochure announcing the seminar had been seen by Mr Broinowski and had been forwarded to RI. It incorporated this material on the subject matter, and provided general information on the seminar format, papers, participants, associates, registration fees, accommodation, the planning committee, the working language of the seminar, visas, etc. The four sections of the subject matter would be considered sequentially, not concurrently, with a final plenary session drawing discussion together. Each section would be discussed by means of: a major general paper (distributed in advance), a series of specialised papers (also distributed in advance) which concentrated on selected aspects in the section’s area, and parallel group discussions in which all seminar members participate, and which are briefly reported and commented on at a plenary session. Persons wishing to be considered for

the preparation of one of the four general papers or a specialised paper, should send a brief outline of the proposed paper to the chairman of the seminar. Details of the author's qualifications and experience would also be helpful to the planning committee. Three copies of all completed papers would need to reach the chairman not later than June 1, 1972. In view of the seminar's subject matter and the limited number of places available, it is intended that participants would be top-level people concerned with broad community perspectives, and drawn from as many countries as possible. They would need to be fluent in English, the working language of the seminar. Associates (relatives and friends of participants) would be included in all social activities, and additional activities would be arranged for them during the working sessions of the seminar.

With the announcement brochure would be a postcard for interested people to return to the seminar chairman. An application form and more detailed information would be sent to people who hoped to attend the seminar. Final date for applications to participate would be 31 January, 1972.

The secretariat of RI in New York suggested we go ahead with the printing of the brochure on the seminar on social aspects of rehabilitation. They found the copy 'excellent'.⁵⁹ No changes to the content or format were proposed. I chose the colour 'India' (pale lemon) for the letter-heads, brochures and other publications for the social aspects seminar. Each seminar had its own distinctive colour.⁶⁰ The material for our seminar was visually attractive, thanks to the way it was presented and our secretarial and printing support.

At the meeting of the organising committee on 16 June, Jean Garside reported 3,000 brochures were ready for distribution. We agreed a package of 20 brochures should be sent to the 64 countries on Jean Garside's mailing list for the congress, with a request that they should only be passed on to 'relevant interested colleagues.' Invitations and brochures should only be sent to senior people like vice-chancellors of universities, national secretaries of voluntary organisations, and directors general of national statutory organisations. Distribution to appropriate people in Asian countries was especially recommended.⁶¹

On my suggestion, at our meeting on 25 November, we asked Lila Hendry to be 'coordinator of arrangements', responsible to me for coordinating the work of the three convenors appointed in Queensland – secretariat, social functions, reception and accommodation – and the treasurer located in Sydney. She would be able to go to Queensland from time to time. Secretarial services would be needed both before and during the seminar. Daphne Carpenter, a social work colleague in the Commonwealth Department of Social Services, was the convenor for departmental secretarial services being provided during the seminar, and Max Wryell undertook for the department to make multiple copies of the papers for distribution before the seminar. Private hospitality could follow a state reception, now being offered one evening. I reported 28

59 Letter, Dorothy Warms to Jean Garside, 27/4/71.

60 Letter, Jean Garside to R. J. Lawrence, 6/4/71.

61 Qantas had agreed to carry the packages free of charge.

people had indicated interest in attending the seminar.⁶²

Obviously, the principal speaker and the other four main speakers, would be centrally important to the success of the seminar.

The Principal Speaker

The principal speaker was expected to play a key role – by presenting at the outset a major general paper on the subject of the seminar; by having a roving commission amongst the discussion groups during the seminar; by giving a review of the seminar on the final day based on the way the speakers and discussion groups had dealt with the four sections of the subject; and in the final session, by being a member of the panel of speakers who would lead seminar discussion on the draft statement on ‘Guidelines for the Future: the Social Component of Rehabilitation’ prepared by RI’s Social Commission. Our program required ‘a person with a rare breadth of experience in social policy matters and ability to handle wide-ranging material in an articulate and visionary fashion.’ We were fortunate to find such a person although the process of getting his acceptance became rather protracted; inevitably they would be in heavy demand and immersed in many other responsibilities and commitments. At the second meeting of the organising committee, the possibility of approaching Alfred J. Kahn, as principal speaker was raised. I decided subsequently, however, that although he was such a world authority on social planning, we should discuss the question of principal speaker further prior to making any approach. At the next meeting on 16 June, after further discussion we all agreed with a suggestion by Max Wryell that Jim Dumpson should be approached.⁶³

James Dumpson

Max Wryell knew him from discussions in 1959 and again in 1968. I had not met him, but had heard him give a paper at the University of Michigan in 1967 and others knew he was a very able speaker. Since January 1967, he had been dean of the Graduate School of Social Service at Fordham University in New York City. He had been professor and associate dean in the Hunter College School of Social Work 1965–67, after working 1959–65 as commissioner of welfare, City New York, one of the toughest welfare jobs anywhere. Born in 1919, his resumé indicated extensive and impressive professional experience often in child welfare – much of it in New York but also nationally and internationally. In September, 1968, secretary of HEW appointed him as a member of the US delegation to the UN Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare. (Max Wryell was a member of the Australian delegation to this conference.) He was currently president of the US National Conference of Social Welfare, president of the Council on Social Work Education, and chairman of its commission on minority affairs, amongst many other responsibilities and commitments.

62 Minutes, Organising Committee, 25/11/71.

63 Minutes, Organising Committee, 16/6/71.

I wrote to James Dumpson on 7 July, 1971, inviting him to be principal speaker enclosing details of the international seminar. 'As you will see, we are designing a program which will make full use of the talents and experience of all members. It will be very much a working occasion, from which we hope future policy changes in many countries may emerge.'

On 20 July, James Dumpson wrote that the invitation to be the principal speaker at the international seminar was an honour which he valued but also 'a tremendous challenge to contemplate'. He was seriously interested, but wondered if he had sufficient experience in the field of services to the disabled to make the level of contribution the seminar justly deserved. As a member of the executive committee for the ICSW Conference in The Hague 13–19 August, he planned to participate in the conference and was likely to serve as a study tour director for a group of American social workers to the middle east in the period just prior to the conference. If he did finally decide to accept our invitation, he could leave The Hague and journey to Brisbane in time for our seminar. There was little likelihood his university could finance his visit because of the very tight economic situation and 'an appallingly disturbing inflation' in the economy. If he did decide to come, he would need transportation and maintenance costs. He asked for more detail about the seminar parameters and objectives, and the background and likely expectations of the participants. Because he would be in Europe for most of August, his next reply to me would be delayed. He sent greetings to Max Wryell – 'it would be a real treat to see him again'.⁶⁴

My letter to James Dumpson, 3 September, expressed our delight in his serious interest in our invitation and tackled the various questions he had raised. It would be possible to meet his air fares (1st class if he preferred it) from The Hague to Australia and from Australia to New York, and from Brisbane to Sydney if he could stay on for the World Rehabilitation Congress in Sydney, and his maintenance expenses.

On the question of whether your background and experience are relevant to the Seminar's purposes, I hope I can put your mind at rest. There are some difficulties, however. As is pointed out in the Seminar brochure, this is the first world-wide seminar on social aspects of rehabilitation, which has been organized under the auspice of Rehabilitation International, and that organization has only recently established a Social Commission. As far as I can tell, social policy, social science and social work perspectives have not previously been strongly represented in Rehabilitation International's work. This had now been realized and this Seminar is being seen as an important pioneering effort to rectify the situation.

I accepted chairmanship of the Seminar and its organizing committee, because of my general interest in and concern for social planning. I have not taken a specialized interest in policies and services specifically for the disabled. We, on the planning committee, believe that Rehabilitation International will be best served if this first Seminar tackles broad issues which help to 'place' the 'rehabilitation sector' in a full societal context. This means that in the Seminar we are hoping to

64 Letter, James R. Dumpson to R.J. Lawrence, 20/7/71.

mix people who have a good working knowledge of policies and services for the disabled with people who have knowledge of other social policy and service sectors. Our choice of you as Principal Speaker was based upon the unusual breadth of your social service experience, not primarily because of background and experience which you have in the field of services for the disabled.

Already there has been some response to our original brochure, but we will not be able to let you know the sort of people who will actually be participating until much nearer the deadline application date of January 31. We will send you a full list of likely participants (their position, country, etc.) as soon as we have it, together with information on the four speakers giving the general papers in each of the Seminar's 4 consecutive sections. We have tried to indicate in our brochure that places in the Seminar will be competitive, and we will give preference to people likely to be able to discuss broad social issues raised by planning for the disabled.

Although I realize some of this is very indefinite, I hope it indicates the trend of our thinking. We are to some extent feeling our way, but will be more definite as we become better informed ourselves about the likely participants.

If any of this is not clear, or you would like further immediate information or comment please let me know. We look forward to hearing from you.⁶⁵

On 1 December, I wrote again to dean Dumpson enclosing a copy of this 3 September letter – just in case it had gone astray. In a letter that crossed with mine, he wrote 'to finalize a plan' but apologised that he did not have available my letter which had clarified the questions he had raised earlier. In mid-December, he wrote:

Your letter dated September 3rd, of which you kindly sent me a copy, was enormously helpful to me. It removed much of the doubt I had concerning the appropriateness of my accepting the assignment as Principal Speaker for your Seminar next August. As a result of your clarification, I am quite willing to accept your invitation ...

He was certainly interested in staying on for the World Congress, for all or part of the congress depending on the demands of the 1972 academic calendar. He apologized for his delay in accepting and hoped it had not too greatly inconvenienced me and the planning committee.⁶⁶ For us, it was indeed a very welcome letter! I was particularly pleased that he would be demonstrating the contribution that an outstanding experienced social worker could make in enabling us to tackle our global seminar topic. The fact that he was black was also a source of especial satisfaction, particularly since we would be meeting in Queensland.

In March, now that the spring semester with their new curriculum was well underway, James Dumpson sought further orientation information about the seminar in August.⁶⁷ In a long letter, I enclosed a draft program which needed to be read in conjunction with the Seminar brochure also enclosed, and again set down what would be the role of the principal speaker and the role of the four main speakers. Lawrence Haber, director of the division of disability

65 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to J. R. Dumpson, 3/9/71.

66 Letter, James R. Dumpson to R. J. Lawrence, 13/12/71.

67 Letter, James R. Dumpson to R. J. Lawrence, 6/3/72.

studies, office of research and statistics, Social Security Administration, US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, would be the main speaker for the first topic 'Defining the Scope of the Problem'. We anticipated the speakers for the other three topics would come respectively from Europe, Asia, and Canada.

We are hoping that your paper will take an overview of social planning processes, helping us to see various ways of conceptualising, understanding and justifying them. As I mentioned to you in my letter of 3rd September, we are especially keen to have your assistance in trying to see social planning for the physically and mentally disabled related to social planning for other special groups and for the population at large. You will be our main source amongst the speakers, for these broader social policy objectives.

He would have a roving commission amongst the discussions groups during the seminar. On the final day, he would give an hour-long review of the seminar based on the way the four main speakers and the discussion groups had dealt with the seminar's subject. At the concluding session, he would participate in a panel of speakers, together with Dr Armstrong, the chairman of RI's Social Commission, in a review of the commission's draft 'Guidelines' document, which was enclosed.⁶⁸

In May, I wrote to Professor Dumpson. The executive committee of the Council of Social Service of NSW had asked me to invite him to speak for about 30–40 minutes at their annual meeting in Sydney either in the evening of Thursday 24 August (our Brisbane seminar would end at lunch-time on that day) or in the afternoon of Friday 25 August. I enclosed their annual report.

As you will see, it is a fairly conventional 'community welfare council' in U.S.A. terms, but without very much financial or staff muscle. The Council's Annual Meeting will provide you with as broad a social welfare arena as you will get in Sydney, and I'm particularly keen that our social welfare people generally will have a chance to benefit from your visit. A person of your experience would not have to prepare extensively for this address. You would not, of course, be expected to relate specifically to the Australian scene. We rarely have the chance to hear someone like yourself talking about overseas social welfare trends. You may wish to talk about The Hague Conference and its focus on social policy. The choice is entirely yours.⁶⁹

He accepted the invitation and suggested the Friday afternoon time. However, he preferred the officials of the council to suggest areas of their interest that an American social work educator and previous public welfare administrator might be asked to discuss. He did not know if community control, participation in social welfare policy development, and social service delivery had engaged my associates or not. 'It is a live issue here and may be of interest to the council'. He was planning to arrive in Brisbane early in the morning of 19 August, which would give him a full 24-hour period to rest prior to the opening of the seminar, and would attend the Congress opening in

68 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to James R. Dumpson, 16/3/72.

69 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to James R. Dumpson, 9/5/71.

Sydney and stay until about Wednesday 30 August. As current president of the US National Conference on Social Welfare, preparation of their national forum was absorbing all of his 'extra-curricula' time, but he would settle seriously into preparation of the Brisbane seminar after that.⁷⁰ The executive committee of NCOSS were enthusiastic that he might speak on 'community control, participation in social welfare policy development, and social service delivery' and Professor Dumpson suggested 'New approaches in the U.S.A. to social service delivery' as a title for his presentation. I passed on his impressive curriculum vitae to NCOSS for publicity purposes.

Max Wryell wrote to Jim Dumpson that it would have been wonderful to have had some opportunity to help show him a little of Australia and its way of life. In Jim's very tight schedule, perhaps he, his friend Tom Kewley and myself could show him something of Sydney on Saturday, 26 August, the day before the opening of the World Congress. Max was 95% sure he would be at the seminar and would be most disappointed if he were unable to participate. With the federal budget on 15 August possibly with social security changes and a federal election before the end of the year, his position would not be clear for a month or so. He did plan to attend at least the first couple of days of the congress.⁷¹ Jim Dumpson was delighted to receive his letter. He would like to see and experience as much as we could arrange for him.

I do hope you get to the Seminar. Somehow, I believe you are responsible for the invitation to come to Australia. So, I hope your legislative and election processes do not interfere.

I am quite excited about my visit to Australia. It is the last of the world's continents that I must visit.⁷²

In his reply, Max was 'now more than confident' of attending the seminar, although he would probably have to attend to a few other things, and have other jobs on his mind, while he was there. He had sent some general social welfare and tourist information on Australia to him.

I suppose I must accept some degree of responsibility for your invitation to come to Australia and trust that you won't hold this against me, as I am confident that you will fully enjoy your brief stay here. Hopefully it will whet your appetite for a longer visit in the future.⁷³

James Dumpson sent me a copy of his seminar paper on 28 July, delayed because he had under-estimated what would be involved in the follow-up period of their national conference on social welfare and in preparing for the international conference in The Hague – but time enough to get it printed before the seminar. I thought it did the opening task admirably and told him so.⁷⁴

On 9 August the president of NCOSS invited me to 'an informal function'

70 Letter, James R. Dumpson to R. J. Lawrence, 19/5/72.

71 Letter, Max Wryell to dean J. R. Dumpson, 22/6/71.

72 Letter, Jim Dumpson to Max Wryell, 5/7/72.

73 Letter, Max Wryell to dean J. R. Dumpson, 13/7/72.

74 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to James R. Dumpson, 8/8/72.

at 5pm after the annual meeting on 25 August, where the Council's office-bearers and a few businessmen interested in the work of the Council could meet with Professor Dumpson.⁷⁵ The other item placed on his schedule was a visit with me to the School of Social Work at the University of Queensland on the afternoon of Thursday 24 August. (I was on the university selection committee for a professor and head of school in 1971, but an appointment was not made until eventually 1973. Meanwhile the school was under stress. In addition to the general situation of social turbulence of the time, Bjelke-Petersen's ultra-conservative, authoritarian government had come to power in 1968 in Queensland, and some of students and junior staff of the school were heavily involved in the protests. Zelman Cowan, appointed university vice-chancellor in 1970, vigorously chaired the selection committee, determined to make 'a good appointment'. I was not surprised when Jim Dumpson observed after our visit that the dominance of tutor-level staff which he had witnessed was very unhealthy for the school. Fortunately Edna Chamberlain's successful appointment to the chair in 1973 helped the school's internal situation.)

The Other Main Speakers

Finding and commissioning suitable four main speakers for the role we expected of them was also a major challenge for the organising committee. In mid-December 1971, I sent detailed individual letters to three of the selected main speakers, but for a variety of reasons their responses were slow. By mid-January, the final one (for speaker 3) had been sent. By early April, 1972, we had achieved a full complement. One dropped out in mid-May, but fortunately we were able to replace him with a very adequate Australian substitute – my colleague Spencer Colliver.⁷⁶

Speaker 1 – 'Defining the Scope of the Problem'. On the recommendation of Mrs Ida Merriam⁷⁷ arising from her correspondence with Max Wryell, we invited Lawrence Haber to give this paper. An experienced social researcher, he was appointed in 1968 director of the division of disability studies, Office of Research and Statistics of the US Social Security Administration. He had joined the Social Security Administration as a researcher in 1962 after working as a researcher in the private sector. A graduate from Syracuse University, he had a master's degree in sociology from New York University. In accepting the invitation, he was already aware of disability studies in Great Britain, Denmark and Israel, in addition to the United States. He would, of course, be reviewing the literature further but he was doubtful there was much more available. My suggestions and comments would be appreciated.⁷⁸ I sent him material relevant for his paper. On 7 July, he reassured me his paper would arrive soon; the international comparisons which I suggested were more complicated than he anticipated and had somewhat delayed him. On 14 July, I could write to him

⁷⁵ It was to be held in the board dining room of the Rural Bank of NSW.

⁷⁶ Earlier we had invited Spencer to be speaker 3, but he had declined because of his other commitments.

⁷⁷ We initially hoped that she herself might undertake the task. Max knew her well professionally and she had helped me with social security data when I was in the USA in 1967.

⁷⁸ Letter, Lawrence D. Haber to R. J. Lawrence, 31/1/72.

'I am delighted to receive your very substantial paper. This gives us plenty of time to have it duplicated ready for the Seminar'.

Speaker 2 – 'Goal-Setting'. After considerable delay, Duncan Guthrie, director, Central Council for the Disabled, London, accepted my invitation to tackle this paper, but in mid-May 1972 found he was no longer able to attend the congress. I knew Spencer Colliver would be an excellent replacement on this topic. It was central in his university teaching in social welfare administration. He was an experienced social welfare administrator with knowledge of the social planning literature. We were very grateful he accepted the task with so little notice, particularly since earlier he had declined our invitation to be speaker 3 because of commitments.

Speaker 3 – 'Resources-Their Allocation and Utilisation'. I wrote on 19 January, 1971, to P. D. Kulkarni, regional adviser on social development, Social Development Division in ECAFE in Bangkok, inviting him to be our third main speaker. I knew him well from the Pre-Conference Working Party for the ICSW Manila Conference in 1970. He was 'delighted' to have my letter but regretted he could not accept because he was leaving ECAFE to take up a position in a new school of social work at the University of Minnesota. What had particularly attracted him was that they had a track on social development planning as an important part of the new course.⁷⁹ Because of his knowledge of the Asian region, I wrote back asking if he could suggest an appropriate third speaker for us. 'We are particularly keen to have someone with an Asian background to tackle this main paper'.⁸⁰ My letter chased him to Minnesota where he arrived on 1 March amid heavy snow and 15 degrees below temperature – the exact opposite of sunny Australia, he said. He suggested we write to Dr Robert Sugang, in the Department of Social Welfare, Government of The Philippines in Manila. He was an experienced welfare planner and administrator, with sufficiently high academic standing, and the capacity to express himself well both in writing and in speech. Dr Sugang had been accepted by the Australian immigration authority to settle in Australia, and Pee Dee was not sure whether he was still in Manila.⁸¹

On 8 March I sent my detailed invitation to Bert Sugang to be our third main speaker, and sent my kindest regards.⁸² At the same time, on the suggestion of Morrie Fox who had just passed through Sydney, I wrote to Frances Yaras in Bangkok.⁸³ 'Because of the nationalities of the principal and other main speakers at the Seminar, the Organising Committee feels that it is essential to have an Asian, not a European, to tackle this particular topic'. Frances replied promptly and confirmed that Dr Sugang should be approached. 'He certainly is a leader in the field of social welfare in the Philippines'. She mentioned

79 Letter, P. D. Kulkarni to R. J. Lawrence, 26/1/72.

80 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to P. D. Kulkarni, 3/2/72.

81 Letter, Pee Dee Kulkarni to Prof Lawrence, 2/3/72.

82 He had discussed with me his plan to migrate to Australia during the Manila international conferences in 1970.

83 She was regional adviser on training in social work and community development, at ECAFE in Bangkok. I first met her at the 1970 Manila international conferences.

one or two other possibilities, but had grave reservations whether it would be possible for any Asian to accept our invitation since there was no provision for payment of travel, per diem expenditure in Australia, nor financial incentives to write the paper. She hoped she was wrong.⁸⁴

Fortunately, Bert Suggang was 'delighted and very honoured to have been considered' but wondered if already being a resident of Australia at that time would make a difference to our invitation. Their application for permanent residence in Australia had been approved and he and his family were flying to Sydney early in May.⁸⁵ I assured him being resident in Australia would make it more feasible to tackle the task, although we would of course be expecting him to draw extensively on his Asian experience. I asked him to get in touch shortly after his arrival in Sydney. 'I will be most interested to hear of your plans as well as discuss the Seminar'.⁸⁶ Bert's initial period in Sydney was 'quite hectic', working on his paper in between temporary work and keeping appointments for job interviews. In early July, he sent me a hand-written draft of the paper, 'Please feel free to react as you did to the first draft and make necessary corrections or alterations as you see fit'.⁸⁷

I am still keeping "my pecker up" but it seems that the consensus is that I know nothing of local conditions, which is understandable; hence even direct service social work positions are considered unsuitable for me. The solution seems to be to read books that will give me a better understanding of Australian customs, mores, likes and dislikes and life in general. At any rate, I have enjoyed the interviews which, in themselves, have increased my understanding of Australian thinking. The next time you hear from me, it shall be to announce my final job placement.⁸⁸

We were incredibly fortunate that Bert Suggang managed to produce a satisfactory paper for the Seminar at such a critical stage in his own professional and personal life.

He subsequently became a well-respected social work practitioner in Barnardo's in Sydney and became part of that organisation's transformation from a focus on institutional care of children to a range of family-oriented programs for particularly vulnerable children, with progressive social work thinking and practice centrally involved. One of our UNSW social work graduates, Phil Hart, was its executive as it shifted from its historic focus on running institutions called 'homes'. (Barnado Homes were originally founded for destitute and abandoned children in London by Dr Barnado in 1877.) Bert Suggang was a member of the Benevolent Society's Scarba review committee,

84 Letter, Frances Yasas to R. J. Lawrence, 15/3/72. In my letter of invitation to the main speakers, I said that because of the anticipated benefits to themselves and their country, we were confident that the employing agencies of main speakers would finance their attendance at the Seminar. Seminar funds were very limited, but if it made the difference between attendance and non-attendance, a small subsidy might be able to be paid to a main speaker. I was afraid that major funding was not a possibility.

85 Letter, Roberto R. Suggang to R. J. Lawrence, 14/3/72. He was still director, Bureau of Child and Youth Welfare, in the Department of Social Welfare in The Philippines.

86 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Roberto R. Suggang, 4/4/72.

87 With the author's approval, Spencer Colliver assisted me in providing Bert with feedback on the drafts of his paper.

88 Letter, Bert Suggang to John Lawrence, 5/7/72.

which I chaired in 1979. Although he was an obvious loss to The Philippines with its far more serious social welfare problems than Australia, Bert quickly became aware of a real need to tackle child and family welfare problems in his adopted, so-called 'developed' country.

Speaker 4 – 'The Roles of the Disabled'. Our fourth main speaker was a recommendation of the RI Social Commission. During the summer of 1971, Wilfrid Race had had extensive meetings with disabled groups in Ontario. I wrote to him in the Department of National Health and Welfare in Toronto, inviting him to tackle this topic for the seminar.⁸⁹ (It was in fact one of particular political significance within RI itself.) My letter had to be redirected to him at the Canadian Council for the Disabled, where he was director, program services. In a response, in March he apologised for the delay, but was delighted to accept and looked forward to participating in 'this important seminar'.⁹⁰

I agreed to chair a Congress session on 'Implications of Technological Advances for the Handicapped'. Dr Constantina Safilios-Rothschild, a member of the RI Social Commission, had been invited to prepare a paper on social implications of the new technology.⁹¹ Norman Acton subsequently asked if it would be possible to invite her to present a paper at the seminar on social aspects. This would be necessary to secure funding from her university. He suggested she could present an excellent specialised paper in the section on 'The Roles of the Disabled'. She had been particularly concerned about the attitudes of the disabled towards themselves and their increasing ability to make known their needs and problems.⁹² I wrote to Dr Rothschild, a sociologist in the family research, Department of Sociology, Wayne State University, Detroit, inviting her to prepare a specialised paper on a topic of her choice within the seminar's framework, and also to act as chairman of one of the discussion groups. I indicated although we did not think it wise to invite another person from North America to be a main speaker, we might be grateful to seek her assistance if one of those we had invited declined our invitation.⁹³ Dr Rothschild was pleased to serve as a chair of a discussion group, but because of her hectic schedule it would be impossible to prepare a specialised paper.⁹⁴

We eventually received only two specialised papers, for printing and inclusion in the seminar material received by all of the seminar participants – 'Social and Vocational Rehabilitation of the Chronically Unemployed Public Assistance Recipients', by Yehuda Schiff, director, welfare and rehabilitation service, Ministry of Social Welfare, State of Israel; and 'Education of the Disabled Child in the South Pacific', by Pierre Gorman, research co-ordinator, Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne.

Keith Armstrong, national executive director, Canadian Rehabilitation

89 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Wilfrid B. Race 13/12/71.

90 Letter, Wilfrid B. Race to R. J. Lawrence, 15/3/72.

91 Letter, Norman Acton to J. Lawrence, 30/11/71. In June 1972, this and a paper by Wilf Race on social action, were relocated into a plenary session, 'Social Change and Social Action', which I agreed to chair.

92 Letter, Norman Acton to J. Lawrence, 18/1/72.

93 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Norman Acton, 24/1/72.

94 Letter, Norman Acton to J. Lawrence, 3/2/72.

Council for the Disabled, was chairman of the IR Social Commission. He had been in periodic correspondence with me both as a member of the commission and as chairman of the seminar. On 8 March, 1971, I told him that we had about 41 interested people from overseas, a number he thought particularly encouraging at this stage of the program planning. He was happy to serve as chairman of a discussion group at the seminar and to introduce the draft guidelines produced by the Social Commission (in the final seminar session which would review them in the light of the seminar's discussions). He would be encouraging members of the Social Commission to attend the Brisbane seminar.⁹⁵

The 'Seminar Information and Programme' document provided to each participant reflected the considerable planning, in both Sydney and in Brisbane, that had gone into the preparation for this international occasion. It provided the names and work addresses of the 18 members of the Rehabilitation International Social Commission (7 of these attended the seminar), and the names and positions of the 10 members of the organising committee and the six convenors in Queensland assisting the organising committee. Immediately before detailing the program, it listed the issues that would be under discussion in each of the four sequential sections of the program. After full information on the program, the names, positions and addresses of the 66 participants from 21 countries,⁹⁶ and the 15 observers from Australia were listed. Each participant was located in one of the 5 listed discussion groups. The chairs and rapporteurs were Keith Armstrong and Millie Mills (group 1), Karl Montan and Joan Tuxen (group 2), Constantina Saflios-Rothschild and William Langshaw (group 3), Rev. Fr. John Collins and Max Wryell (group 4), and Annie Chan and David Hall (group 5). Four of the rapporteurs were members of the seminar organising committee and the other one, David Hall, was a qualified social worker working as a project officer in Max Wryell's department. At the end of each day, I would meet with the group chairmen, rapporteurs and the speaker of the day. During the first 30 minutes of the next day that speaker would review his topic as handled by the discussion groups as reported by the rapporteurs.

At the beginning of the seminar document, I wrote in these terms:

Dear Colleague,

Our attendance at this Seminar represents a considerable expenditure of time, effort and money – by individuals and by organizations, government and non-government. These will be resources well spent if our discussions result in enhanced life chances and life styles for disabled people. I anticipate that we all personally will be gaining a great deal from the Seminar's intellectual and social stimulation. Certainly this has been the major pre-occupation of the Seminar organizers. The

⁹⁵ Letter, Keith S. Armstrong to R. J. Lawrence, 10/4/71.

⁹⁶ 16 came from the host country, Australia, 11 from Hong Kong, 9 from the USA, 4 from Canada, 3 each from New Zealand and South Africa, 2 each from Swaziland, Austria, West Germany, Iran, Zambia, and Thailand, and 1 each from Ghana, Kenya, Bahamas, India, Vietnam, Sweden, Norway, and Israel. One of the participants from Canada was Betty Govan, a professor from the School of Social Work at the University of Toronto. As indicated in Vol. 2, she had been the first director, Department of Social Studies, University of Sydney, 1940–45.

Seminar's main point and pay-off, however, must lie not with our personal satisfactions but with our effectiveness in helping to improve the life conditions of the people who are our focus of concern.

For all participants this will be a working occasion. In the course of the Seminar, each member will be expected to –

- to have read the distributed papers (especially the relevant main paper before each Section is dealt with in the Seminar)
- to participate actively and frankly in a discussion group
- to read the Social Commission's draft statement, 'Guidelines for the Future', in order to participate in the review of this statement in the final Session.

But as you can see from the programme, it is not all work. Our Brisbane hosts have seen to that!

Whether at work or relaxing together, we are delighted to have you with us. Thank you for coming. If we can help you in any way at any time, please don't hesitate to say so. The Information Sheet indicates those whom to contact.

The president of the World Congress, John Broinowski, and the secretary-general of Rehabilitation International, Norman Acton, spoke briefly at the opening of the first plenary session of the seminar on Sunday, 20 August. The Australian minister for social services, W. C. Wentworth, sent his apologies because he was opening a facility at Bedford Park Industries in Adelaide. Bill Hayden, the shadow minister for social services, also sent apologies. Both sent messages wishing this international seminar success. I provided an introduction to the seminar before introducing the principal speaker Jim Dumpson.

The Keynote Address

At the outset of his paper, he acknowledged the many 'value and experiential prisms' through which he viewed the subject of the seminar – 'Issues in social planning for the physically and mentally disabled'. He was an American social worker and his view of people, whatever their condition, was influenced by the American social work value system with its commitment to a democratic, humanitarian ideal; with its emphasis on the dignity and worth of every individual. He was an American Black man and, as such, had internalised certain values and attitudes that were associated with that particular minority status as well as all minority status. He was also a social work educator and practitioner who was keenly interested in social policy and social planning. As he integrated these prismatic views, he related first to people as individuals albeit they happened also to be labelled handicapped. The handicapped person was viewed as an individual with an inherent right to benefit from an equitable distribution of all the social benefits and services required by all individuals to meet their full potential, as socially and economically participating members of society. Recognition was given to the universality of human need but also to the influence of differing social, economic and cultural characteristics of a society on the structure and content of need fulfilling benefits and services. The handicapped and disabled person also had special needs and these could best be met by assuring needs fulfilment for all people.

Social planning was a systematic, on-going process of anticipating needs, making adequate provision for meeting those needs, and for evaluating the effectiveness of both of these steps for input into the process. He briefly summarised social change factors which influenced the definition and solution of issues, and then identified a number of social issues which related to the social component of rehabilitation and the importance of its integration with the medical, education, and vocational components. The implications for social policy development of a systems approach to an understanding and organisation of social supports for people described as handicapped were set down. In many countries there was growing acceptance of government having primary leadership responsibility in effecting social systems change as well as change in national values. The field of rehabilitation was a ready example of this development. It was nurtured by the premise that government had as its primary responsibility the utilisation of its social, economic, and political resources for the well-being of its citizens. The role of government was one of the many issues Dumpson expected to be considered in the seminar.

He concluded his paper with a return to an emphasis on values, quoting from Alfred Kahn's *Planning Community Services for Children in Trouble* –

Mechanisms, structures, and designs come after values. Devices and instruments have no validity except in relation to goals. A community cannot be expected to support a program whose objectives are not understood or are opposed. And a practitioner whether he be judge, probation officer, a school social worker, or a house parent in an institution, (and he might have added personnel in rehabilitation) cannot implement a policy whose basic philosophy is confusing.

Dumpson believed that basic philosophy and human values were 'the cornerstone for all of the concerns at this seminar'.

The major thesis of this paper is that all or most of the issues involved in planning for the handicapped have their source in the malfunctioning of those social and economic systems that affect the lives of the handicapped person. It must be remembered that our systems reflect the values of the groups in power. A superordinate issue for all of us is how to stimulate and cause a society, through a socio-economic planning process, to mobilise all of its resources and energies to effect the necessary value changes without which there can be no significant change in our social policies. The challenge to all of us, regardless of our social role, our reference groups, or social systems is to find ways, and support those ways, for contributing to the improvement of the quality of life for a significant proportion of our society.⁹⁷

As part of a report of the World Congress in the 1972 October issue of *Rehabilitation in Australia*, I gave a brief account of the social aspects seminar:

In 1969, Rehabilitation International took steps to set up a Social Commission. In association with Rehabilitation International, its Social Commission, and ACROD,

⁹⁷ James R. Dumpson, 'Issues in Social Planning for the Physically and Mentally Disabled', Brisbane, August, 1972.

an Australian Organizing Committee organised Rehabilitation International's first seminar on social aspects, associated with a world rehabilitation congress. This Seminar was held at the Crest Hotel in Brisbane, August 20–24, 1972: the theme, 'Issues in Social Planning for the Physically and Mentally Disabled.'

A recurring observation at the Seminar was the comparative neglect of social, as distinct from medical, vocational and educational aspects of rehabilitation. It was, however, strongly asserted that all aspects of rehabilitation needed to be seen in a social context. What values people hold, for themselves and others, and what services give people access to these values are essentially social matters. It was generally agreed that persons with disability should have access to the same range of human values as the rest of the population. Planning to achieve this was the focus of the Seminar.

The Principal Speaker, Professor James Dumpson, a distinguished black American social worker, placed emphasis squarely upon the handicapping social and economic systems within which persons with a disability lead their lives, and saw special needs of the disabled being met in systems of service universally available to the general population. Residual, separatist, and potentially stigmatising services only for the disabled were strongly disfavoured. In Professor Dumpson's view, the challenge for responsible action lay not in making people adjust to unfair and inadequate social and economic systems, but to change the systems through informed and just social policies.

The Seminar's main speakers – drawn from the United States, Australia, the Philippines, and Canada – prepared major papers on the four sequential topics, 'Defining the Scope of the Problem', 'Goal-Setting', 'Resources – Their Allocation and Utilization', and 'The Roles of the Disabled'. In addition there were two specialized background papers. Much of the Seminar took the form of 5 parallel discussion groups. Each commenced with the previous day's speaker commenting on the way the discussion groups had handled his particular topic. In the final session participants had the opportunity to comment on a draft set of 'guidelines' for action, prepared by the Social Commission.

In all, 92 people attended the Seminar – 66 as full participants. Because of the keen local interest, 15 Queenslanders were invited as observers to the plenary sessions. So as not to swamp an international occasion, Australian participation had to be carefully limited. This gave the Organizing Committee one of its most difficult tasks. ...

The organization of the Seminar was a notable collaborative effort extending across many boundaries, international, national and state, and government and non-government, and boundaries between rehabilitation and other social welfare services. The contributions of staff of the Crippled Children's Association of New South Wales and of the Commonwealth Department of Social Services were particularly noteworthy.

Three Australian outcomes of this Seminar could well be:

- increased confidence in task-focussed social welfare collaboration
- greater awareness of the crucial role of social work staff in designing and maintaining effective services for people with a disability, and
- stimulus to rehabilitation interest in Queensland

This made no mention of the social program which in fact made a significant contribution to the success of the seminar – the buffet meal and ‘get together’ on the first evening, the private hospitality provided for the participants in the evening of the second day, and the Queensland government reception at the end of the third day. The Queensland premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen,⁹⁸ and a number of his ministerial colleagues, came to the reception. I had the task of introducing each conference participant to the premier and I took particular pleasure in introducing our black principal speaker!

I wrote to Jim Dumpson on 7 September:

For once I'm almost lost for words. How can I express adequately our appreciation for your contribution not only to the Brisbane Seminar, but to the New South Wales welfare community, and the Queensland and New South Wales Universities' schools of social work. You are a 'package deal' of great rarity, able to contribute richly in whatever context you move.

I know that fitting in this Australian visit amongst all your other commitments must have been extremely difficult. You have the heartfelt thanks of all of us that you made the effort.

The breadth, wisdom and manifest concern of your various contributions could not have been more highly valued. Especially were you exactly the sort of person we were seeking as the Principal Speaker for the International Seminar.

I personally greatly enjoyed your company and only wish that New York were closer to Sydney.⁹⁹

In early September, I also wrote many other individual thank-you letters – to each of the main speakers, to the members of the organising committee, to the Queensland convenors, to Bruce Hamilton (director-general, CDSS) and Colin Atkinson (Queensland director, CDSS) for secretarial and organising work by CDSS staff, to Selina Parkinson of NSW Society for Crippled Children for her secretarial work, to the manager and staff of the Crest Hotel – ‘the various arrangements proved eminently suitable and we could not have wished for a more pleasant and co-operative atmosphere’, to Charles Butler for persuading the government to put on a first-rate reception, and to the premier for the state reception and attending the reception with a number of his ministers. I also sent a general letter of appreciation to the 18 people who had provided private hospitality for the participants on the Monday evening of the seminar.

I congratulated Jean Garside on her organisation of the World Congress (‘I heard nothing but complimentary remarks about it’), and for her assistance over many months with the Brisbane Seminar. ‘That Seminar was an excellent collaborative effort, with everyone pulling their weight. In fact, it has greatly strengthened my fundamental faith in humanity!’¹⁰⁰ Jean wrote:

ACROD is greatly indebted to you for the enthusiasm and energy which you gave

98 He was Queensland premier from 1968 to 1987 – an ultra-conservative, ‘law and order’ politician who maintained office through a continuing electoral gerrymander.

99 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to James R. Dumpson, 7/9/72.

100 Letter, John Lawrence to Jean Garside, 8/9/72.

to the task of organisation and your Chairmanship of the Seminar. When it was first decided that the Seminar would be held, I was the person who nominated you for the position of Chairman and at no stage in the planning did I ever doubt my choice. From what I hear, everyone who attended was very satisfied with the content of the programme and with the method of organisation. I am sure that you have received many complimentary letters and messages from those who participated. ...¹⁰¹

Norman Acton thanked me on behalf of the Council of RI for my share in making the Congress program both excellent and comprehensive. 'We are aware that sacrifices may have been necessary on your part to engage fully in the concentrated professional aspects of the Congress and we assure you of our appreciation'.¹⁰²

We did receive very positive feed-back from the participants in the seminar. For example, Wilf Race wrote from Canada that he had very much enjoyed participating. 'It was just about the best run international meeting I have ever attended. When such efficiency is combined with the kind of warm friendship and hospitality which you and your colleagues extended to us, a remarkable outcome is inevitable. ... It was a great pleasure to me to meet you, and I hope that you will look me up when you are next in Canada'.¹⁰³ Leslie Park, executive director, UCP (United Cerebral Palsy of New York) 'felt the meeting was extremely well planned and demonstrated the outstanding leadership you manifested throughout the actual operation of the seminar. I personally gained from this experience very much and am sure others who attended feel the same'.¹⁰⁴ Dr Wolfgang Presber, chief consultant for a rehabilitation clinic in East Berlin, wrote on 21 October thanking me for sending him 'the promised copy of the 'Guidelines'. 'I think it is fine material and as I said already you did a good job. ... May I tell you once more that you did a good job on this seminar too. I liked very much to be a participant'. He said he would always be glad to see me and show me around a little when I visit 'the old continent' during my studies.¹⁰⁵

The 'Guidelines' document referred to by Dr Presber was prepared by myself and Beatrice Wright. It was evident in the light of the seminar content, and discussion of the draft statement of guidelines for the future in the final 2-hour plenary session of the seminar (which I chaired) that revised draft guidelines would be needed for consideration of a sub-committee of the Social Commission of RI on 31 August. This was just prior to Keith Armstrong's report to the final working plenary session of the Congress on Friday, 1 September. Beatrice Wright and I found time to tackle this difficult task, on 30 August! Fortunately we were in basic agreement about what was

101 Letter, Jean Garside to John Lawrence, 26/9/72. She enclosed a copy of a letter from Keith Armstrong to John Broinowski, expressing 'very deep appreciation for the excellent way in which the 12th World Congress was organised and carried through. ... It will go down in the records as one of the really constructive events in the life of Rehabilitation International', 21/9/72.

102 Letter, Norman Acton to Professor J. Lawrence, 26/9/72.

103 Letter, Wilfrid Race to John Lawrence, 4/10/72,

104 Letter, Leslie D. Park to John Lawrence, 14/9/72.

105 Letter, Wolfgang Presber to Prof Lawrence, 21/10/72.

required and I could not have had a better collaborator.

Beatrice Wright, a fellow member of the RI Social Commission, was a professor of psychology from University of Kansas in the United States.¹⁰⁶ She gave me to read her recent article, 'Value-Laden Beliefs and Principles for Rehabilitation Psychology', which set down her conception of important principles and beliefs that applied to rehabilitation psychology as a field of study and service. Her book *Physical Disability – A Psychological Approach* (1960) was 'a seminal work on disability and psychology'.¹⁰⁷ I recall her telling me that not before had she encountered social workers like Spencer Collier and myself who took such a broad social approach. She also observed, however, as we worked together that I was well aware of psychological aspects of disability. (The 1983 second edition of her 1960s book was retitled *Physical Disability – A Psychosocial Approach*, which of course was typically how social workers viewed their work.)

I commended Keith Armstrong for his 'admirable and very responsible' handling of the guidelines situation in the final day of the Congress. 'Giving yourselves time to review all of the relevant materials, including the hurriedly prepared document of Beatrice and myself, was surely the wisest course of action'.¹⁰⁸ As agreed, I sent multiple copies of our document to Keith and to each of the people who attended the meeting on 31 August.

In mid-December, 1972, Keith Armstrong sent to members of the Social Commission a copy of the 'Social Guidelines for the Future', finalised by the guidelines subcommittee. As chairman he took responsibility for the document. This terminated his responsibilities as chairman. He expressed his sincere appreciation for the co-operation he had enjoyed. There had been four meetings of the commission – London, Athens, Paris and Sydney. Those not able to attend had contributed through correspondence. 'We are grateful to Dr Safilios-Rothschild for the leadership she gave to the seminar on psycho-social aspects in Athens, and to Dr Lawrence for the outstanding seminar in Brisbane'.¹⁰⁹

In an introduction to the publication, *Rehabilitation Guidelines for the Future in the Medical, Vocational, Educational and Social Fields* (Rehabilitation International, New York, December 1972), Norman Action described the process behind the production of the texts and claimed they represented a consensus of the thinking of the more than 1500 participants, volunteers and professionals, in the 12th World Rehabilitation Congress. They had not been officially adopted by RI or any other organisation, but they pointed to some of the concerns of highest priority in the further development of rehabilitation services and merited consideration by all who played a role in that development.

106 In 1976, when I was asked to write in support of her nomination as a distinguished professor, I stated, 'Her remarkable record of scholarly writing and community activity speaks for itself. I know of no-one who has made a greater contribution to the psychology of disability. Her work is well recognised in rehabilitation and professional circles far beyond the confines of her own country.' Letter, R.J. Lawrence to Franklin C. Shontz, University of Kansas, 16/11/76.

107 See 'Beatrice Wright (psychologist)', article on the internet.

108 Letter, John Lawrence to Keith Armstrong, 8/9/72.

109 Keith Armstrong memorandum to members of the RI social commission, 14/12/72.

The final 'Guidelines for the Future in Social Rehabilitation' in this publication was an 11 – page statement, with each section and each paragraph numbered for ready reference. The preamble was almost identical to the one Beatrice Wright and I provided in our draft document. It read:

I. PREAMBLE

1. The focus of concern of Rehabilitation International, and especially of its Social Commission, is to enhance the life conditions and personal well-being of all people who have physical or mental disabilities. People in rehabilitation must cooperate with others whose prime concern is the prevention of accidents, disease, and other disabling conditions. However effective are preventive measures, every society has a substantial proportion of its population suffering from disability and in need of rehabilitation services.
2. The following guidelines are presented as common principles or guides to action which have strong claims for the attention of those who make decisions which affect a society's social condition.
3. As is testified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948, it is possible for all humanity to agree in a very general way on what things are important to every human being. That Declaration has moral, not legal force. It suggests common interests, values or objectives which people share and which must not be set aside lightly by decision makers.
4. Because mankind is grouped in nation states, special responsibility for ensuring and enhancing reasonable life conditions for all people resides within those states.
5. The Universal Declaration sees, however, not only states, but 'every individual and every organ of society' as having a responsibility to promote the matters contained in the Declaration.
6. Every human being lives within, and in contact with, many social systems, formal and informal – the family, voluntary organisations, neighbourhood groups and various economic and political systems at different organisational levels.
7. Key values which underly and give direction to a society's social systems include: Civil and Political Rights (as expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), and Social, Economic, and Cultural Rights.
8. These Rights provide personal freedom and responsibility, individual, group and community participation and a sense of dignity, worth and purpose.
9. These values serve both as ends in themselves and as means to other ends. For example, health may be seen as an end in itself as well as a means to the attainment of other important ends like education and employment.
10. Societies have increasingly developed policies and services which enable people to respond to their key values defined in terms of needs and goals. How any person fares in relation to these values is highly dependent upon the scope and availability of a range of specialized services.

11. Every society in the world is in a state of social change and development, a fact that emphasizes the need for social planning.
12. The basic value premise of these guidelines is that each society has a moral responsibility to ensure that its members have reasonable access to these common human values. In order to achieve this, especially in relation to those of its members who are physically or mentally disabled, some guidelines are necessary.

After this preamble, the Lawrence/Wright document proposed 38 specific guides for action addressed to the life conditions of persons with disabilities:

Equality of Access to Human Values

1. Persons with a disability should have access to the same range of human values as the rest of the population.

Additional Specialized Services

2. Depending on the nature of the disability, this access will often require additional resources and specialized services.

Life's Many Social Contexts

3. The actual and potential life conditions of the person with a disability can be fully understood only by studying the overall range of social contexts within which he¹¹⁰ lives his life.

Broad Understanding Underpinning Action

4. Intervention to enhance such life conditions should be based on as broad an understanding as possible, even when the intervention is addressed to only one specific aspect of the person's life.

The Need for Calculated Risks

5. In many circumstances, however, it may be justifiable to take a calculated risk in terms of what is perceived to be at stake, rather than await more complete knowledge.

Multiple Involvement in Policies and Action

6. In every society the life conditions of many people with disabilities are seen to violate widely held values sufficiently for rectifying action to be taken. Increasingly, such action is being taken by governments as well as by non-government groups, with the disabled themselves playing a significant role. This trend toward multiple involvement should be strengthened.

Whose "Good Life"?

7. Especially important is recognition of the right of the disabled themselves to specify their preferred life style on which community strategies should be based; for example, living in segregated housing versus with the rest of the community.

Extending Living Horizons

110 Yet another example of the sexist language convention of the day.

8. Because of the limited social experiences societies have allowed their disabled members, the disabled will often need special assistance to become aware of the possibilities for living more fully.

Achieving Justifiable Decisions

9. At all levels of decision making, action should be guided by a consideration of the interests of all the persons involved. Persons with a disability, especially where it is stigmatized, tend to be excluded from such equal consideration. This means that special measures have to be taken to ensure that their interests are reasonably reflected in decisions at all levels of social organization.

The Role of Family Life and Necessary Supports

10. The family is particularly important in giving its members an experience of sustained, close, personal relationships. Families with disabled members often will need special support for a variety of social services. Without such support, all members of the family are likely to suffer unjustifiable deprivation.

Education of the Public

11. Every society should actively educate its members about the nature of various disabilities and should combat harmful stereotypes. Direct personal contact resulting in a positive experience is important in this process.

Adapting the Physical Environment

12. Every society needs to recognize in its physical arrangements, the wide range of physical capacity of its population. These arrangements include all buildings and their furniture and fittings, transport systems, and other public facilities such as post boxes, telephone booths, and drinking fountains. Principles relating to the removal and avoidance of architectural barriers to people with limited capacity should be included in a society's building codes.

Extending Mobility

13. Since access to many human values depends upon mobility, increasing the mobility of people with a disability must have a high priority. Practical mobility devices of all sorts should be developed with due regard to the conditions of their use and maintenance. They should be made widely available and not confined to those who can afford them.

Relevant and Widely Available Bio-Technical Aids

14. Bio-technical aids, both very simple and complex, should generally be addressed to the every-day needs of the disabled person, and should be made available.

Information Centres

15. All disabled persons, their families, professionals, and others should have ready access to up-to-date knowledge on all aspects of legislation, policies, services, and equipment to assist the disabled. This requires

development of information centres, linked to a central system.

Informing Potential Clients

16. Every effort should be made to inform citizens of services available, especially those citizens who can directly benefit from them.

Accessibility of Service

17. Social agencies must reach out and make accessible their services to their potential clients, for example, by geographical decentralization, by employing itinerant professionals, by using indigenous workers, and by making services available in the evening and at week-ends.

The Value of Work

18. Work is highly valued in most societies for most people. The traditional concern to integrate persons with a disability into the work force has therefore continuing validity for many disabled. However, a single-minded concern for work to the neglect of other human values does not give full weight to the many possible dimensions of human life.

Fitting Jobs and People

19. To enable many persons who are disabled to be integrated into the labour market, special help will often be necessary. This includes modifying working conditions to meet special needs as well as developing appropriate job skills.

An Adequate Income Security System

20. Every society has a responsibility to develop an adequate income security system which covers as a matter of right, the basic economic needs of population groups who are separated from the work force. What is considered "basic" will vary from society to society and must be determined according to the prevailing standards of living.

Relevant Services for the Severely Disabled

21. For a proportion of people with severe disabilities, competitive or sheltered work is not feasible. These people should be fully entitled to services which fulfil other important values apart from the work value – for example, recreational, health, education, and housing services.

Responsibilities of the Disabled

22. Every person in a society should have reciprocal responsibilities as well as rights. Assumption of social responsibilities – to family, friends, the wider community – applies as much to persons with a disability as to other members of society.

Avoidance of Legislative Segregation

23. Legislation to meet the special needs of people with disabilities should be incorporated in, and not separate from, legislation for the rest of the society.

Ineffectual Legislation

24. Legislation not effectively implemented is worse than no legislation,

because it brings law into disrepute and pays merely lip service to society's responsibility for some of its most vulnerable citizens. (Legislation does not always need to precede relevant community action to meet the needs of person with a disability.)

Mutual Aid Groups

25. Mutual aid groups of persons with disabilities can play an important role in initiating collective action to meet their needs. This may include advocacy and direct help roles, and employment of professional and other staff with relevant knowledge and skills.

Explicit Goals

26. All organized systems of service involving disabled people need to state clearly their goals in terms of which they can be organized, can seek public support, can assess results, can be held accountable and can be effectively related to by other agencies.

Respective Roles in a Comprehensive System of Service

27. Societies should try to achieve at least some measure of agreement on the respective roles of different levels of government and non-government organizations in the overall system of service available to people who are disabled. Under conditions of rapid social change, these respective roles will need periodic review, and could well change quite radically in a short period of time.

An Overview National Body

28. In each country there should be a statutory overview organization concerned with the well-being of people with disabilities. It should be multidisciplinary, and representative of consumer groups and of all types of organization, government and non-government. This body should maintain close relationships with other national bodies such as general welfare organizations and more specialized rehabilitation bodies.

Manpower Requirements

29. To help many of the disabled to attain the wide range of human values specified in these Guidelines, the service of large numbers of professional people and of others with special skills and relevant training are required.

Professional Manpower and Relevant Education

30. The basic professional education of medical doctors, therapists, teachers, psychologists, social workers, architects, town planners and others should include (a) understanding of the social and emotional needs of the disabled, and (b) how to work in collaborative client – and community – focussed teams. Continuing education should be built on this educational base.

Seeking Financial Resources

31. Any organization seeking financial resources should not do so at the expense of their actual and potential clients. Emotional, pitying appeals tend to do this.

More Equitable Distribution of Financial and Manpower Resources

32. Every society needs to give explicit attention to its distribution of financial and manpower resources against the needs of the various population categories, with a view to removing glaring disparities between categories of disabled as well as between disabled and non-disabled.

Counselling Help

33. A disabled individual receiving service will often need the help of a particular person acting as counsellor or social case worker to enable the individual to use available services as effectively as possible. Such a helping person must have full collaborative relationships with the other personnel involved in service provision.

Using Knowledge for Social Action

34. Knowledge gained from working with problems of disability should be used in social action towards improving the life conditions of the disabled.

Protecting Individual Rights

35. An ombudsman for the disabled may be appointed to safeguard the rights of the individual and to rectify the wrongs suffered at the hands of government and other organized services.

The "Village Counsellor"

36. In economically developing countries, or in sparsely populated areas, an indigenous "village counsellor" might help the disabled person and his family to seek appropriate assistance. To be effective, this role will require some basic training.

The Need for Research and Utilizing its Findings

37. All societies should devote skilled resources to research into the scope of problems associated with disablement and deliberate effort should be made to utilize in current policies and practice relevant findings.

Sharing Experience Internationally

38. Each country should share internationally its experience and research in developing new ways of achieving improved life conditions for all its people including those with disabilities. These should include studies of comparative legislation and different service delivery models which each country can adapt to its own situation.

In conclusion, the Lawrence/Wright document stated:

IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE GUIDES FOR ACTION

The specific economic, political, geographic, and cultural circumstances of each society must determine how each of the above guides is appropriately applied in that society. What is a morally justifiable course of action depends upon how it actually affects the interests of all the people involved. Especially under conditions of scarce resources, a more limited range of choices is likely to operate, and what is right under the circumstances in one society may be radically different from

what is right in another. As was stated in the preamble, however, there do appear to be common goals roughly shared by all mankind, and these provide universal reference points – to be interpreted and made operational in the specific circumstances of each society.

The final Guidelines document (December 1972), after our preamble, organised its guidelines under various headings: Scope of Commission Activity; Exploring New Dimensions in the Environment – The physical environment, The economic environment, The legal environment, The social and cultural environment, The psychological and emotional environment of the disabled (each with objectives for action); Training of rehabilitation personnel; Research; and Implementation. Not unexpectedly the document was more oriented to action to be taken by RI and its members than ours had been, but much of the content was the same or similar. Ours had attempted to provide an underlying philosophical rationale in moral philosophy, which reflected Jim Dumpson's emphasis on the fundamental importance of values and philosophy in social policy and action.

In July 1973, I was asked to accept re-appointment as a member of the Rehabilitation International Social Commission. Norman Acton sincerely regretted the delay in the re-constitution of the commission after the congress in Australia. It had been decided to seek to decentralize many of the activities of RI, including the operations of the standing commissions. Each commission would now have a 'detached secretariat' provided by an affiliated national organisation. The Social Commission would now operate in Finland and Dr Veikko Niemi would serve as chairman.¹¹¹ I sent my reluctant acceptance, because 'we in Australia are so far off the international beaten track'. I hoped to spend a sabbatical in Britain in the second half of 1974, and this would bring me so much closer to the secretariat at least for a period. However, in June 1974, I had to resign because I found it impossible to be an active member of the commission and I did not think there should be inactive members on the commission. 'I am still very strongly identified with the Commission's work, and wish you well in your activities.'¹¹² I very much appreciated receiving a postcard from Veikko Niemi, regretting my resignation, with messages from other members of the Commission meeting in Opir, Portugal, in September 1974.

111 Letter, Norman Acton to John Lawrence, 19/7/73.

112 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr Neikko Niemi, 14/6/74.

R. I. Social Commission - World Seminar, Brisbane 1972



Seminar Participants (James Dumpson – second row, 5th from the right-hand end)



RJL visiting seminar discussion group – Betty Govan, Larry Haber and ?



Max Wryell, Jim Dumpson and Tom Kewley – in Sydney for World Rehab. Congress



Thai participant, Beatrice Wright and Tina Saflios-Rothschild – Gold Coast, on way to Sydney for World Rehabilitation Congress

Chapter 4

Program Planning, ICSW World Conference 1972 – The Hague

In December, 1970, the executive committee of the ICSW invited me to be a member of the program committee for next world conference in The Hague. J. K. Owens (United Kingdom)¹¹³ would be the chairman. It was realised that much of the work would have to be done by correspondence. I already had made the heavy commitment of acting as chairman responsible for the world seminar on social aspects of rehabilitation in August, 1972, but despite this they were eager to have me, although they understood it would be impossible for me to attend the conference. Kate Katski assured me the duty of the program committee members would not be too onerous.¹¹⁴ In accepting I expressed my appreciation of my Manila experience and saw undertaking this further work as the best way of showing it.¹¹⁵

An *ICSW Conference Bulletin* (January, 1971) stressed that the 16th Conference should consider how the goals and strategies ‘in the excellent report of the pre-conference working party’ and in the deliberations of the 15th Conference in Manila could be built into overall national and international development policies. Six topics were amongst those which would need attention – integrating economic and social policies in a unified strategy; the components, the range of consultation, and the priorities which go into the making of viable social policy; the preventative aspect of social planning and the development of projects designed to anticipate problems; implementing social policy to ensure maximum public participation in viable programs together with social justice for minorities; the evaluation of the success of social policies by means of indicators, statistics and research; and the planning and

113 Director, National Council of Social Service, UK.

114 The 25 members of the program committee came from England (2), Netherlands, Brazil (2), Togo, Nepal, Israel, USA (3), Mauritius, Nigeria, Australia, Venezuela, Iran, Japan, Spain, Yugoslavia, Panama, Switzerland, Austria, Kenya, France, and Canada.

115 Letters, Charles I. Schottland to R.J. Lawrence, 30/12/70; R.J. Lawrence to C. I. Schottland, 10/1/71; Kate Katski to John Lawrence, 21/1/71.

execution of social policy at the sub-national level to meet varying needs of different areas and to ensure optimal units for the provision and administration of social services.¹¹⁶ The program committee was responsible for developing the program outline for consideration and approval by the ICSW executive committee in August 1971. A planning timetable was provided.

It was anticipated that the conference structure would be generally similar to earlier conferences – national reports; pre-conference working party; plenary sessions with internationally recognised speakers; general meetings with presentations by experts on topics related to the theme; commissions of experts selected by national committees and international member organisations; international exchange groups for participants; meetings sponsored by international voluntary agencies; special meetings for persons with common interests not necessarily related to the conference theme; films; agency visits; and exhibits by national committees, governments and international organisations, illustrating programs and activities related to the theme.

The chairman of the ICSW program committee wrote after a full meeting of the committee (attended by 19 members and ICSW officers) in Edinburgh on 29 July, thanking me for my letter of 19 July. 'We had a very interesting session although I received far less help with subjects and speakers than I did from the excellent suggestions which you made in your letter'. Enclosed was a letter to all members of the committee, with minutes of the subsequent Brussels ICSW executive committee which had discussed the recommendations of the program committee.¹¹⁷ This meeting had decided on a final wording for the conference theme – 'Developing social policy in conditions of rapid change – the role of social welfare'. The purpose and most suitable arrangements for the pre-conference working party and the national reports had received lengthy discussion at both meetings. I noted with special interest that Julia Henderson (general secretary of the International Planned Parenthood Federation) was to chair a pre-conference working party of experts in January 1972, well ahead of the Hague Conference. J. K. Owens's letter had a 'PS':

Although it is rather late in the day may I congratulate you on the success of the Manila Pre-Conference Working Party. Both at Edinburgh and in Brussels there was much talk of the excellence of the report of your group.¹¹⁸

116 These were the topics used for the six expert commissions, for which the program committee sought chairmen, vice-chairmen and rapporteurs.

117 Attached papers listed suggestions received for key speakers and topics at the conference. Mine included Professor Richard Titmuss (opening plenary session), R. J. Dowling and Keith Hancock (economics professors), and R. J. Hawke (president, ACTU) for speakers, and social policy and the multinational organisation, national and international mobility, the role of international organisations, the effect of the loss of a disproportionate number of the population being in the non-earning group, economics and social policy, etc.

118 Letter, J. K. Owens to R. J. Lawrence, 24/8/71.

Chapter 5

Objectives of ICSW Conferences, 1973

Although I could not attend the Hague Conference, I was invited by the new ICSW president Reuben Baetz, to be a member of an ICSW Committee on Objectives of International Conferences. J. K. Owens chaired the committee of 9, with Baetz and Kate Katski (ICSW secretary-general) ex officio members.¹¹⁹ Our task was 'to consider and report on objectives of our International Conferences in relation to the goals of the International Council on Social Welfare and to make recommendations to the 1973 Executive Committee on a structure for the 1976 Conference which will be best suited to meet these objectives'.

Not until April 1973, however, did we hear from the committee's chairman. The 1973 Executive Committee would be meeting in Granada in Spain, 2–4 July. Our committee would meet at 2.30 pm on 1 July. Much of the work and thinking would have to be done in advance. An appendix to the chairman's letter was his paper ('prepared very quickly' with help from Kate Katski) which gave the goals of ICSW and the references in the Council's literature to the role of the biennial international forums, together with the some questions of his own on the possible objectives. He sought our views by 14 May. A second paper would then incorporate the consensus of views on objectives and suggestions on structure of conferences. A final paper would be for discussion at the 1 July meeting. 'Perhaps members of the committee who will be unable to make the journey to Spain will be able to let me have their views in writing.'¹²⁰ In fact, only two of us on the committee had sent him comments by 21 May.

My response was full and wide-reaching:

First, I regret that limitations imposed by very late notice, distance which precludes participation on much discussion, and lacked of shared information about the ICSW and its conferences, make it seem that the Committee on Objectives of International Conferences can only do a rather superficial job. I fully appreciate

119 The appointed members of the committee came from UK, Greece, Ethiopia, Canada, India, Australia, Niger, Mexico, and Yugoslavia.

120 Letter, J. K. Owens to R. J. Lawrence, 11/4/73.

the problems of trying to operate effectively on an international level, but I had expected much earlier and fuller documentation. The ICSW can perhaps be accused of not taking sufficiently seriously this particular review of a most important aspect of its work, its biennial conferences.

We are asked to consider and report on the objectives of these conferences in relation to the goals of the ICSW and to make recommendations about the structure of the 1976 Conference.

Political challenges and the development of organisational theory have contributed to the recent emphasis on the importance of clarifying goals of social welfare activity. Goals provide essential orientation in terms of which activities can be organised, they give legitimacy to these activities, and they provide standards against which activities can be assessed for their effectiveness and efficiency. Achieving clarity of goals, and making declared goals and actual goals coincide are, however, recognised as being especially difficult in social welfare activity. As Donnison and Chapman have said, 'Even when general aims are agreed, the methods appropriate to attaining them are open to questions of more than a technical nature.' (*Social Policy and Administration*, Allen and Unwin, 1965). In what are called social welfare activities, we are plagued by vaguely stated formal goals, which allow free reign to informal goals, and which make it difficult to call people in organisational roles into account. If, however, we are more explicit about our formal purposes and we take our revised goal statements seriously, we may lose some of our existing support, sectional and personal interests within the organisation will not have such free reign, previously obscured value conflicts will be exposed with consequent open conflicts, and participants' activities will have to be justified in terms of generally accepted goals.

This review in which we are engaged forces us to examine the goals of the ICSW, as well as of its conferences, because obviously the latter have an instrumental relationship to the former. Although I have very limited knowledge of the situation, it seems to me that it would have been timely for the ICSW to commission competent researchers to examine and assess its work from the points of view of its declared objectives, and its actual objectives as reflected in its organisational arrangements, and the activities of participants. On-going staff work of this kind should be servicing current decision-making, including decision-making about the purposes and format of the world-wide conferences, in order that decisions are better informed than they can be at present.

Having said all that, here are some comments on Appendix II in your letter of 11th April.

Comments on the Goals of ICSW

1. I agree with your giving priority to 2 (b).¹²¹ It seems to me, however, that 'to develop social welfare throughout the world' should be the single general goal of the Council against which all its activities should be measured.
2. To make this general goal operational requires continuing concern for clarifying and developing the concept of social welfare throughout the world. I would make 'to clarify and develop concepts of social welfare throughout the world', the first of a series of instrumental 'Objectives' listed after the Council's general goal.

As I have indicated to you in my letter of 19/7/71 when I was discussing the program of the 16th ICSW Conference, there is considerable inconsistency and ambiguity in the ICSW's usage of the term 'social welfare'. I admit in that letter that there are often good reasons for not being too explicit in developing, inter-cultural situations, but the scope of the ICSW's concerns exemplified in the themes of the 15th and 16th Conferences calls for broader, not narrower definition of social welfare. I argued then that operating under broader, explicit definition would encourage the ICSW to seek fuller effective participation from all social service sectors (health, income security, housing, education, welfare, etc.), and therefore justify the choice of such wide-ranging topics. Strong, active representation from each of the specialised international organisations with whom the ICSW has consultative status could well result. Also, the objective 2(c) could well be rewritten to cover all professional groups employed in the various social sectors, without explicit mention being given just to social workers.

Putting into active relationship what increasingly in the U.N. literature are being called the 'social sectors', is a tough enough task within each nation, let alone at the international level. It may be that ICSW has not the resources or influence to do this. If this is the case, then it should say so and only tackle what it can cope with. Otherwise the task looks as if it is being done when in fact it is not.

In addition to putting into relationship the various 'social sectors', a contemporary social welfare interest seems to demand a concern for social aspects of economic planning, and concern with social aspects of physical planning. Does the ICSW embrace these in its current operational definition of 'social welfare'?

Again, is the focus on the policies and services deliberately designed for social welfare purposes, (the social sectors mentioned above) or is it rather on 'the well-being of the world's peoples', the claimed focus in the leaflet 'What does the ICSW do?' (see Appendix II, 3). The latter focus is obviously the broadest of all, and would be made explicit by stating the ICSW's general goal to be 'to develop

121 Section 2 of the ICSW constitution listed its purposes as:

- (a) to provide a world-wide forum for the discussion of social welfare and related issues;
- (b) to foster the development of social welfare throughout 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.

This was the constitution adopted in 1966 when the organisation changed its name to The International Council on Social Welfare, from The International Conference of Social Work.

the social well-being of the world's peoples.'

At the 15th ICSW Conference, the President of ICSW referred to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as embodying the beliefs and goals of those involved in international social welfare, but gave special mention to articles 22 and 25. (Charles Schottland, 'Welfare's Historic and Continuing Commitments', *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Social Welfare*, Manila, 1970, pp. 37-8.)

The point of all this is that people inside and outside the ICSW need to know what are its boundaries, and these should be indicated by its current working definition of 'social welfare', as elaborated in a widely available policy document periodically revised. With the contemporary demands to assess all human institutions in terms of their impact on the lives of the people involved in them, the boundaries may be set very wide indeed, so wide, in fact, that the task becomes hopeless for any one organisation, unless it is working in active collaboration with a host of more specialised organisations. The ICSW seem to want to keep all its options open by deliberate vagueness. What I am suggesting is that in fact this is dysfunctional for the ICSW to be an effective and efficient organisation.

What is feasible for the ICSW to accomplish, given its 'non-political, non-governmental, non-sectarian and non-profit character' and its level of resources should, of course, be borne in mind when prescribing objectives. Global 'public relations' objectives unrelated to feasibility of accomplishment should be avoided.

3. Other instrumental objectives which the Constitution might list after my suggested first one of clarifying and developing the concept of social welfare throughout the world, could include:
 - (a) to promote the development of data to ensure that social welfare assessments and decisions are as well-informed as possible
 - (b) to promote throughout the world the exchange of knowledge, information and experience among all groups engaged in social welfare activities and others interested in social welfare
 - (c) to provide a world-wide forum for the discussion of social welfare issues

You will notice I have avoided reference to 'the field of social welfare'. Less and less is it useful to call social welfare 'a field'. While I think it is agreed that there are a range of institutions which tend to be called social welfare institutions, an interest in people's social well-being is now seen to need to embrace so much more than these. I personally see a social welfare perspective as being conceptually linked with working out ideas of morality in, and between different societies.

As far as I can see, ICSW has no power or legitimacy directly to make policies on social welfare matters and to ensure these are carried out. 'To develop social welfare throughout the world', it must rely upon trying to influence the thought processes of those whose decisions and behaviour are crucial to the social welfare of our world. Its main means of influence with these organisations and persons are through sharing of ideas and knowledge, the provision of opportunity for mutual discussion, and through moral suasion.

Comments on 'the Council's Means of Action'¹²²

... My revision of 'The Council's Means of Action' would be:

- (a) the promotion and sustaining of a national body representative of the full range of social welfare bodies, governmental and non-governmental, in each country; and the encouragement of and cooperation between these bodies;
- (b) the promotion and facilitation of cooperation among relevant international bodies, intergovernmental and non-governmental;
- (c) study and research into social welfare questions on a world-wide and regional basis;
- (d) the publication of documentary material on social welfare and its strategic distribution to develop social welfare;
- (e) the organisation of conferences, seminars and working groups on a world-wide and regional basis;
- (f) all such other lawful activities as are incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objectives.

Comments on the International Conferences

It seems to me that the international conferences should be integrated as much as possible with the ongoing activities of the Council, not only linking with previous conferences through subject matter and many common participants, but also with the many other means through which the ongoing program of ICSW should be trying to achieve its objectives. It could be seen as a periodic review point when its ongoing program throughout the world is assessed and evaluated in terms of its objectives and means of action as stated in its Constitution. This would make the conference manifestly a working occasion with participants being expected to contribute within its framework. I tend to think that having a different theme each time impedes the development of systematic, ongoing and cumulative attention being given to major aspects of social welfare.

The seriousness and urgency of the world's social problems and the need for social development perspectives demand that these international occasions should maximise what ICSW says it exists and stands for. (I am, of course, assuming greater clarity on these matters in accordance with my earlier comments about the Constitution and a policy document on concepts of 'social welfare'.) My impression, both personal and from talking with others, is that this does not occur at present.

- (a) The ICSW conferences do not attract evenly key national social welfare

¹²² Section 3 of the ICSW constitution listed its means of action as:

- (a) the organisation of conferences on a world-wide and regional basis for all persons interested in or identified with the field of social welfare;
- (b) the promotion and conduct of study and research into questions related to the field of social welfare on a world-wide or regional basis;
- (c) the publication and distribution of documentary material on the field of social welfare;
- (d) assistance to National Committees and international organisations by the provision of such information and materials as may be feasible;
- (e) the promotion of the interests of social welfare with the appropriate intergovernmental bodies;
- (f) all such other lawful activities as are incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above purposes.

- policy-makers, especially at the political level.
- (b) The ICSW conferences are too much social work occasions. Other professional groups, even those working centrally in the various social sectors, are poorly represented.
 - (c) Many able and experienced people who do attend have not the opportunity to use their talents.
 - (d) Being willing and able to prepare specifically for the conference is not seen as a requirement of attendance.
 - (e) Many participants view the occasion as a well-earned break in foreign parts, and have a very limited commitment, if any, to the work side of the conference.
 - (f) Spectacular and lengthy ceremonies, and lavish accommodation and entertainment, while they may be immediately satisfying for the participants and the national and international organisers, need the closest scrutiny. A social welfare conference is highly vulnerable to moral attack if it indulges in these things to the detriment of its objectives. Norms set by other international conference should not necessarily be taken as guidelines in these matters. The ICSW itself should ensure that arrangements made by the host country for the ICSW conference are within justifiable parameters in these things.
 - (g) An overconcern for international protocol and a wish to cover up and gloss over genuine and important differences tends, in the eyes of some, to disqualify the ICSW as a body which can promote realistic understanding of social welfare matters. As Richard Titmuss and other students of social policy have emphasised, a contemporary social welfare concern demands an awareness of, and an ability to cope and work with, disagreements and conflicts, and the need for policy-makers to choose between competing and often conflicting interests.

Suggested Principles for the Organisation and Running of Conferences

Briefly, then, I would like consideration to be given to the following principles for the organisation and running of ICSW conferences:

1. Each conference should be integrated as much as possible with the ongoing activities of the Council.
2. The conference should be the occasion for reviewing the ongoing program of the ICSW in terms of its objectives and means of action as stated in its Constitution (see my suggested revisions of the Constitution).
3. The securing of participants strategic for ICSW's objectives should be planned and actively pursued.
 - (a) There should be participation by politicians and key officials from all the social sectors, by people interested and involved in economic and physical planning, and by a full range of social scientists.
 - (b) Special consideration should be given to ensuring a balanced participation for an inter-cultural point of view. (This may necessitate limiting numbers from some of the affluent countries and subsidising participation from economically poor countries.)
4. Every participant should be expected to prepare for the conference, both

individually and in consultation with others, and the conference should be structured in such a way that participants can contribute on the basis of such preparation.

5. All aspects of the organisation and running of the conference should be justifiable in terms of the ICSW's general goal 'to develop social welfare throughout the world'.
6. Conflicts, disagreements and differences should be dealt with frankly and openly, not avoided and glossed over – with the one important proviso, however, that this happens within the general goal and instrumental objectives of the ICSW. If participants do not identify with the declared purposes of ICSW, but wish to use it merely for their own personal or sectional ends, then too great an emphasis on conflict and differences is likely to destroy the ICSW.

The general thrust of what I have had to say is that we need to be as task-oriented as possible, and as clear and hard headed as we can be, in defining the tasks and organising for them. In the course of my comments and suggestions I think I have given some views on the greater part of sections 4 and 5 in Appendix II of your letter.

I know we were not asked to revise the ICSW Constitution, yet our particular job does raise questions about its present adequacy as a viable document in terms of which ICSW activities can be organised and pursued.

I hope these comments and suggestions are of some assistance. Good luck with a most difficult task. I'm sorry I cannot be of more direct help.¹²³

J. K. Owens thanked me so much for my letter. He could not reply at the moment to the very useful points I had made, but would certainly study my letter with great interest and would write again. Meanwhile, he thanked me very much indeed for my most helpful contribution.¹²⁴ His letter to all members of the committee at the same time stated he had only received comments from two of us. He had, however, benefited from comments from the secretary-general, evaluations of The Hague conference from Dutch and Canadian committees of ICSW, and from a minority group of participants at that conference, and the critical appraisal of ICSW conferences by the Australian committee of ICSW earlier in 1972.¹²⁵ Any changes in objectives in the constitution could be long and painful to achieve and therefore were for some future date.¹²⁶ On 22 June, J. K. Owens wrote to me briefly, after a very interesting talk with Joan Brown. He enclosed two papers (21 May, 1 June) he had meant to send to me much earlier! 'Life is very full and we are riding a great financial crisis. I go to Granada most ill-prepared but hope we can make some dint in the ICSW 'Establishment'.'¹²⁷ In a 'PS', he said he had found my paper of 11 May 'most stimulating', but there was no further comment!

Finally, on 15 August, J. K. Owens wrote to all members of the committee

123 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to J. K. Owens, 11/5/73.

124 Letter, J. K. Owens to R. J. Lawrence, 21/5/73.

125 Both Joan Brown, ACOSS secretary-general, and I had been active contributors.

126 Letter, J. K. Owens to all members of the ICSW Committee on Objectives of International Conferences, 21/5/73. .

127 Letter, J. K. Owens to R. J. Lawrence, 22/6/73.

sending a copy of the report from the meeting on 1 July (attended by only three members of the committee) which he presented to the ICSW executive committee on 2–3 July. At the executive committee meeting, after a long debate the proposal for a 3-year cycle went forward for consideration at the meeting of the committee of representatives at the Nairobi Conference in 1974. The rest of the recommendations were accepted in principle as guidelines for the future. In fact, many of them were already being incorporated in the Nairobi program.¹²⁸ In an accompanying note with this letter and attached report, J. K. Owens said to me: ‘After the very sound advice which you gave us, I am afraid this report has not put forward many radical ideas, but I think we are beginning to make some movement in what has been a very conservative body.’

128 Letter, J. K. Owens to all members of the ICSW committee on objectives of international conferences, 15/8/73. ‘Report of ICSW Committee on Objectives of International Conferences, 1st July 1973.’

Chapter 6

ECAFE/UNICEF Consultancy, Bangkok October – December 1972

This consultancy obviously arose from and built on my earlier international experience in Manila. This time the focus was specifically on the role of social work education in social development in the Asian and Pacific region. It involved 8 weeks away from my family, and from the UNSW School of Social Work and other professional commitments in Australia. It was, however, centrally focused on both of my major work commitments – social policy and social work education, and it offered the opportunity to work with others in the region who appeared to share these concerns. For me, it provided ‘time-out’ from the multiple continuing work demands in Sydney, and to give my undivided attention to a significant international venture. The project entailed being centrally involved in both the planning for, and reporting on an international seminar in Bangkok. My UN report from the seminar dealt with abiding issues for both the development of social policy and social work education. Although obviously it reflected social thinking at the time, its content is still well worth re-visiting.

In mid-June, 1972, I received a letter from Frances Yasas, regional adviser on training in social work and community development, exploring whether there was any possibility of me attending, at my own expense, their Seminar on Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula, to be held in Bangkok, 14–25 November. Countries in the Asia and the Far East would be attending, plus representatives of international associations and selected UN advisers in the region. ‘We think Australia could make a significant contribution to this Seminar and we would be very happy if you could find the resources to attend’. Attached was a fairly detailed statement about the seminar – the background and origin of the seminar, its nature and purpose, its program of work, documentation for the seminar, and choice of participants, and the financial arrangements for selected participants. The seminar would elect its chairman, vice-chairman and rapporteur. It would be serviced by UNICEF East Asia and Pakistan Regional Office and ECAFE Social Development

Division. A consultant would be appointed to assist in the substantive preparations for the seminar including the preparation of secretariat papers mentioned and in reviewing the reports of the preparatory in-country exercises. The consultant would also act as the technical rapporteur and prepare the seminar's final report.¹²⁹

A number of regional and more general international meetings and documents were directly relevant antecedents to the seminar, including the International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare in New York in 1968, and the first Asian Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare held in Manila in 1970, both of which assigned a developmental mandate for social work education. The immediate reason for the seminar, however, was a report by David Drucker on work in 1971 exploring social work curricula in five countries in Asia, with special reference to the relevance of social work education to social development goals. This was carried out under the sponsorship of the Social Development Division of ECAFE and UNICEF (East Asia and Pakistan Region). In addition seven in-country groups, mainly on request, had each worked on one of the Exploration's 23 recommendations.

I acknowledged that the seminar would be discussing many matters in which I had an active interest in my own country, but unfortunately finding the necessary resources to attend was a problem. My university was in financial difficulties at present, and all I could hope for from this source was leave with pay plus a maximum of \$200. The economy return air fare was \$772 and in addition there would be hotel expenses. I had also enquired about possible support from the Australian Council of Social Service, but they were unlikely to be able to assist, although they were very sympathetically inclined to the idea. 'I am afraid I have not available the personal resources needed'. 'It seems, then, that I must decline the invitation.'¹³⁰

On 19 July, Frances Yasas asked if I would be interested and available to act as a consultant for the seminar. My air travel and per diem would be paid by UNICEF, plus a small honorarium. They would need me, however, 18 September until 8 December. My tasks would be to help in the substantive preparation for the seminar, to be a consultant during the seminar, and to stay two weeks after the seminar to write the final report. After discussion with Rupert Myers, UNSW vice-chancellor, we agreed that I should accept the invitation but for a shorter period, 11 October to 8 December. This was acceptable in Bangkok, and Yehia Darwish, UNICEF regional director, immediately sent me the practical details of my appointment, and sent under separate cover a copy of the full Drucker Report. He also informed me that they were engaging a second consultant who would be available during October and November. She was Dr Rifat Rashid, head of the School of Social Work, University of Punjab. 'We look forward to a combination of approaches in these consultancies which we feel will be an excellent asset to the seminar'. Frances Yasas from the Social Development Division of ECAFE would be writing to discuss the

129 Letter, Frances Yasas to Professor Lawrence, 8/6/72.

130 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Frances Yasas, 28/6/72.

substantive aspects of the consultancy.¹³¹ Frances Yasas listed various points for the consultants, but believed they should wait until the consultants arrived in order to discuss their respective roles with them. I agreed this was sensible rather than trying to determine these in advance.

I asked to be booked into what would be a suitable hotel, bearing in mind where and with whom I would be working over the 2-month period. Since the Social Development Division of ECAFE was located in the R.S. Hotel, which was very near to the UNICEF office, and the seminar itself would probably take place in that hotel, I was booked there. It was not a first class hotel but was comfortable and had a swimming pool. If I was not satisfied I could change later.¹³² I did, in fact, change to the Mandarin Hotel, in about mid-November, because the seminar was actually being held there, and given my role during the seminar and afterwards it was the best location. It was a modern hotel (opened in 1965) with excellent conference facilities, in a very convenient central location within reasonable distance from the R.S. Hotel. I found it was better, although more isolated, to work there in my room in the Mandarin Hotel without interruption, than be in a shared work space in the ECAFE office.

In early September, 1972, I formally requested that UNSW grant me leave with pay to act as consultant to a United Nations seminar in Bangkok, 11 October to 8 December, 1972.

Mr Spencer Colliver would be Acting Head of the School of Social Work in my absence, and I have been able to make suitable arrangements amongst my staff to cope with my teaching and marking responsibilities in the final stages of the academic year. My responsibilities as Acting Head of the Department of Industrial Arts would be assumed by Pro-Vice-Chancellor A. H. Willis, at his suggestion.¹³³

Rifat Rashid, director of the Department of Social Work, University of the Punjab, Lahore, in Pakistan, was very experienced in working with international consultants in the course of developing the school since the mid-1950s. 'International consultants ... in cooperation with the Pakistani faculty have been able to establish a definite working relationship with the social policy planners of the Government and voluntary agencies.'¹³⁴ Now she and I were joint international consultants for the proposed seminar. I could quickly appreciate why she had been chosen, because of her experience and 'developmental' orientation. I was grateful that one of us came from a so-called developing country and had a good working knowledge of the region. Fortunately we worked well together, and with the ECAFE and UNICEF staff. We agreed that during the seminar itself, she would act as the operating consultant, while I would be the rapporteur and produce the final report after the seminar.

First, however, we had to deal with a situation which had not been disclosed to us until we arrived in Bangkok. We were told that David Drucker, in the

131 Letter, Yehia Darwish to Professor Lawrence, 2/8/72.

132 Letter, Margaret Gaan (acting deputy regional director, UNICEF) to Professor Lawrence, 9/8/72.

133 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Rupert H. Myers, 5/9/72.

134 See Rifat Rashid, 'Schools of Social Work and Social Policy: The Experience of a New School', *International Social Work*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, January 1965.

course of his ECAFE/UNICEF project which had produced the Exploration and subsequent in-country work, had apparently upset a highly influential person in social work education in the region. Angelina Almanzor was director of the Philippine School of Social Work in Manila, president of the Philippine and Asian Regional Associations of Schools of Social Work, and served as a vice-president of IASSW from 1968 to 1976.¹³⁵ She had urged others in the region not to cooperate with Drucker and did not want him to be invited to the proposed seminar. Rifat Rashid and I insisted, however, that he should be invited – as one of the resource persons for the seminar. Our appointment as consultants was clearly expected to help to retrieve credibility for the seminar, despite what had happened in connection with the Drucker project. David Drucker's Exploration and the subsequent in-country reports had obviously provided a great deal of material for the seminar, and to exclude the author of the Exploration altogether we thought was wrong professionally. The main focus had to be kept on the substance of the societal and professional issues under discussion.

Before the seminar, Rifat Rashid and I prepared two documents for the participants:¹³⁶

- 'The "Remedial", "Preventive" and "Developmental" Functions of Social Welfare' – a brief record of extracts dealing with these concepts in recent international meetings of experts and ministers responsible for social welfare'.
- 'Problems and Prospects in Schools of Social Work Contributing to Development in the ECAFE Region – Guides and Sources for Discussion'.

The latter document listed issues which had been raised either in or by the Exploration, the in-country reports, or written comments from individuals on the Exploration.¹³⁷ Its purpose was to stimulate thinking, to give discussion a running start on the basis of work already done, and to suggest where in the seminar particular types of issue might be examined. We organised the issues into a timetable of the topics that would be under sequential consideration in the course of the seminar:

- *Brief comments and discussion on some general issues in relating social work education to a social development emphasis in each country.* (14 issues)
- *Educational programme for students – learning experiences in the school and in the field.*
 - (a) *What curriculum content would prepare social workers for social development roles?*
 1. *Defining and building theory in terms of social development roles, present and future.* (9 issues)
 2. *At what level should the curriculum be? – the relationship between different levels of curricula, and professional education and training.* (4 issues)

135 'Angelina C. Almanzor', in James O. Billups (ed.), *Faithful Angels: Portraits of International Social Work Notables*, NASW Press, Washington, 2002.

136 These were included as appendices in the final report of the seminar.

137 The sources were identified with a simple key.

3. The relevant subject content? (28 issues)
 4. The availability and relevance of teaching materials (2 issues)
 5. The most appropriate teaching – learning methods (3 issues)
 6. Curriculum – changing machinery and procedures (4 issues)
- (b) *Education in the field* (8 issues)
- (c) *Research* (16 issues)
- (d) *The use of indigenous creative literature* (9 issues)
- *What are the implications of a social development focus for people staffing schools of social work?* (12 issues)
 - *What implications does a social development focus have for the student bodies of schools of social work?* (10 issues)
 - *What implications does a social development focus have for a school of social work's relationships with other educational bodies?* (8 issues)
 - *What implications does a social development focus have for a school of social work's relationships with non-educational bodies?*
- (a) *Within the country* (9 issues)
- (b) *Internationally* (12 issues)

The final session of the seminar, Friday, 24 November, was to consider An Action Framework to help schools of social work contribute to the ECAFE Region for the period 1973–78. This agenda deliberately provided a coherent structure not only for the seminar but for most of my subsequent report on the seminar.¹³⁸

The Participants

About 46 persons were invited to take part in the seminar, all as individual professionals not expected necessarily to represent the points of view of their respective governments or organisations. We had participants from Hong Kong (2 – from both the Chinese University, and the University of Hong Kong),¹³⁹ India (2 – from Bombay University,¹⁴⁰ and the University of Delhi), Indonesia (2 – from Ministry of Social Affairs in Djakarta, and School of Social Welfare, Bandung), Republic of Korea (2 – from Chung Ang University, and Seoul National University), Malaysia (1 – from Ministry of Welfare Services, Kuala Lumpur), Pakistan (2 – from Planning Commission, Islamabad, and University of the Panjab), Papua New Guinea (1 – from University of Papua and New

138 *Problems and Prospects in Schools of Social Work Contributing to Development in the ECAFE Region* (Report of the ECAFE/UNICEF Seminar on Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula), Bangkok, 14–25 November, 1972, United Nations, Bangkok, 48 pp. The following account of this seminar is drawn from this source.

139 Peter Hodge, head of its Social Welfare Department, was a social policy LSE product. He became a friend whom I saw periodically at international meetings and sometimes in Sydney in subsequent years.

140 Dr Armaity Desai in 1982 became head of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay, established in 1936 as India's first school of social work. I enabled her to come to a regional social work meeting in Australia in 1979, and had the pleasure of chairing and introducing her when she delivered the third Younghusband Memorial Lecture in Vienna in 1988.

Guinea),¹⁴¹ the Philippines (3 – from Asian Social Institute, the Philippine School of Social Work in Manila, and University of the Philippines), Republic of Viet-Nam (1 – from National School of Social Work in Saigon), Sri Lanka (1 – Ceylon School of Social Work in Colombo), and Thailand (5 – 4 from Thammasat University, 1 from the Public Welfare Department of the Ministry of Interior). Most of these participants headed schools of social work or were in other senior positions relevant for the seminar. There were, in addition, 6 resource persons, 10 observers (including from UNFPA, UNESCO, FAO, and ICSW), and 4 student observers (from Thammasat University).¹⁴²

Limitations

In the preamble of the report of the seminar, its limitations were recognised:

The participants were drawn from only some of the countries of the region, and usually only from one or two schools within any country. The seminar consisted primarily of people directing, conducting or advising on social work education, and a few officials concerned with social policy and social welfare administration. Yet as the Exploration points out (p. 50), much of the work in establishing explicit and articulated social development roles has to be done through 'political and administrative work'. It is 'not primarily to be achieved by education or training'. It was clear that, accompanying the change in social work education in the direction of social development, matching action would be required to establish social development career structures for social workers. ... (and, of course, not only in the social work education system.) Plans, at least to some extent, had to be integrated in the broader systems of the social work profession, the social welfare industry including all the social sectors, and the economic and physical planning systems. Finally, ... available time and very limited resources had allowed merely an 'exploration', not a definitive study, and only five countries of the region could be visited, and subsequent follow-up work with in-country working groups ... had had to be very limited.

Yet, given these various limitations, the seminar was still seen by its organisers as the first serious attempt in any region in the world to help social work education actually come to grips with the newly emphasised developmental focus. The socio-economic circumstances of this particular region made the attempt both the more difficult and the more urgent.

The Substance of the Seminar

In the final published report, I strove to give an accurate reflection of the recorded main points made in the three discussion groups and plenary sessions, and these were organised to follow the course of the seminar.

141 Dr Maev O'Collins, a social work graduate from University of Melbourne, with a doctorate from Columbia University in the USA. She was just beginning her development of the social work course at the University of Papua and New Guinea, 1972–89.

142 The names and positions of the participants, and the names and positions of the ECAFE and UNICEF secretariat, are in an appendix of the final report, pp. 46–48.

The Opening Session

The opening session of the seminar commenced with a statement from U Nyun, executive secretary of ECAFE. The joint sponsorship by ECAFE and UNICEF was seen as 'an excellent example of a co-ordinated effort between members of the United Nations family', and reference was made to the pioneering nature of the meeting. Trying to re-orient social welfare and social work education to the developmental needs of the region was a novel, momentous and urgent undertaking. In this Second United Nations Development Decade, ever-widening disparities between the haves and the have-nots and increasing mass poverty called for a more radical approach.

U Nyun's statement made special mention of the potential role of social workers in ensuring the participation of the people in developmental planning. Institution-building was seen as equally important, despite the dangers of institutional frameworks becoming 'exclusive, conservative and bureaucratic'.

In speaking on the seminar's objective of developing a long-term action framework within the region, U Nyun's statement emphasised the need for coordination among the many interested parties and for realism related to resources. Special attention would need to be given to seeking active interest of governments and schools of social work and other social work institutions not represented in the seminar. Finally, it was very important that whatever plans were decided upon should be regularly evaluated and revised in the light of experience.

Then followed comments by senior officials of the two United Nations bodies which sponsored the seminar:

Yehia H. Darwish (UNICEF) claimed that despite 'the fluid margins that characterize the growing profession of social work', there was 'an identifiable core of theory and practice'. This could 'contribute heavily to alleviate social dysfunctioning that may exist in social relationships and remove the barriers to the healthy development of individuals, groups, and communities'. Social work had a scientific foundation, and also was derived from values which varied according to the prevailing cultural heritage. Problems and goals might differ from one country to another in nature and dimension. Darwish challenged the seminar to consider whether social work and social work education were relevant and effective in the conditions of each of the countries of the region. He concluded: 'May I see the future in your own ideas and thinking as visionaries: then we shall try to make the future because we can see it'.

H. B. M. Homji (ECAFE – chief, Social Development Division) spoke on socio-economic conditions in the region, expanding on some of U Nyun's comments expressing concern about the situation. Population growth and mass poverty received special stress. Earlier notions that economic growth would automatically bring about social progress had had to be revised. Unified development planning which focussed on 'economic growth with social justice' was now the preferred planning strategy stressed by the United Nations. Many social factors were not quantifiable, however, and unified planning was still scarcely a reality.

Homji observed that concepts of social work education had been largely borrowed from those suited to western conditions and were now being used in

societies which tended to lack institutions of a distributive, participatory, cooperative, decentralised and/or developmental nature. Social work paid little attention to rural areas, those having been served by the community development movement. Now social work was learning from the development focus of community development.

The need for men to be liberated, especially in the developing societies, was underlined. Men should creatively determine their own destiny.¹⁴³ The philosophy of liberation urged the discarding of all paternalistic approaches from outside or above, in favour of self-identification and self-determination. Foreign and domestic forces, but subtle and powerful, had to be combated to free people from a condition of servile dependency. Men became themselves only in and through the community, and through participation in what was basically a process of education. Societies needed to get rid of oppressive institutions and replace them with more liberal ones.

In speaking of the role of Asian social work education in development and liberation, Homji mentioned that, in each country, social work education must search for its own identity and image. But social work methods had to be responsive to the needs of the mass of the people. A number of different kinds of practice was necessary.

The seminar would be discussing ways of strengthening or re-orienting the curricula of schools of social work to meet the needs of their country. This 'indigenization' of the curriculum of each school would especially call for staff embedded in their country's professional practice and values.

Homji briefly referred to listening, enabling, and collaborating and planning roles an international agency could play in relation to social work education in the region.

General Issues

A range of difficult general questions were posed at the outset:

It is true that political and professional social welfare initiatives had apparently assigned a developmental mandate for social work education, but how willing and ready were the social welfare sector, those engaged in social work and social work educators to take up the mandate? In any case, how agreed were members in a particular society on what constituted 'development'? How did people perceive the relationship between social, economic and physical aspects of development? How much political influence did the social welfare sector actually have? Could social work education in Asia and the South Pacific pioneer a developmental focus without the necessary financial and manpower resources, and how could adequate organisational machinery be developed without those resources? Would schools of social work lose the support of key power groups such as senior politicians, high-level public officials, high-status voluntary workers, large landlords, wealthy businessmen, and upper-class groups, if they moved too effectively in the direction of social development? How would the other social sectors view this development – cooperatively or competitively? In terms of what and whose

143 The persistence of the sexist language is particularly striking. It is obvious that Homji was talking about people of both genders.

criteria, should a professional social work curriculum be assessed? There are many interested parties who would have differing points of view.

The seminar participants saw these as relevant, but rather overwhelming initial questions. They needed to be particularised, and in fact discussion of them recurred in various forms throughout the seminar. Some important observations were, however, made right at the outset:

1. It was argued that social work education should not wait for development roles and goals to be spelt out in detail before introducing the development component into the curriculum. This in no way denied the need for greater definition and clarification of such roles and goals.
2. An over-emphasis upon development as manifested through administration, policy-making and planning at a centralised national level was criticised. Development should be associated with all levels of the social structure.
3. All development had a political component. Development structures often oppressed the people even when supposedly created in the national interest. Development required the answering of profound basic questions such as, 'What kind of society do we want to achieve in this country?' and, 'What concerns for social justice have we in development?'
4. It was recognised that, in some countries, the future was politically uncertain and eluded determination at the present moment. Working for social development in such circumstances required high degrees of faith and commitment. Social workers' acceptable and possible roles were heavily determined by the political system of a country.
5. Some fears were expressed that social development itself might be an imposition from external sources upon Asian schools of social work, which risked losing sight of their recognised responsibilities for training itself for clinical and remedial functions in social services. Was there sufficient appreciation of the level of maturity required for students training for developmental roles and tasks? If governments simply did not consider social work graduates eligible for developmental roles, would schools of social work be preparing students for non-existent appointments?
6. The Exploration has used the framework of a social work profession to advance social development. There was a danger that the profession would be regarded as too much the tool of the Establishment. Had this risk been sufficiently appreciated and explored?
7. Several schools reported that they had been involved, in varying degrees, with sharing planning tasks and these were seen as indications that social work knowledge and skills were beginning to be regarded as having a contribution to make to development. This did not, however, always mean recognition of the social work profession as such, but a search for new allies possessing potential worth on the part of planners and development agencies increasingly puzzled by their own inability to deal with the human component of development.

After considering these general issues in relating social work education to a social development emphasis, the seminar moved to a discussion of social

development roles for social workers and education to prepare for such roles – the type, level and content of such education, and the respective contributions of field learning, research, and indigenous creative literature.

Social Development Roles for Social Workers

Further attention was given to the social development roles – in terms of which the curriculum might be designed:

1. Special attention was given to the social policy and social planning functions of social workers. The Exploration had pointed out the need to document and learn from the existing social workers who had experience in such functions.
2. Views expressed on national planners were:
 - (a) that they were often highly qualified people who felt obliged to produce very sophisticated plans, however actually inapplicable they might be;
 - (b) that frequently planners had divergent views themselves and did supply specific job descriptions for development tasks; and
 - (c) that they had a very strong economic emphasis (funds for social welfare were often spent unwisely and unimaginatively).
3. Often administrative machinery to implement plans consisted of bureaucratic structures which over-emphasised seniority and centralisation of decision-making, which therefore tended to be out of touch with the current field reality.
4. Would people with a social work qualification do any better than many of the present planners and administrators? Comments made on present-day social workers included:
 - (a) they did not understand the related disciplines in development, such as economics and political science;
 - (b) they tended to confine themselves to narrow professional interests and missed the opportunity to consider overall social development – the inter-relatedness of disciplines and components;
 - (c) they tended to be committed to the provision of services rather than to reform of institutions and bringing about redistribution of power in the structures of society;
 - (d) their education system, with its devotion to methods intervention, had crippled their capacity to give priority to tackling society's most important social problems.
5. The view was firmly expressed that despite their current inadequacies for many social development tasks, social workers were more likely than other groups to address themselves systematically to social development. 'Who else?' was asked by several members, not in the sense of only social workers being involved, but in the sense that if social workers were not willing or able to be concerned about their country's social development, how could others be expected to be concerned?
6. Seminar members appeared to accept the need for social work and social work education to move in a social development direction, although on the understanding that a developmental approach could and should include small-scale local intervention.

7. Was there a tendency to move too quickly into curriculum-building without knowing what it was that social workers were to be educated for at the 'doing' level, and yet did not one have to take chances in view of the urgency of the situation and uncertainty into the future? The tension between these two perspectives ran through the Seminar.

The Educational Program for Student Learning

The Level of the Curriculum

8. A general introduction and orientation to social development was considered appropriate to undergraduate social work education or earlier levels of training for welfare tasks. There was need for numbers of direct service workers trained at these levels, with an awareness of broad social policy and planning and the specific developmental approach in practice. This was especially the case for rural areas where there was scope for developing mobile training programmes.
9. More concentration on social policy and planning and associated field education, was seen by many as more appropriate at the graduate or advanced level; where, in addition, specialisation in social policy and planning could well be provided by those small numbers who would actually become high level planners.
10. Although the need for different levels of education and training was emphasised, concern was expressed lest charlatans be encouraged to take part in work which required the professional values of self-criticism, self-control and analysis.

Observations on Relevant Curriculum Content

11. It was felt that all social work students should have to start with a broad social science base in economics, sociology, political science, etc.
12. Social development called for an interdisciplinary approach. This could be exemplified in social policy courses which analysed a society's most pressing problems and its attempts to deal with them. It was emphasised that not only tangible problems of inadequate food, clothing and shelter should be considered but also problems relating to human dignity, and civil and political rights. Certain social problems were seen to be dominant in the region – mass poverty, over-population, mal-distribution of wealth, illiteracy and various forms of social injustice. These should be given explicit and inter-disciplinary attention in the curriculum.
13. Learning about such problems was a basis for undertaking social work to remedy them. But knowing what needed to be done was different from knowing how to do it. What were the required skills and were they identifiable as social work skills? It was considered that a plurality of social work roles and associated skills could well be appropriate: these required research. Social workers needed to be more skilful in political situations and more aggressive in advocacy, and in this context possible gains through using educational processes was stressed. Such education, however, had to be of a liberating, not domesticating kind, that is, one which developed critical

- consciousness, social awareness and personal responsibility.
14. Non-violent social change was the preferred social change strategy but also the view was strongly put that many of the existing social, economic and political arrangements were doing violence to the personalities of countless human beings. In such cases, the acceptance of punitive reaction as a price to pay in the cause of the oppressed might be warranted.
 15. It was held that social work students should not only draw from many disciplines in learning a social development approach, but that they also needed to learn to work with other disciplines. This was seen as a part of inter-sub-cultural relationships, each discipline being viewed as a 'subculture'. There was some discussion which produced differing views on the advisability of having a generalist administrator coordinating different disciplines in a field social development setting, or a person from one of the disciplines with greater administrative experience. All collaborating disciplines were seen to need some orientation to societal, organisational and administrative matters.
 16. Social workers were seen to have a role in local community development. They could, it was claimed, attend to the organisational side of developing local communities and local leadership, as well as to stimulating popular participation.
 17. Despite the new development emphasis, it was urged that social workers should not neglect their traditional concern for people who were by-passed by existing services. In fact, getting these people into the development milieu of the main stream of the society and helping them to become contributing members, could be seen as a distinctively social work developmental concern and this should be a specific focus in the curriculum.
 18. Since social workers could make a significant contribution in national disasters such as floods and droughts, knowledge and skills to cope with such situations could be given in their education.
 19. The respective roles of government, voluntary and private enterprise social service structures should be studied. Learning about social service structures should not lead to confirming them, but to moulding and adapting them to the needs of the population. People tended to be compartmentalised by service structures, which however convenient administratively, made it difficult for a focus of service to people, and especially to the family, to be achieved.
 20. Part of the problem of social workers learning what to do in policy and planning situations related to the availability of resources. When resources were very scarce, how could priorities be determined, even if social workers had the authority and power as policy makers? What did one teach about priority determination in such a situation? National budgets need to be examined to see how much priority was being given to social welfare and social development generally in contrast, for example, to 'defence'.
 21. Some participants commented that, for social work to be effective in development, commitment to national development goals had to be emphasised in the curriculum. But the question had been raised in the Exploration about the vagueness and frequent non-applicability of existing statements of such goals.

22. The prevailing social milieu of social work education was seen to vary in different countries of the region, which meant that different patterns and content of education were likely to be required.
23. It was generally agreed that the social worker had to be educated to cope with a wide variety of tasks in a flexible manner, especially in societies undergoing rapid change.
24. Special emphasis was placed by some participants on the need to evaluate professional performance in social development against results in the development and change of people in the community, and not in terms of an organisation's requirements or the worker's satisfaction.
25. Potentiality for development and change in people rather than emphasis on problems and solutions was seen as the re-orientation needed in social work education. People's own participation in social development and change should be the emphasis. This participation should be organised and, if required, institutionalised, but taking care to avoid stereotyped practices.
26. It was commented that authoritarian attitudes prevailed in many of the social structures of the countries of the region, including in their educational institutions. Social work students in particular needed to be given the opportunity and encouraged to participate actively in curriculum development.

Education in the Field, Research, and the Use of Creative Literature

19 paragraphs in the seminar report dealt with points to tackle the seriously inadequate field learning for social development roles. The section of 11 paragraphs on research commenced with:

How to encourage and develop in students an enquiring, critical mind was seen as a crucial purpose of the curriculum generally, as opposed to just specific 'research' courses. It was observed that because of the prevailing authoritarian attitudes and uncritical acceptance of the way things are in many countries of the region, the task was especially difficult and required patient and sensitive handling.

The seminar gave separate and special attention to the use of creative literature in encouraging a social development focus in a social work curriculum. Discussion reported in 7 paragraphs of the report ranged over folk media, the visual and performing arts, and cartoons, in addition to written materials. Among written materials there was disagreement on whether books held to be divinely inspired should be included. For those who stressed a creative element in all human writing, no sharp distinction was drawn between 'creative' and other types of writing. However defined, there appeared to be agreement that educational objectives should determine what and how creative material was used.

The notion that this was a passing fad was rejected. Used selectively, creative material was seen as adding permanently to, and enriching the professional and social science teaching materials relevant for social work practice in social development roles. It was not seen as a substitute for these materials.

Creative material could fulfil various educational purposes, but difficulties were mentioned in making use of this material. Some possible solutions were suggested.

A start on using creative materials in the curriculum had been made, some of it stimulated by the Social Development Division of ECAFE.¹⁴⁴ More systematic work was now seen to be called for.

Implications for Staffing

A social development focus was seen to have many implications for a school's staff and others involved in its educational program:

1. There was general agreement that present teaching staff in schools of social work were not well prepared for the new social development focus, yet they could scarcely avoid its challenge. It was held that since remedial, preventive, and developmental approaches were interlocked, what was required was a shift in emphasis and orientation, not a completely new type of staff person.
2. To fill out the teaching of developmental topics, especially in policy, planning and administration, the use of guest or part-time lecturers was examined. These could bring into the curriculum content which would be difficult for school staff to obtain, and it was particularly important for students to be informed about actual policy, planning and administrative structures of their own society.
3. Reservations were expressed about using external lecturers because they tended to lecture from their own particular viewpoint, which was not always appropriate for a social work course, and part-time teaching often lacked continuity.
4. How to develop and re-orient existing social work teachers received considerable discussion. It was held that the current Seminar could well be followed by a series of national in-country seminars on social development planning and/or teaching, to aim at inter-disciplinary and inter-sectorial cooperation relevant to each country. ECAFE could assist in organising such seminars. ... The view was expressed that in-country resources should be utilised before people looked beyond their own countries.
5. Social work faculty were seen to need fundamental teaching in social development planning. This could perhaps be given on a sub-regional or regional basis under the auspices of the long-awaited Regional Training Centre at Manila, expected to be open in 1973. Concern was expressed over the delay in the establishment of this Centre, apparently caused by both shortage of United Nations funds and uncertain support being forthcoming from Governments of the region.
6. It was insisted that the social work educators' learning in social development could also occur on the micro-level, as had been well illustrated by the Klong Toey project, which had offered a wide range of experience and challenge to the social work staff of Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand.

¹⁴⁴ This was a special interest of Dr Frances Yasas.

7. The involvement of social work educators in the field ... was seen as playing an important role in indigenising teaching, and also in giving stimulus and social development motivation to the social work teacher. ...
8. The social development of one's own country called for recognition and status being given to social work degrees awarded by the country's own universities. ...
9. Some Seminar members stressed the need to pay special attention to younger staff members, while recognising that basically capacity not age or seniority should be the predominant considerations in professional ventures. Not only senior people should be invited to important conferences and seminars. ...
10. Where they were integral parts of universities, school of social work were constrained by the staff development procedures and outlook of the university at large. These might need to be influenced by social work staff taking a more active interest in the working of the university, especially of its staff council or association and its academic council. Staff development should be built into every educational programme, particularly one like social work education which was undergoing rapid change.
11. Also mentioned in connection with staff development were: (a) the need for a full induction of new staff members to a particular educational programme; (b) the involvement of senior staff in undergraduate as well as graduated courses; (c) encouraging and making it possible for staff to attend seminars, conferences, and international gatherings; (d) increased opportunity for staff particularly junior members, to gain comparative perspectives by studying social policies and programmes, and social work education in different countries; (e) staff undertaking training in different subjects relevant to selected aspects of social development; (f) the possibility of an advanced social work course containing a specialty in 'social work education'; (g) periodic staff seminars; (h) inter-school workshops; (i) faculty meetings; (j) learning from visiting social workers; (k) the use of training grants; (l) scholarships for research; (m) evening courses; (n) attending classes of other faculties; (o) the role of the professional association; (p) exchanges of lecturing staff.

Implications for Students

It was generally recognised by the seminar that a re-orientation towards education for social development tasks had wide-spread implications for the student body of schools of social work:

1. Education for social development roles required in students capacity for change and growth, tolerance, flexibility, and ability to see broader issues. The tendency towards passive role learning which was acknowledged as very common throughout the countries of the region was seen as a particularly inappropriate preparation for such roles. Formal education could by its very character damage and lessen motivation. These culturally determined patterns of learning made the development of the student into a self-directing, critical person, with mature judgement strikingly difficult, especially as the teachers themselves had been conditioned by the same cultural patterns.

2. The idea of teacher and student being colleagues in a joint learning experience was said to be rare. Conscious attention should be given to moving schools in this direction. Provided they did preparatory work, students could, for example, well have been more fully represented in the current Seminar. ...
3. Students were seen to have a role in curriculum development, at the least in reflecting the curriculum from a consumer's point of view – its content, timing and teachers. This involvement could be both formal and informal. Experience in some countries had revealed that students appeared to have only a peripheral interest in curriculum development, and the view was stated that it was necessary to guard against the fashion of involving students in all matters of the university. However, students' involvement in curriculum development was seen as a correct principle. It was not related only to their competence and motivation, as a positive response to the school and its programmes was likely to be encouraged by student involvement. Staff often had to be helped to accept students in these roles and to consider their suggestions as objectively as possible.
4. What sort of students did schools of social work need in order to teach social development tasks effectively? Social work students came from different sources and differences in age, motivation and experience often made it difficult to mount an effective common educational programme.
5. Students recruited fresh from high school were seen as being too young to handle complicated social problems, and many of them were described as being poorly motivated, having drifted into the social work course rather than making it a strongly preferred choice.
6. Older students consisted of: (a) people who already had a degree and who were described as knowing better than undergraduates what they wanted to do, and (b) others, many of whom already had work experience in the social service field. Motivation among the latter group when their education was being sponsored by their agency was often not very high, and it was considered important that the school's educational purposes and requirements should be made fully known to the agency concerned. In some countries, a school representative was invited to help an agency select appropriate trainees.
7. The field experience of social work students in social development tasks, especially when undertaken in interaction with fellow students, was seen as having great potential in their motivation. For students already with a social action orientation it was vitally important. Social work courses were described as having their share of students who left because of dull, unimaginative teaching, both in the classroom and in the field.
8. Social work recruitment was made difficult because of social work's often poor image. Contributing to this were: social workers' propensity to talk too much rather than act; their 'reluctant engagement with the poor', rather than being committed to general social justice; and their attempts to keep up with other academic faculties for non-social work reasons. In addition, the practice of many voluntary and untrained workers being called 'social workers' confused the situation.
9. In most countries, social work was still largely associated with women. There

- was a need for more men, especially if the local culture determined that many of the social development roles were seen as inappropriate for women.
10. The socio-economic background of students received some discussion, and some participants suggested that particular socio-economic backgrounds could be linked with particular social development tasks. This view was, however, challenged.
 11. Social development roles were seen as providing young people who were concerned about social problems with the opportunity of doing something constructive about them. Some participants distinguished between student activists, whose motivation was often in doubt, and student actionists who could be productively recruited into social work. ...
 12. Schools offering post-graduate programmes could also offer elective courses for undergraduates in other university departments, to make them aware of social work and possibly recruit suitable social work students.
 13. University schools of social work were bound by general university rules relating to admission. In many schools this meant the only admission criterion was the academic one. In such situations it was doubly important for students before entering the course to know generally the nature of social work, paying attention to the prospective social development focus, and for them to be counselled out or failed if they subsequently were demonstrated to be unsuitable.
 14. As was already recognised in some countries, government-sponsored schools of social work had a responsibility to recruit students for other than just the government service. Government financial assistance for students should not be confined only to actual or future members of the government services.

Implications for Organisational Relationships

The final substantive discussions at the seminar considered the implications of a social development focus for the organisational relationships of a school of social work with other educational bodies and with non-educational bodies.

With Educational Bodies

1. Schools of social work generally did not yet enjoy a high reputation among other, often longer established, university departments. Sometime schools experienced competition and rivalry from other departments such as sociology, yet it was stressed that the social work school should reach out and bridge the gaps that existed, even if it was initially in a disadvantaged position.
2. Cooperation with other disciplines within the university was essential for many social development purposes: (a) Social work students could take elective courses provided in other departments and vice versa; (b) Staff of the departments could assist in the school's teaching and research programme; (c) Social work staff could contribute to the programmes of other university departments.
3. There was discussion on the possibility of a university promoting

inter-disciplinary courses on social development, with the cooperation of the school of social work, faculty of social sciences, etc. Inter-disciplinary courses on urban studies, industrial studies and administrative studies were already being offered in some places, usually at a master's level. Such developments were welcomed, but participants thought it was necessary to differentiate between these and a social work curriculum oriented in a social development direction. The whole area of the respective contributions of different disciplines to social development, including that of social work, required further examination in depth.

4. It was seen as important that the student organisation in a school of social work relate to other student groups, that it be integrated into the school structure with responsible involvement, and that it be encouraged to become a vehicle for social work student action and commitment inside and outside the university.
5. There was considered to be a real need for closer association among different schools of social work in each country. This was the more so when social work education was at different levels. Not only should social work schools relate together, but also relate with the various forms of welfare training. The whole should be seen as an inter-related system. Possibly a country should establish an advisory committee to keep under review the total system. Certainly there was an important role for an association of schools of social work. Collective action was seen as vital to further the cause of social work education in social development directions.
6. Participants viewed with concern the prevailing practice of developing ad hoc short-term, 'dead-end' courses. Schools should try to discourage these, or at least try to get them related to more long-term education.

With Non-Educational Bodies

7. The Seminar did not give extensive consideration of this aspect of the topic. Much of the earlier discussion had, however, implied the need for a school of social work to be extensively linked with non-educational bodies – especially field agencies used in its educational programme, the government departments involved in the various social sectors, the country's planning organisation, the council of social services, and the professional association of social workers. Relationships could be both formal and informal, but there was agreement with the Exploration that in many countries more formal machinery was needed.
8. Social work education for social development could seek powerful support among civic-minded organisations. Social work schools had to use many organisational connections to help to change and re-orient the public image of social work. Alumni associations could assist in this.
9. A relationship seen to be of special importance was that between the professional association of social workers and social work educators. It was reported that in some countries there were representatives of each school of social work on the executive council of the professional association. Professional associations badly needed strengthening, and could not hope to undertake a more active social development role in collaboration with

schools of social work unless they had adequate staff.

10. The view was expressed that even some of the specialised international agencies such as WHO, needed more knowledge about social work and social development, and also about one another's roles and activities. It was recognised that UNDP's new country programme exercises were, at least partly, aimed in helping to rectify this.

Action Proposals

In introducing the final section on action proposals, I wrote:

Almost every paragraph of the preceding sections of this report can be seen as having action implications. At the concluding meetings of the Seminar, participants had the opportunity on the basis of their earlier discussions, to specify the action they wished to see highlighted. In addition, as a way of helping to focus possible action, participants were asked to suggest project ideas which they thought might be appropriate in their own countries. These were not, of course, in any sense country proposals. It was hoped, however, that at least some of the project ideas would capture the interest and active support of the relevant parties in the countries concerned, and that the cooperation of international agencies would both be sought and forthcoming. Those projects which required United Nations assistance would have to win the approval of the government of the country. Although UNICEF and ECAFE were the Seminar sponsors, relevant international action was not seen as confined to them. Future action, as appropriate, should cover the whole United Nations family, and beyond to the international non-governmental organisations. As had been emphasised by the Exploration and the Seminar discussions, a developmental focus called for a full and rich collaboration between the various international organisations, both inter-governmental and non-governmental.

The final section of the report records action proposals emanating from the final meetings of the Seminar. As will be apparent they ranged from the highly specific to the very general, from application to one school to many schools, from one country to many countries, from one international organisation to many, from time specific to untimed, and from reasonably developed action ideas on which some work had already begun to germs of ideas still far removed from implementation.

Although the Seminar's action proposals could have no official status, there was a strong conviction that this should not be yet another Seminar for which there was no follow-through on the action proposed.

The report recorded 44 action proposals. Nine of them made proposals about follow-up organisation and mechanisms with regional bodies and all of the schools in the region. The report should be sent to all governments in the region, to indicate action being taken in accordance with the resolutions of the Conferences of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare in 1968 and 1970, and to encourage them to strengthen the efforts of schools of social work in relating social work to social development. Paralleling this essentially in-country work, the United Nations should consider, as had been suggested in the Exploration, setting up an expert group to examine the construction of

institutional models for social work education and social work in the development context. Seven of the proposals concentrated on data collection and distribution in the region, six to the content of the curriculum and teaching materials, twelve to staff, four to students, and five to a school's organisational relationships. At the end of these various general action proposals, was:

United Nations consultative services on social work education should be extended to individual countries on request. Such collaboration should proceed in close collaboration with the local UNDP staff member, the government, and representatives of the country's schools of social work. It is readily apparent that considerably enlarged United Nations staff resources will be necessary to make effective many of the action proposals emerging from the Seminar. The acquisition of these resources should be seen as a matter of urgency – a basic requirement if social work education throughout the region is to shift towards a developmental focus.

The action proposals concluded with a summary account of diverse project proposals put forward in the final sessions of the seminar, by participants from the Philippines, Pakistan, India, Thailand, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, and the Republic of Vietnam. These proposals were fully listed (as stated by the participants themselves) in a document of the support materials for the seminar which I subsequently prepared for publication with the seminar report.¹⁴⁵

Living in Bangkok

Although I wrote very regularly to Trish and the family, I cannot find my letters in our family archives, and I did not keep a detailed diary. Thankfully the work was demanding and engrossing, but I did not enjoy living in a hotel away from the family. Fortunately, however, some social activity with work colleagues and associated with the seminar, a week-end excursion with a Thai family, and shopping for presents to take home,¹⁴⁶ helped to make life more tolerable. Thankfully, I had confidence that the UNSW school was in good hands with Spencer Colliver acting as head of school, particularly at a time when student unrest was generally prevalent.

The Thai family,¹⁴⁷ whom I kept in touch with for a while through Christmas cards, took me on a memorable drive to the town of Kanchanaburi, about 130 kilometres north-west of Bangkok. On the way, just 56 kilometres west out of Bangkok was Nathon Pathom. Its Phra Pathom Chedi was a Buddhist temple, 'the tallest stupa in the world', which was used by Buddhists as a place of meditation. It was on a site which was said to date from the introduction of Buddhism into Thailand in the sixth century. Five kilometres outside of Kanchanaburi, we visited a railway bridge, made famous by the fictional film, 'Bridge over the River Kwae'. The original bridge was built as part of the notorious Burma-Siam railway, constructed 1942/43 by forced labour at great human

145 *Support Materials for the ECAFE/UNICEF Seminar on Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula.*

146 I was particularly pleased to be able to buy some beautiful Thai silk for Trish.

147 She was a teacher and he was a military officer.

cost, linking Bangkok to Rangoon in Burma to support the large Japanese forces in Burma. About 180,000 Asian civilian labourers and 60,000 allied prisoners of war worked on the railway. Around half of the Asians and 12,399 of the prisoners of war died, including 2,815 Australians.¹⁴⁸ After viewing the memorials at the bridge site, we visited the war cemetery in Kanchanaburi, one of the three war cemeteries on the railway. I spent time looking at and reflecting on the graves of 1,362 Australians. If I had been born a few years earlier, I could have been amongst them. What happened on the railway has become embedded in the Australian cultural story, and 'Weary' Dunlop's devoted medical work with the Australian prisoners of war has become a source of great national pride.

I had many very enjoyable evenings at the Napoleon Bar¹⁴⁹ with Tom Brigham, Alan Cass, David Drucker (UN resource persons at the seminar), and Mary Dresser, an American of Greek background from Iowa, who was I think doing a stint as an American Peace Corps volunteer. They were excellent company. Tom was UNDP resident representative in Manila, helping to develop social work education in the Philippines. He had been founding dean of the School of Social work at Fresno State College, but had resigned in 1971 in protest when social work faculty were being fired because of their social activism.¹⁵⁰ When he wrote to me in December 1973, he had returned to teaching in the school but had resolutely turned down all offers to apply for other deanships. He gave me news of Mary who was back in Iowa, but asked if I knew the whereabouts of David and Alan. 'It really was sad to leave Bangkok at that time – such good friends and such good fun.' 'Still I think of some of our madcap evenings when I hear "Raindrops keep falling".'¹⁵¹ (That was a song constantly being played during our time in Bangkok.) Alan Cass was UN adviser in social welfare, UNDP resident representative in Seoul, Korea. David Drucker was usually the liveliest of us all – except for one night after he had just heard that Richard Titmuss was dying from cancer. David was one of his countless social policy students at LSE who greatly admired him. I, too, felt very sad to hear the news. Titmuss had been one of the examiners of my PhD and I had greatly appreciated his outstanding pioneering work in social policy. I never had the good fortune of meeting him.

Another good memory was going to lunch on a number of occasions with Homji and other staff of the Social Development Division at a restaurant known only to the locals. It was apparently visited incognito by the king of Thailand who was partial to its duck dishes. Homji had great knowledge of Thai and Chinese food and would order various dishes for all of us to share. At the beginning of the meal would always be a ritual wiping our cutlery and plates clean with paper napkins, not the provided damp cloths which he said actually spread infection. Homji was very proud of having a daughter in the Sadler's Wells Ballet company in London. He himself was a very cultivated man.

148 See internet article on 'Burma-Siam Railway'.

149 Just a couple of weeks after we stopped going to the Napoleon bar, police raided the place!

150 'Thomas Brigham 1924–1999', California Social Work Hall of Distinction, article on the internet.

151 Tom Brigham to John Lawrence, 19/12/73.

Homji informed UNSW vice-chancellor Professor Rupert Myers that the joint ECAFE/UNICEFF seminar proved most successful:

It has, we feel, pioneered the new concept of orienting social work education to the broader requirements of social development as directed by General Assembly resolution 2681 (XXV) on unified development planning as is in line with the recommendations of the Global and Asian Conferences of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare.

The success of the Seminar was, in no small measure, due to the excellent support and constructive contribution made by Prof. R. J. Lawrence, Head of the School of Social Work of your University, who was permitted to serve, while on full pay, as a consultant to the Seminar taking part in the preparatory and organisational work, as well as in the reporting of its deliberations.

We therefore take this opportunity to express to you our deep gratitude and appreciation for lending us the services of Prof. R. J. Lawrence and we feel that his contribution was as important to the United Nations family as to the profession of social work itself. We hope he will also be available some day in the future to assist us in such worthy causes.

Kindly convey our appreciation also to Prof. Lawrence¹⁵²

Rupert Myers sent me a copy of this letter, and his response in which he said, 'It is always pleasing for a Vice-Chancellor to receive such laudatory remarks about the activities of a member of the University and I shall certainly see that your appreciation is conveyed to Professor Lawrence'.¹⁵³

Yehia Darwish, UNICEF regional director, also expressed to the vice-chancellor gratitude for releasing me from my duties to act as a consultant to the seminar.

The Seminar was one of the most successful we have had in this Region, and we are hoping to concrete effects in the country-level projects that were planned by the participants. Professor Lawrence made a distinguished contribution to the success of the Seminar, and we are most grateful to him and to you.

In sending me a copy of this letter, Rupert sent the message, 'Well done. Thank You.'

Amongst my Christmas cards in December 1972, was one from Dolores (Dolly) B. Lasan, acting director of the Philippine School of Social Work in Manila, who had served as the elected chairperson at the Bangkok seminar. 'Dear St John, Mandarin '606' will never be the same without you!' She thanked me again for the opportunity to work and learn with me in Bangkok. Her school had apparently written hoping I might stop-over in Manila as consultant for an echo seminar on 14 December, but I had not received the letter.

I had promised to let Beatrice Wright know how the consultancy in Bangkok went. In mid – February, I wrote these very frank comments to her:

My two months in Bangkok were a fascinating experience. ... I found myself plunged

152 Letter, Homi B. Minocher Homji to The Vice-Chancellor, UNSW, 12/12/72.

153 Letter, Rupert Myers to Homi B. Minocher Homji, 22/12/72.

into a very confused and troubled situation. Trying to help get it sorted out, and getting growth rather than destruction from all the conflicts and inadequacies of the participants and the international agencies involved was quite a challenge. In the end, everyone was patting themselves on the back for 'one of the best UN seminars held in Bangkok', but before I left I did my best to try to help them review the processes in which we had all been involved and to learn from them. It was my responsibility to produce the written report of the Seminar. This should be quality printed and ready for distribution to all countries in the Region and wider, at the end of the month. We have tried to ensure that it will be used as an active working document, by the international agencies as well as within the various countries, but I am sceptical about this. Frankly the level of resources and inadequacies of staffing of the Social Development Division of ECAFE make me despair of its future as a major leverage organisation within the countries of the Region.

I returned home shortly before Christmas, and apart from a short family holiday, have been frantically busy ever since – trips to Canberra (the new Federal Government is setting a cracking pace), getting new staff, preparing for a new MSW by course work, etc, etc. I wish I had more time to ruminate, and keep in touch with good friends.

In May 1973, I had to write to Frances Yajas:

I have become increasingly concerned that I have not yet received the printed report of our Seminar ... You will remember that before leaving Bangkok, both Mr Homji and Mr Darwish undertook to have it ready for distribution no later than the end of February, 1973. It is very important, as you know, that this should be used as a working document not only by the participants in that Seminar, but by many others both inside and outside the region. Unless this happens we all will have been party to a sterile, time wasting exercise from a professional viewpoint, no matter what personal gains and satisfactions we may have derived from it. I would, therefore, be most grateful if you could bring this matter to the attention of both Mr Homji and Mr Darwish. ...

Life continues at a hectic pace, as I am sure it does for you too. Many, many thanks for being such an agreeable and thoughtful colleague while I was in Bangkok last year. I hope our paths cross again in the not too distant future.¹⁵⁴

Frances told me the report was out by February, but the other publication (on the support materials) had been delayed. Both documents could now, however, be sent to me immediately. 'I think you can feel very proud of the Reports on which you did a terrific job.' If any follow-up about them was necessary, I could write to Mr Kamayana;¹⁵⁵ she would be leaving for six weeks in the US soon.¹⁵⁶

The delay had apparently been due to the documents reproduction unit reproducing the documentation for the 29th ECAFE session in Tokyo. In his letter accompanying the two seminar documents, Mr Kamayana referred to

154 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Frances M. Yajas, 2/5/73.

155 He was a social affairs officer (from Bali in Indonesia) in the secretariat of the Social Development Division.

156 Letter, Frances Yajas to John Lawrence, 15/5/73.

initial implementation steps already underway, internationally and within some of the countries of the region – the Philippines, Indonesia, Korea, India. The 9th session of the regional inter-agency meeting on social development had established an inter-agency sub-committee on social work education, and its first meeting at the end of May 1973, its terms of reference and programme of work would be discussed.¹⁵⁷ A general letter from the chief of the Social Development Division of ECAFE, Homji, enclosed the list of members of the sub-committee,¹⁵⁸ the terms of reference, and the work programme. The aim was to offer its assistance if so requested in order to implement the recommendations made by the seminar. As recommended in the seminar, regular country reporting of progress in reorienting social work emphasis towards developmental needs was encouraged. Also, the Social Development Division wished to be kept informed of developments in social work education and training in each country. Summary information could be circulated by their social work training newsletter.¹⁵⁹

In September, 1973, I received an exploratory letter from Dolly Lasan. In connection with one of the seminar recommendations to actively promote short-term training courses for social work teachers, using the ECAFE fellowship scheme, a number of schools in the region had expressed strong interest in a course for staff on integrated methods. 15–20 participants from regional schools would be invited for this one-month course in Manila. Due to limited fellowships to attend the course, ECAFE would have to decide on the participants, but schools not selected might also request to send a participant at their own expense. Schools in Japan, Australia and New Zealand would be invited, but be expected to participate at their own cost.

In my response to the letter, I regretted my school did not have the funds nor an appropriate staff member who could be free next year to be away for the amount of time proposed. Perhaps another Australian school could send someone, but they were likely to have the same funding problem – most seemed to have difficulty in funding travel within the country, let alone outside it. Although participation in the proposed course was not possible, I made a brief comment on the idea of ‘integrated methods’:

It seems to me that this is the most recent manifestation of the traditional ‘generic-specific’ debate in social work education and practice. I consider the major social work methods – social casework, social group work, community work, administration and policy-making, and research – as having a common value base, and to a fair extent a common knowledge base in the social and behavioural sciences. To a much lesser extent do I see them as sharing the same repertoire of interventive skills. For example, at an earlier point in time when people were talking about ‘generic social work method’, some very silly things were said about administrative

157 Letter, I. G. Kamayana to participants, Joint ECAFE/UNICEF Seminar on Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula, 10/5/73.

158 UNICEF, ILO, FAO, WHO, UNESCO, the Asian Institute for Economic Development and Planning, Committee for Coordination of the Lower Mekong Basin, ECAFE Technical Assistance Unit, ECAFE Research and Planning Division, ICSW (India), Regional Association of Schools of Social Work (Philippines), and IFSW (Philippines).

159 Letter, Homi B. Minocher Homji to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 6/11/73.

skills, because the latter were seen as analogous to social casework skills.

I consider that each member of the social work profession should 'know about' the various methods, and how they mesh together for the profession's collective purposes. But that does not mean each social worker must use, or can use competently, all methods. I see a discussion of 'integrated methods' as requiring a very careful delineation of what it is that is being 'integrated', and whether one is talking about the individual social worker or the collectivity of social workers, working within structures of service.

A further point is that social work values may indicate that in different countries there is a need of vastly different 'balances' to be struck between the amount of attention given to each of the methods in an 'integrated' system of service. This raises a serious problem for training courses which will be drawing participants from countries in vastly different social, economic and political circumstances.

I think the issues 25-38 on pages 34-5 of the Report of the ECAFE/UNICEF Seminar on Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula, Bangkok, 14-25 November 1972, are especially pertinent to your proposed course.

I hope these few comments are of some help. Good luck with your planning.¹⁶⁰

During 1973, there were certainly signs of social work people in the region beginning to address concern for social development, but inevitably the process was complicated, uncertain and slow. I was privileged to have been invited to have at least some involvement in this regional development, but I was under no illusions about the puny nature as yet of efforts to tackle regional social conditions and my own limited part in these.

160 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dolores B. Lasan, 15/10/73.

ECAFE/UNICEF Consultancy October–December 1972 – Bangkok



Rifat Rashid and Frances Yasas – balcony, ECAFE office, Bangkok



Khlong (canal) tour with Frances Yasas, Meher Nanavatty, and ?



Peter Hodge, John Lawrence, Rifat Rashid – Bangkok UN Seminar, Nov 1972



Seminar under way



Maev O'Collins, RJL, and Alan Cass and Tom Brigham (UN resource persons)



With seminar participants (including Dolly Lasan [Philippines])



A social occasion



Dancing with hostess (Minister for Social Services, Thailand)

Sight-Seeing with Thailand Family



Buddhist temple



Host family – Australian war graves near Kanchanburi, 130 kms NW of Bangkok



On 'the Bridge over the River Kwae' – the notorious Burma-Siam railway



The children of my hosts – in front of Buddhist college

Chapter 7

Social Welfare and Development Centre for Asia and the Pacific (SWDCAP)

This was a UNDP-supported inter-governmental institution, created to 'supplement the efforts of Asian and Pacific countries in promoting social aspects of development through innovative social welfare strategies'. The first International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare (September, 1968), had recommended the establishment of regional centres for social welfare development, and the first Asian Conference of Social Welfare Ministers (September, 1970) had accepted a proposal by the government of the Philippines to host a centre for the Asian and Pacific region. However, as already indicated, this regional centre was slow to be established. In February, 1974, I participated in an experts' workshop which suggested guiding principles and priorities for the work plan of the centre in Manila. In March, 1974, an ECAFE resolution called for the early establishment of the centre. Finally, in July 1976, the centre was under way.

As head of the Social Development Division of ECAFE, Homji was centrally involved in making the idea of the centre a reality. In early January, 1973, in a letter marked 'personal and confidential', he was very grateful I had taken up the issue of funding for the centre with 'the higher-ups' in the Australian government. It was too soon after the election of the Whitlam government, but some interest had been indicated. Homji said the Hong Kong, Indonesian and Pakistan governments were 'quite favourably inclined to the project', and he urged me to follow-up with our new government and let him know progress.

I think the Australian Government must look upon the world at large and this geographic region in particular as part of an obligation of the better-developed country towards the lesser-developed countries. Things should not tend to be judged as good or bad for Australia alone. I think the new Government has a more realistic sense of belonging in Asia. But this sense of belonging should be projected in terms of concrete and sometimes entirely selfless support to the

developing countries. Now with the era of military pacts ending, the new era of regional cooperation is dawning, and in my personal view, Australia with its new and dynamic orientation should not let slip the opportunity to exert a leadership role in Asia. I feel that Japan too is losing on this ground. Japan only talks of how much it wishes to invest in technical cooperation in the region but each time that I have approached them for assisting a 'social' project, including the Asian Centre, their response has always been negative; and developing countries are not slow in assessing this situation realistically. Therefore it would really worry me if I were an Australian to see my Government not taking a positive and dynamic approach to regional technical cooperation at this particular period in time, particularly in the social field, which I believe is the need of this decade and perhaps also of the next. Perhaps to is on this line that from your vantage point, you may be able to influence the Government decision-makers in future. These are of course my personal views entirely and are conveyed to you also in that spirit and form.

Homi Homji concluded his letter with:

All our best to you and your dear family. (Do you still wipe your plates and cutlery with paper napkins and are you remembering the Thai and Chinese delicacies of this lesser-developed country?) Frances, Drucker and Basnyat have completed their mission in the Himalayas and are currently wintering in Afghanistan.¹⁶¹

In November 1973, I heard about progress on the regional centre project from P. D. Kulkarni. We had worked together in the Pre-Conference Working Party in Manila in August 1970.¹⁶² I had subsequently corresponded with him in the course of planning for the Brisbane international seminar and discovered that after five years with ECAFE in Bangkok he had just moved to the University of Minnesota – to help establish a new social work school 'specifically for graduate level education in social development and with a conspicuous international orientation.'¹⁶³ Since early September 1973, P. D. Kulkarni had been UNDP regional social welfare adviser in Manila, assigned the task of doing everything necessary to establish the regional centre. With his letter, P. D. sent me a copy of the latest progress report on the Asian Centre project, and a draft brochure on the centre which he had written and on which he sought my comments before revising for wider circulation.

It was proposed that an expert group, jointly convened by ECAFE/UNICEF and the government of the Philippines, would meet around mid-February to produce a workplan for the centre. The stage had come when governments in the region would be requested for financial contributions, and they would like to see a more specific and detailed outline of what precise kind of training and research the centre would undertake. 'It is my hope and expectation that your name would be high on the short list of experts who will be invited by the sponsors'. Would I be free for about a week around 15 February?

You will notice from the report that Japan, Nepal, Pakistan and Philippines have

161 Letter, Homi B. Minocher Homji to John Lawrence, 3/1/73.

162 See p. 13.

163 See p. 53.

indicated substantial financial support and India, Indonesia and Iran are among the prospective donors. I have met with the Australian representative in Bangkok (Mr Bowen) who sounded very hopeful of an Australian contribution to the project. Earlier, the Australian government had indicated a "wait and watch" policy. But it seems that with the new orientation of policy under the present Australian government, such a project will be viewed more favourably. We have, therefore, every reason to hope that an Australian donation to the Asian Centre will be substantial. Since you have been personally drawn into the Asian picture in recent years, you have the best professional appreciation of Australian participation (even lead) in the promotion of the regional centre for social welfare and development.¹⁶⁴

My general reaction to P. D.'s draft brochure was favourable, but I did make some written comments on a copy of his draft which I returned to him. I also suggested he list somewhere in the brochure all of the countries who would be included in the region covered by the proposed centre, and not just those currently interested.

One of the challenges of the Centre will be to relate effectively to the diversity which includes so-called 'developed' countries. The brochure is written as if the Centre is *only* concerned with the 'developing' countries. While that certainly should be the prime focus, it should not be the exclusive focus if the Centre is to be truly a Regional facility.

My school is sponsoring a residential national seminar on 'The Integration of Social and Behavioral Science into Social Work Practice and Education', February 8-17, 1974. It is never easy to get away, but I think I could participate in your proposed group meeting in Manila, immediately after this seminar, the week commencing 18 February. If absolutely necessary, I could miss the last couple of days of our seminar, but I would obviously prefer not to do so.¹⁶⁵

P. D. thanked me for going through the draft brochure so meticulously. 'Your suggestions are all very positive and would immensely help improve the content and presentation of the material'.¹⁶⁶

In the last week of January, 1974, I received a cable inviting me to participate in the experts preparatory workshop on the workplan of the Asian Centre, in Manila 18-25 February, and to contribute a paper on 'Recruitment and development of faculty for the Asian Centre'. UNICEF would cover the air fare and make a per diem payment (US\$23). A document provided the necessary travel and accommodation details, and a provisional schedule. Participants were required to stay in the Bayview Hotel where the workshop would be held. A helpful annotated agenda was sent to participants to serve as an outline for papers written by participating experts and indication for discussion on the respective items.

The workshop was attended by social welfare policymakers, educators, administrators and field workers drawn from various countries in the region

164 Letter, P. D. Kulkarni to Prof. R. John Lawrence, 22/10/73.

165 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to P. D. Lawrence, 10/12/73.

166 Letter, P. D. Kulkarni to R. John Lawrence, 26/12/73.

and representatives of UNICE, UNDP and ECAFE,¹⁶⁷ and the specialised UN agencies (WHO, UNESCO, ILO), the UN Asian Institute for Economic Development and Planning, Bangkok, and non-governmental agencies (ICSW, IASSW, IFSW). The government of the Philippines was represented by senior officials of the Department of Social Welfare and the National Economic Development Authority. There were 11 experts – Dr Sugata Dasgupta (director, Gandhian Institute of Studies), Prof Peter Hodge (head, Social Work School, University of Hong Kong), Dr Dolores Lasan (acting director, Philippine School of Social Work), Prof John Lawrence (head, School of Social Work, UNSW), Dr Admodullah Mia (Institute of Social Welfare and Research, University of Dacca), Prof Nuichi Nakamura (president, the Japanese School of Social Work), Prof David Yoshiharu Ohtani, field supervisor, Japanese Christian Children's Fund), Dr Frank Paiva (University of Missouri, USA), S. H. Pathak (Delhi School of Social Work, Delhi University), Sayom Ratana Wichit (Department of Public Welfare, government of Thailand), and A/Prof Esther Vioria (Institute of Social Work and Community Development, University of the Philippines. Experts from Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Pakistan (Dr Rifat Rashid), and the Republic of Vietnam, were invited, but for various reasons were unable to attend. Dolly Lasan was elected chairperson of the workshop and Peter Hodge the general rapporteur. I was chairperson for one of the three parallel groups, with Frank Paiva the rapporteur.¹⁶⁸

At the inaugural session, Dr Estefania Aldaba-Lim, secretary of the Philippine Department of Social Welfare,¹⁶⁹ claimed it was a significant period in the history of the Philippines. A new society was being forged to awaken people to their potentials as well as their needs – a new society 'founded on social justice, the equal sharing of benefits of development, and participatory democracy', addressing 'peace and order, land reform, economic development, the enhancement of moral values, government reorganization, and the development of the social services'. Her own department had selected a strategy to tackle vigorously the needs and problems of the poorest 30% of the population and a program with emphasis on 'a new productivity thrust, aimed at transforming the poor and dependent from plain 'consumers' into producers – self-reliant and independent'. Many questions concerned her department, not least that the time had come for fundamental changes in the training strategies to develop social workers in the Philippines who could deliver all kinds of services, from motivating families for family planning to attending the needs of the handicapped. How do you train social workers to be deeply committed? Can we shorten the training period for social workers in order to graduate enough of their kind to serve the rural areas? Is it compatible to be trained as an effective social worker and, at the same time, be an efficient manager?¹⁷⁰

Yehia Darwish traced the historical background of the workshop through

167 I. G. P. Kamayana, Meher C. Nanavatty and Frances Yasas.

168 A Report of the Experts' Preparatory Workshop on the Workplan of the Centre, February 1974, The Asian Center for Training and Research in Social Welfare and Development, United Nations Development Program, Manila, 1974.

169 Her department was responsible for the general arrangements for the workshop.

170 *Workshop Report*, pp. 2–3.

the various international and regional conferences and meetings since the original proposal at the social welfare ministers' conference in New York in 1968. He mentioned a number of particular challenges for the centre. The Centre was not another school of social work. It should supplement the research and training of the schools in the region and should avoid duplication of training and research programs already provided in the other regional centres. It should be a regional centre guided by country-level activities and experience. The concepts and principles of the social work profession should be applied to specific situations and be responsive to public interest. Methods should follow problems, not problems methods. Provision should be made to evaluate the activities of the Centre in terms of its objectives.¹⁷¹

In his introductory comments, Homji reminded the workshop of the problems yet to be surmounted in getting the Centre established. The UNDP acted to stimulate and promote regional institutions desired by member governments, but the continuation of the institutions was the responsibility of those autonomous governments. Although the concept of the Centre had been endorsed by a large number of ECAFE member countries in principle, only a few had so far pledged their contributions. Hopefully the number would considerably increase during the annual ECAFE meeting in Colombo, March-April 1974.

(Homji) stressed the need for social welfare to develop a new dynamism, outlook, and role in national development in Asia, and contribute thereto rather than limit itself to the ameliorative and curative aspects of particular weaker sectors of society. What seemed to be preventing this from happening was not the will but the know-how. And it is in this last respect, among several others, that the Asian Centre can make its contribution and impact. ... There has to be evolved a new pattern of social work education, teaching content, methods of teaching, creative literature and field work services for relating the training programme to the needs of social development.

Homji warned against a regional institute operating in a vacuum without being firmly established within the context of the needs and aspirations of the member countries.¹⁷²

The immediate outcome of the workshop was a report which could be used in enlisting not only the support of governments in the region, but also of all the other potentially affected interested parties. The report was in three sections. In the first section was the introductory material, followed by a chapter which dealt with the frame of reference, rationale, and goals and objectives of the Centre. The second section contained six chapters. Three of these concentrated on the nature and scope of the Centre's educational activities – selection of candidates, curriculum and content, and innovative methods and techniques of training. This was followed by chapters on the production of teaching materials and training aids, and on nature and scope of research activities. A final chapter in the section was on methods and techniques of evaluation of performance and review of policies. The third section consisted of a chapter on the governance and staffing of the Centre.

171 *Workshop Report*, pp. 4–5.

172 *Workshop Report*, p. 5.

In re-visiting the report, I can recognise that much of the material in the chapter on the frame of reference, rationale, and goals and objectives of the centre reflected my own thinking, and obviously that of significant others, including the rapporteur Peter Hodge whom as I have already mentioned was a social policy scholar originally from Britain.

1. *Frame of Reference*

1. Social welfare, for the purposes of the Workshop, was considered to be a range of government and non-government policies and services intended to maintain and enhance the well-being of people. It was recognised, however, that despite the intention, such policies and services had not had significant impact and themselves needed to be changed. Those associated with social welfare activities and also those associated with economic planning efforts have not achieved basic changes in the living conditions of the vast masses of the people in the Region. Indeed, they can find little satisfaction from the worsening poverty in many of the countries and the accelerating collapse of their social institutions. This is a matter of most serious concern both in terms of the human degradation involved and the loss of human resources for achieving satisfactory levels of living. Such a concern is not, of course, confined to people involved in social welfare and economic development activities but is increasingly being expressed by government, international agencies, and all people who share humanitarian values.
2. The resultant searching for new levels of cultural and social living amounts in many cases to seeking a new society in which social justice is a prime value held by all sections of the population. In the quest for better conditions of life, the existing humanitarian concerns of social welfare institutions and practitioners can be utilized in the service of social progress. A developmental orientation emanating from the social welfare sector will have basic humanitarian validity because of the sector's understanding of what life is like for people who are facing the hazards of hunger, loneliness, deprivation, sickness and death. This closeness to the life-styles of the people validates the demand that social welfare should be in a position to give some leadership in developmental tasks.
3. Within the social welfare sector, the social work profession has typically identified itself with trying to understand the interrelatedness of the various aspects of human functioning, and the relevance of social institutions to the attainment of better life conditions. One of its insights is that of learning to build on the innate capacities of people to survive, surmount their difficulties, change and build anew. Renewal is generated from within, and as this can be done with people, so can it be done with and for societies. These perspectives are increasingly shared by other professional groups employed in, or in relation to, the social welfare sector, and obviously to work towards the goal of societal change collaboration between professions, disciplines and sectors of development is essential.
4. The developmental approach through social welfare is, then, concerned with – working with the people themselves and helping them to develop their own life styles;

- organizing and influencing new institutional arrangements which reflect the needs of the people (e.g. in the fields of government, education, agriculture, etc.);
- interrelating institutional developments to help them maximize their servicing of human needs;
- putting into closer relationship the various professional groups in order to utilize their knowledge and skills more effectively in the service of the lives of the people.

The pursuit of these concerns will not result in unitary methods of approach. There is no one single or exclusive road to development, no model or development philosophy or ideology. The above concerns applied to societies which are overwhelmingly poor and rural will call for really different developmental strategies than when applied to urban industrial societies. However, the fate of each society is increasingly a matter of common concern in a world which cannot escape from recognition of the interdependence between societies in the Region and elsewhere. Since the vast majority of people in the Region are poor and living in rural areas, they must be the major focus of concern for the Regional development strategies.

In providing a rationale for the centre, the workshop recognised a number of regional institutions already attempted to affect living conditions in the region, but they were focused upon using economic development strategies, with very limited concern for social development strategies. So far no systematic attempt had been made to utilise the potential of social welfare for developmental purposes. This was a most serious gap in the region's institutional arrangements. There appeared to be long-term trends encouraging the social welfare system,¹⁷³ the economic planning system, and the physical planning system to become alive to the interrelatedness of the various dimensions of development. Therefore, social welfare's developmental concerns would be matched by similar developmental concerns in each of the other major systems, some of which will have been deliberately stimulated by social welfare itself.

The workshop proposed four goals for the centre:

1. To delineate the major developmental tasks of the Region which can be addressed through social welfare developmental strategies. (This will mean special attention to the majority of the people who are living in rural areas and lacking in a range of basic needs and who have been neglected in developmental strategies.)
2. To develop new social welfare strategies for the priority developmental needs in the Region.
3. To help the Welfare sector in each country to become developmental in its orientation.
4. To help other key social welfare sectors such as health, education, income security, employment, agricultural extension, cooperatives, etc. to become developmental in their orientation. (Where those already have a welfare

173 This system was seen to include the welfare sector (the usual cluster of child welfare policies and services, family welfare, rehabilitation of disabled groups, etc.) as well as aspects of other key sectors (health, education, income security, employment, agricultural extension, etc.).

component, the role of this component in the sector is to be used as an important mechanism in the process.)

Eight specific objectives were seen to flow from these goals:

1. To undertake research relevant to the goals of the Centre.
2. To collect and make available to countries, agencies, and peoples in the Region, relevant data on living conditions and cultural values and characteristics.
3. To identify, collect, and develop relevant data on social welfare developmental strategies and make it available throughout the Region.
4. To provide, for key people in the social welfare system of each country, greater understanding of developmental tasks and increased capacity to effect developmental changes. (An important means of achieving this objective will be through a variety of educational experiences at the Centre and in various countries of the Region. ...)
5. To produce new teaching materials on developmental tasks which can be utilized effectively in the countries of the Region. (The Centre will give explicit attention to communication problems in the production and utilization of these teaching materials.)
6. To maximize the participation in the Centre of all the countries in the Region.
7. To establish effective links with similar Centres being established in other Regions throughout the world.
8. To establish effective links with other institutions in the Region who are involved in economic and physical planning.

Apart from the intensive work with colleagues at the workshop which produced this report on the proposed Asian centre, I have two other vivid memories of that time in Manila. The president's wife, Imelda Marcos, who was taking a particular interest in the establishment of the centre, invited the workshop participants to an extravagant fashion parade! I was not alone in thinking how inappropriate this was, given our concerns in the workshop. The other memory is of experiencing an earthquake (6.7 scale) during one of our workshop meetings. Fortunately we were in a building designed to withstand quakes. It did not collapse, but later we noticed it had opened up a little at the seams. I can recall the colour draining from our faces as we sat it out. Our Filipino hosts said it had been predicted; we should be alright provided we stay put and not try to use the lifts. For Darwish, however, this was too much. He got up and went hairing off to the lifts exclaiming 'There are limits to courage!'

Follow-up After the Workshop

On 6 March, 1974, P. D. Kulkarni thanked me for my valuable contribution to the proceedings of the workshop. 'We are particularly grateful to you for having kindly consented to carry the responsibility as an elected official ... and to have done so with great competence and cordiality.' Having had a direct hand in outlining the program of the centre, he hoped that I would secure support for it in governmental and professional circles. He was just about to see H.E. Mr Henderson (the Australian ambassador) and would provide him with the

relevant documents.¹⁷⁴ On 15 March, I told P. D. I had gone to Canberra to discuss with senior officials in the Australian Department of Social Security and the Foreign Affairs Department, the likelihood and level of Australian support for the proposed Asian centre. 'I think I can say informally that the signs are good.'¹⁷⁵

P. D. wrote to me on 22 April that ECAFE had adopted a resolution, sponsored jointly by Iran, Japan and the Philippines, on the speedy establishment of the Manila Centre. They had at least four more financial pledges including one of \$50,000 from Japan. There was also a resolution about coordinating the work of the various regional institutions, which of course was quite consistent with their own policy. Subject to a couple of documentary formalities, the way for the establishment of the Centre was now clear. He was, however, disappointed to report that despite taking active part in the deliberations on the item of regional institutions, the Australian delegation did not even mention the social welfare centre proposal. 'It leaves me with an uneasy feeling to get a total non-response from a major government like yours. That this should be so in spite of your efforts in Canberra is beyond my comprehension. I hope that the Australian government will find it possible to take interest in this Centre sooner than later.'¹⁷⁶

I followed up the matter in a letter to Bill Hayden, Australian minister for social security. In it I briefly traced the origins of the idea of the Asian centre for training/research in social welfare and development, and the concrete proposals coming from the workshop in February.

At the workshop, it was clear that great store was being placed upon gaining the support of the Australian Government for the firm proposal which was to be considered at the forthcoming Colombo meeting of ECAFE.

While in Manila, I discussed with the Australian Ambassador, Mr Henderson, how to encourage Australian support. He suggested that I have a discussion in Canberra with Mr Spratt of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and also with senior officials of the Department of Social Security. Subsequently on 7th March, I discussed the Centre with Mr Spratt and another senior official of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and with Mr Max Wryell and Mr Spencer Colliver of your own Department.

In view of your Government's well-earned reputation for being actively interested in social welfare policy matters, I was surprised when I received the attached letter. (P. D. Kulkarni's, 22/4/74) My personal view is that Australia has a responsibility to participate actively in the proposed Centre, and indeed Australian social policy makers could well gain from it increased expertise.

I had the impression when talking to the Department of Foreign Affairs officials, that they did not have strong consultation links with your Department. If this is the case, it would seem unfortunate. As you know, the development of countries in the Region is being increasingly seen by the U.N. and its agencies within a broad social welfare frame of reference, rather than a narrow economic and/or

174 Letter, P. D. Kulkarni to John Lawrence, 6/3/74.

175 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to P. D. Lawrence, 15/3/74.

176 Letter, P. D. Kulkarni to John Lawrence, 22/4/74.

political one. Yours is the most obvious department to encourage Foreign Affairs to comprehend what is involved in such a frame of reference.

I congratulated Bill Hayden on the return of the government, and sent him personally warmest best wishes for this next term of office.¹⁷⁷

On my return from sabbatical leave in the United Kingdom (from July until in January, 1975), I received this written response from Bill Hayden:

I am disappointed at the report that the Australian delegation to the ECAFE Conference in Colombo was not able to take a more positive line concerning the proposed Centre. I myself had written on 19 March to Senator Willesee as the Minister for Foreign Affairs, commenting on the importance of the proposal for the Asian Centre and suggesting in the strongest possible terms the need for the Australian representative at the Commission Meeting to indicate a concrete commitment to the development of the Centre, both in terms of financial assistance and of expert advisory resources as appropriate.

I had indicated that officers of my Department would be happy to consult further with the Department of Foreign Affairs in order that the Australian representatives at the Commission Meeting could be adequately briefed on our view of the importance of the proposed Centre. My own officers had given me extensive briefing on the proposal and had highlighted the importance of it for social planning and social welfare education throughout the region.

I am afraid there is little that I can do of a practical nature at this stage. I will, however, again bring the matter to the attention of the Minister for Foreign Affairs and ask that his Department do everything possible to indicate the Australian Government's interest in this development.

Thank you indeed for writing to me.

Hayden began this belated letter with an apology for the delay in responding to my letter. It had been referred to his Department but unfortunately it was not possible for Mr Colliver to take action at the time. He noted that I would be in the U.K. until February 1975.¹⁷⁸

I was pleased to hear that Hayden would be actively pursuing the matter of Australia's participation in the centre. 'It is a question of some importance, and certainly has a bearing on the extent to which Australia is seen to be accepting its social welfare responsibilities beyond the confines of its own national boundaries'.¹⁷⁹ In June 1975, Bill Hayden left the ministry of social security, replacing Jim Cairns as treasurer in the Whitlam government shortly before the government lost office in November. Hayden had become disenchanted with social welfare aspirations and planning and the government was under financial stress, so in fact there was now little likelihood of the proposed centre receiving financial support from the Australian government.

In February, 1976, I received a letter from the Dr Estefania Aldaba-Lim, secretary of the Philippines Department of Social Welfare in Manila, informing me that the Asian Centre for Training and Research in Social Welfare and

177 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Bill Hayden, 3/6/74. I sent copies to Max Wryell and Spencer Colliver.

178 Letter, Bill Hayden to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 9/1/75.

179 Letter, John Lawrence to Bill Hayden, 13/3/75.

Development had been inaugurated on 4 February. She enclosed photos of the occasion and a booklet of the speeches by Ferdinand Marcos, president of the Philippines, Imelda Marcos (who had 'sponsored and facilitated the construction of the building'), and J. B. P. Maramis (executive secretary, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific).¹⁸⁰ President Marcos, after noting 'we all have the same things to say about social welfare and development', added

... this is a monument to Asian unity. It is a rebuke of the idea that the cultural, geographic and historic barriers of cooperative action among Asian nations are insurmountable. The mere fact that we have, therefore, attained this objective in setting up this center is certainly an inspiration for all other cooperative endeavors in the region.

Dr Aldaba-Lim thanked me and others like me 'who saw the vision and helped to make the establishment of this Centre a reality. We hope you will continue to lend your most valuable support to the Centre'.¹⁸¹ The centre had the participation and support of the governments of India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Nepal, Pakistan, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand and the United States, as well as UNDP, UNICEF, ESCAP, and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The centre became operational in July 1976, under the direction of an Iranian, Dr Ahmad Fattahipour. It included residential facilities (30 rooms) at very reasonable rates. Its location was in Makati, Metro Manila – part of a complex of institutions established under the leadership of Imelda Marcos.

In late October, 1976, Keith Jennings, UNSW registrar, received a request from the Australian Development Assistance Agency through the Australian-Asian universities cooperation scheme of the Australian vice-chancellors' committee. It was for names of 'some outstanding scholars and social scientists concerned with Social Welfare and Development in Asia and the Pacific, preferably from the Schools of Social Work in Australia', who may be interested in working with or for ACTR/SWD as experts, consultants or members of the advisory board in future. The Jennings' response (which I drafted) was forwarded to the director of the ACTR/SWD. It gave my name and set down my credentials:

Professor Lawrence was a member of the Experts' Preparatory Workshop which met in Manila in February 1974 to draw up a work plan for the Centre. He has indicated continuing interest in the Centre now it has been established.

His active international interest in social welfare and development connected with the ESCAP Region has included:

- Chairman of the Pre-Conference Working Party for the 15th International Conference on Social Welfare, held in Manila in 1970.
- October-December 1972, located in the Social Development Division of ECAFE, working as a consultant for a U.N. Seminar to assist schools of social work in the ECAFE region to become developmentally oriented. Chief rapporteur for the seminar.

180 'A Monument to Asian Unity', Asian Centre for Training and Research in Social Welfare and Development, Manila, Philippines.

181 Letter, Estefania Aldaba-Lim to Prof. John Lawrence, 19/2/76.

- Nominated by Dr Desai, who was Chairman of the Asian Region Association of Schools of Social Work, for individual membership of the Executive of the International Association of Schools of Social Work, 1974–76; re-elected for a further two years 1976–78.
- Currently Vice-President and member of the Board of Governors of the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS), which sees itself as having a regional social welfare responsibility; Member, ACOSS's International Committee.¹⁸²

The UNSW letter also stated that Dr Alexander Mamak and Grant McCall of the UNSW School of Sociology were interested in the possibility of being associated with the Centre. They were actively following up the recommendations of a Young Nations Conference in the school in August 1976, which had focused on research for development and development planning in the South Pacific. Finally, reference was made to the national social policy research centre.

On the invitation of the Federal Government and with its full financial support, the University is in the process of establishing a Social Welfare Research Centre. This should be fully operational towards the end of 1977.¹⁸³ Part of its work is likely to involve international comparisons, and the ACT/SWD could well be a suitable contact point through which some of these comparisons can be made.

The director of SWDCAP (the revised designation of ACT/SWD) wrote to me in November, 1977.¹⁸⁴ They were wondering if I would be interested in a one-year assignment at the centre as a social policy consultant and whether I would be available sometime in 1978 – the sooner the better. 'We are looking for specialists, educators and researchers in the field of social policy who would be interested in helping us in our programme (copy enclosed)'. Despite the tremendous financial difficulties, the centre had reasonably grown and was expected to have five professional staff in 1978. An enclosed brochure provided information on its activities since its establishment in June 1976.¹⁸⁵

I did not, in fact, receive this letter with its enclosures. Ahmed Fattahipour enclosed this material in a further letter sent on 22 February. Since they had not heard from me they assumed I was not interested in a one-year assignment at the Centre. He would, however, like to explore another possibility. Would I be interested in serving as a member of the advisory committee of the Centre, 1978–80, if as seemed likely Australia was selected as one of the member countries of the committee for that period? The committee met annually in Manila for 3 to 4 days in order to study the work program of the Centre and provide professional advice to the director for his future activities. Its 6 members from Asian and Pacific countries were primarily selected on the basis of their professional capacity, but to be fair to all countries of the region,

182 Letter, Keith Jennings to R. E. Vizard, ADAA, 16/11/76.

183 In fact, it opened in 1980.

184 Letter, Ahmad Fattahipour to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 22/11/77.

185 UNDP Social Welfare Development Centre for Asia and the Pacific, General Information, September, 1977.

geographical considerations were also given due consideration.¹⁸⁶

In reply to this letter, I said it was a worry when mails were so unreliable. I very much regretted they had not received definite response from me about the one-year assignment as a social policy consultant. Because of my existing commitments, in fact I could not have considered this for 1978. Perhaps I could consider the possibility in 1981 when I was due for a year's sabbatical leave, but that was still some distance in the future. I was, however, interested in the possibility of serving on the advisory committee, 1978–80, if a member was to come from Australia.¹⁸⁷ Ahmad Fattahipour wrote on 22 April that my name had been included in the list of suggested members of the advisory committee that would be sent to the executive secretary of ESCAP for his final decision.¹⁸⁸ He looked forward to talking with me in Sydney in early June, on his way back to Manila after a conference of The South Pacific Commission in Noumea. In Sydney, he would be discussing with Ian Yates about the possibility of SWDCAP and ACOSS organising a workshop for social workers from the Pacific countries. He spent time with me, and my family, when he was in Sydney on 6 June. On 14 June, he thanked me for my 'generous time and hospitality', and sent kindest regards to me and my family. He would be in Bangkok the next week and would submit the names of the potential members of the advisory committee to ESCAP. He would keep me posted on developments.¹⁸⁹

In the *SWDCAP Chronicle* (vol. II, no. 3), August–December 1978, the director stated:

SWDCAP made a significant breakthrough in 1978 by initiating a number of important measures towards becoming a truly viable professional institution at a regional level. During the year, a total of eleven training courses, seminars and workshops attended by nearly 300 participants, were carried out in six countries of the region; fourteen case studies were conducted in various Asian countries; and a number of steps were taken to extend professional services to the Pacific Island countries.

He referred to the addition of more professional staff and increased financial resources in 1979. The *Chronicle* included photographs and the curricula vitae of two recently appointed social welfare experts, who had come from the Social Development Division in Bangkok – both social work professionals very experienced in regional social welfare and social work. Meher Nanavatty was a graduate of the Tata Institute of Social Services in Bombay, and after several years of field experience completed his master's degree in social administration in 1950 from Case Western University in Cleveland, USA. In 1954, he headed the field work department of the Delhi School of Social Work. After five years, he joined the Indian government as director of social education in the Indian Ministry of Community Development, and later as social welfare

186 Letter, Ahmad Fattahipour to Professor R. J. Lawrence, 22/2/78.

187 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Ahmad Fattahipour, 14/3/78.

188 Letter, Ahmad Fattahipour to Prof R. J. Lawrence, 21/4/78.

189 Letter, Ahmad Fattahipour to John Lawrence, 14/6/78.

adviser in the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare. From 1972–78, he had served ECAFE/ESCAP as regional adviser on social welfare aspects of family planning consulting in 15 countries.¹⁹⁰ Frances Yaras, originally from USA, had spent 15 years in Asia as a social work educator. Her doctoral thesis (at Catholic University in Washington) was on Gandhian values and professional social work values, with particular application to a curriculum in an Indian school of social work. She worked in India for four years and started a school of social work for women in Bangalore, South India. Before joining ECAFE as regional advisor on training in social work and community development, she was a country adviser in training and social work to East Pakistan (now Bangladesh). During her career, she had spent time in 20 countries in the region.

These appointments and the various projects underway and planned seemed promising for the continuing development of the Centre, but I did not hear anything from Ahmad. The Centre's next *Chronicle* (January – March 1979, vol. III, no. 1) indicated why.

In the past few months, two major developments have created a new perspective for the regional institutions of ESCAP. First, the Governing Council of the regional institutions decided on the merger of APCWD, in Tehran; APDAC, in Kuala Lumpur; APDI, in Bangkok; and SWDCAP, in Manila. This decision was based on the recommendation of the UNDP/ESCAP Task Force to integrate the regional institutions in order to achieve an integrated approach towards development. Second, the decision of the Governing Council was confirmed by the 35th Session of the ESCAP Commission. Therefore, the institutions will be merged into a single centre, to be called the Asian and Pacific Development Centre (APDC). In the resolution of the Commission, it is stated that 'social welfare and development' will receive due emphasis in the work programme of the new centre. Also, in general, the present staff of the existing institutions may be transferred to APDC. It is hoped, therefore, that this will ensure the continuity of SWDCAP's work programme and mandate under APDC.

... This development may be seen in two ways. Optimistically, APDC will be able to achieve greater scope in its service to the development of the region in view of the fact that its funds will come from the combined resources of the four existing institutions. And since social welfare will be a major component of the work programme of the new centre, it is possible that social development, at the regional level, might become better integrated into national development plans of the countries of the region. Conversely, this perspective can only be accomplished if financial stability of the new centre is ensured right from the very beginning so the new director will be able to concentrate on the *quality* and *relevance* of the services of this new centre to the entire region.

Ahmad Fattahipour wrote at length in May 1980. During the past two years, so many unpleasant events of a political nature had disturbed his life that he had decided to start a new path in life. The horrible political events in Iran

190 See 'Meher Nanavatty', in James O. Billups (ed), *Faithful Angels: Portraits of International Social Work Notables*, NASW Press, Washington, 2002.

since late 1978 had seriously affected his life 'slowly, gradually and definitely'. On top of this, the four regional institutions of ESCAP, including SWDCAP, would close down by June 30, 1980, and the new Centre would be established in Kuala Lumpur as of July 1, 1980. Because of the US – Iran relationships, he was barred from entering the U.S., and his American wife was not permitted to enter Iran. The director of the new Centre in Kuala Lumpur was expected to be an economist and a top politician, so he would not have much chance to go there. A few months ago, he had made a firm decision to go back to the States and rejoin the academic world again, but the climate had further deteriorated. He was now thinking about possibilities for a period in teaching and/or research elsewhere before going to the USA with his family to continue his academic career there once the current crisis in US – Iran relationships was over.¹⁹¹ I discussed his situation and curriculum vitae with senior colleagues in Sydney and his curriculum vitae was circulated amongst heads of social work schools in Australia, but there were not obvious possibilities for the kind of appointment that would suit him. Finances generally were very tight and there tended to be an over-all cut-back situation in the Australian universities.¹⁹²

191 Letter, Ahmad Fattahipour to John Lawrence, 6/5/80. He would be interested in teaching courses on social institutions, social psychology, social organisations, sociology of education, migration, minorities, social development in Asia, and other related subjects; and would also be interested in doing research on development problems in Asia and the Middle East.

192 Letter, John Lawrence to Ahmad Fattahipour, 4/6/80.

Chapter 8

International Association of Schools of Social Work 1970–78

In 1973, the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) was briefly described in these terms:

Established in 1928 with a small nucleus of schools located primarily in western Europe as its members, the IASSW has grown steadily, in size and influence, as the international spokesman for schools of social work in every geographical region. Its membership now includes 20 associations of schools of social work¹⁹³ and more than 450 schools in 65 countries in all parts of the world.

Membership is open to educational institutions offering a defined course of study in social work, to national or regional associations of such institutions and to organisations engaged in advanced studies, research or other special activities related to social work education. Standards of admission are established by the Executive Board and General Assembly of the IASSW and administered by regional membership committees.¹⁹⁴

1970 and 1972 Congresses

In February 1970, I received a letter from Joan Eyden, chairman of the program committee for the 15th IASSW Congress in Manila inviting me to represent Australia in a panel discussion in a plenary session on the 5th UN survey of training innovations and experiments in social welfare. I could not, however, accept because at the time I would be writing up the pre-conference working party report for the ICSW. In preparation for the IASSW Congress, national associations of schools of social work from both developed and developing

193 These bodies collectively affiliated their member schools with IASSW. They existed in Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark (Scandinavian Committee of schools), Finland, France, India, Republic of Ireland (UK Joint University Council for Social and Public Administration), Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway (Scandinavian Committee of Schools), Philippines, South Africa, Sweden (Scandinavian Committee of Schools), Switzerland, United Kingdom (Joint University Council), and United States.

194 *International Association of Schools of Social Work, Directory of Members*, IASSW, New York, May 1973.

countries in all parts of the world forwarded reports to IASSW on the congress theme 'Training for Social Welfare and Development – Policies and Programmes for the Seventies'. These formed the basis of a very helpful background document for discussion groups at the congress, which was prepared by Joan Eyden.¹⁹⁵ In response to requests from the membership, the greater part of the 1970 Congress was devoted to discussion in small groups on previously announced topics with delegates indicating their preferences. Regional discussions (first held at the 1968 Helsinki Congress) were held in the afternoon on 1 September. Unfortunately I was too sleep-deprived to attend the Asia and Far East meeting, and had to return to my hotel instead! Audrey Rennison, recorder for the meeting, told me about it later. A novel feature of the congress was 'Congress Daily', which provided a running commentary on what was going on. Dolores Lasan and Esther Vilorio were co-chairmen of the printing and publications committee which produced it. I came to know both of them well in the course of subsequent shared professional concerns in the region.

Katherine Kendall, secretary-general of IASSW, invited me on behalf of Herman Stein and the executive committee, to be a member of the program committee for the 16th Congress to be held in The Hague in the Netherlands in August 1972. No funds were available to bring the world-wide committee together so the work had to be carried out by correspondence.¹⁹⁶

In Dick Splane's December 1972 Christmas card, he wrote that he was disappointed when he found I was not among the Australian delegation at the ICSW conference in The Hague in July.¹⁹⁷ 'It was a good conference though it lacked some of the excitement felt in Manila.' He was on a year's leave of absence from Health and Welfare Canada as a visiting professor in health services administration in the Faculty of Medicine, University of Alberta. He was enjoying academic life and might well opt for it after a year or two back in the department. He talked about a visiting professorship program under which perhaps they could get me to Canada. 'I hope your new government is more sympathetic to social welfare than the old'.

Membership of IASSW

In June 1970, I wrote to Katherine Kendall about the UNSW School of Social Work joining the IASSW. On 28 January, 1972, I sent a response to her detailed, structured request for information on the school for inclusion in the 'Guide to Social Work Education Around the World', to be published by IASSW. The oldest and the newest schools in each country were being selected, and as the newest school in Australia according to their records, UNSW would be included. I hoped the response could be accepted as data in support of the school's application for IASSW membership.¹⁹⁸ In response to

195 Joan Eyden, 'Training for Social Welfare and Development: Policies and Programmes for the Seventies', IASSW XVth congress, Manila, 1970. The groups also had copies of Herman Stein's keynote address.

196 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 20/5/71.

197 I had a prior commitment with the international social planning for the disabled seminar in Brisbane, see pp. 36–69.

198 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine A. Kendall, 28/1/72.

further questions, I supplied additional material about the PhD and MSW degrees, the research component in the BSW degree, typical settings for field instruction, the types of employment of our graduates, and library resources. On types of employment, I stated:

Our graduates are employed in all areas of social work practice. Some of our graduates hold positions of considerable administrative responsibility within both Government and non-government organisations. A major proportion of our graduates are employed in settings with a casework orientation, but as the range of employment possibilities open to Social Workers has widened, the number of graduates engaged in community work and social group work has increased.¹⁹⁹

The School of Social Work at UNSW was admitted to IASSW membership in April, 1972, with the membership committee congratulating us 'on the excellence of your programme'. We were sent a list of the current members and told we would be listed in the next directory of members. The program of the next IASSW Congress, in The Hague 8-11 August, 1972, was enclosed and our teaching staff were encouraged to attend - at a lower fee. The school was now eligible to send a representative to the general assembly of the schools of social work, just prior to the congress, and I nominated Audrey Rennison. The minutes of the general assembly in Manila in 1970, and the associated report of the secretary-general, Katherine Kendall, were enclosed and I was impressed by the quality of the reporting. Also enclosed were the first two issues of *IASSW NEWS*, channel of communication between the secretariat and member schools.²⁰⁰

Our annual membership fee 1972/73 was at the top of the scale but it was a paltry US\$35! It was obvious the scale badly needed revision for schools in developed countries, where this amount was at a level of petty cash. At the executive board meeting in The Hague in August 1972, the treasurer, Robin Huws Jones, noted an increase in income, primarily from donations, contracts, and bequests. He underlined that for a membership organisation, dues were the only reliable, steadfast, and growing source of income. Dues had never been and probably never would be an adequate source of support for the IASSW. However, in order to obtain additional support, foundations and other sources of funds must have evidence that the members of the association thought well enough of it to contribute more adequately to its support.

A five-point scale of membership dues was adopted and, after consultation with national associations and individual schools, four criteria for implementation were determined - gross national product per capita of the country, the general economic position of the schools in the country, the flexibility available to schools to determine how much they could pay, and greater equity among schools in different parts of the world. It was recognised that increased dues might lose some members, but IASSW's officers believed 'we now need to focus on strength through more committed membership'. They prepared a brochure which explained why IASSW merited support and noted the material

199 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Patricia J. Stickney, research associate, IASSW, 11/4/72.

200 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 14/4/72.

that each member school would be receiving in the next 6 months.²⁰¹ Our school was asked whether we would be able to pay increased dues from 1974. The scale set for Australia and 8 other countries (Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and United Kingdom) was from \$75 to \$100.²⁰² For 6 countries, with higher GNP per capita (Canada, Denmark, France, Sweden, Switzerland and United States), the scale was still just \$100, no different from what was already paid by Canada and the United States.²⁰³

I considered it reasonable that our school should be billed at the new rate of \$100. 'It seems the very least we can do to support the continuing development of the Association.'²⁰⁴ In writing to Katherine Kendall, I added:

I was disappointed not to meet you when you were passing through Bangkok towards the end of last year. In particular I wanted to say how much I appreciated reading a special Address you delivered in London soon after The Hague Conference – I thought it excellent, full of insight and wisdom of the kinds we seem badly to need at present.²⁰⁵

Katherine wrote that it was 'heartwarming' to receive our positive response to the request for an increase in membership dues. 'You can't imagine what it does for the morale of an organisation to have this kind of support for its work'. They hoped they would see me at the 1974 Addis Ababa Congress – 'or perhaps we shall both converge on Bangkok again one of these days'.²⁰⁶

In the May 1973 directory of members, five Australian schools were listed – at the Flinders University of South Australia, and at the Universities of Queensland, New South Wales, Melbourne, and Sydney. Regional activities and groupings were emerging as a feature of IASSW, and had representation on the executive board. A regional association of schools (ALEATS) was established in Latin America in 1967; the Association for Social Work Education in Africa (ASWEA) in 1971; and the Asian Regional Association for Social Work Education (ARASWE) in 1974. In Europe, a Scandinavian Committee of Schools of Social Work continued to be a channel for joint activities in the sub-region, and a European committee of the executive board worked on specific substantive questions but as yet no European regional association existed.

1974 Congress Background Paper

IASSW planned to hold its first congress in Africa in Addis Abada, Ethiopia,

201 Proceedings of an IASSW seminar on curriculum development and teaching in Bombay, November 1971; proceedings of the Hague international congress of schools of social work, August 1972; analytical abstracts on population and family planning; *Guide to Social Work Education Around the World*; *Directory of Members*; and continuing issues of *IASSW News*.

202 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 29/3/73.

203 IASSW, 'Proposed Revision of Dues Scale', November, 1972.

204 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine Kendall, 5/4/73.

205 Katherine A. Kendall, 'Dream or Nightmare', prepared as the Younghusband lecture, an annual event in London.

206 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 23/4/73.

5-9 July, 1974.²⁰⁷ Immediately following IASSW's 17th Congress, interested people could travel to Nairobi, Kenya, for the International Conference on Social Welfare organised by the International Council on Social Welfare, and a symposium sponsored by the International Federation of Social Workers.

In February, 1974, Katherine Kendall wrote on behalf of the congress planning committee a persuasive invitation for me to prepare a brief background paper on 'Teaching Social Policy and Planning' for use as a resource document for a discussion group on the topic:

Recent United Nations reports on training for social development have recommended that social workers be prepared to assume leadership positions in social policy and planning. There seems to be little argument that social workers, through their attention to the human component, can contribute significantly to social policy and planning but questions do arise as to the effectiveness or feasibility of preparation beyond a general orientation for all students. It is argued for example, that there is not enough access to policy and planning positions to justify a major social work involvement in this area. Probably the most difficult questions, however, have to do with the level of preparation, if it is offered, and the content of classroom and field experience relevant to social policy and planning. Teaching materials also require examination. We know your interest in this problem and through a background paper we seek your views on the trends and issues involved in teaching social policy and planning which could profitably be discussed in this group. ... We expect this particular discussion group to attract a select group of thoughtful, experienced international social work educators.

They hoped I would attend the congress, but it was not necessary to do so to submit a background paper. Because of reproduction pressures, the paper was asked to be submitted about a month after the invitation!²⁰⁸

I replied, 'The topic is vast, the preparation time is short, and I have many other commitments, but I will do what I can.' Unfortunately it was impossible to attend the congress.²⁰⁹ In fact, only one of the four of us who provided background papers for this discussion group was able to be at the congress.²¹⁰

The 1974 IAASW Congress had to be relocated from Addis Abada to Nairobi. The secretary-general after a one-week visit, and the organisers, decided it was not an appropriate time to hold the congress in Ethiopia – the allocated government funding to the university for the congress was withdrawn, university facilities would no longer be available because term would have to be extended into July after a closing of the university, and there was general concern for famine relief and rehabilitation together with an unsettled political situation.²¹¹

207 ASWEA was located in the School of Social Work in Haile Selassie 1 University in Addis Abada, financed by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation of West Germany.

208 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 19/2/74.

209 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine A. Kendall, 18/3/74.

210 This was Professor A. V. S. Lochhead (University College of Swansea, Wales). The other authors unable to attend were Professors Merle Hokenstad (Western Michigan University, USA), and Roy Parker (University of Bristol, England).

211 Katharine A. Kendall to the Executive Board, IASSW, 17/4/74.

Originally it was anticipated background papers would be included in congress proceedings, and this was for me an inducement, for as will be obvious I hoped my background paper would be read far beyond the confines of a discussion group at the congress. The severely limited budget because of the last-minute shift of the congress made this impossible, however. The paper was eventually published in an Australian social work book in 1980.²¹² It is reproduced here, because it gives insight into my thinking about my main university teaching area and curriculum planning related to it.

Teaching Social Policy and Planning

Since this topic is being discussed in a congress of social work, it seems reasonable to focus upon the teaching of social policy and planning in a school of social work. It is, however, important to recognise at the outset that such teaching concerns are increasingly likely to appear in many other educational institutions in a contemporary society. In the 1950s, Wilensky and Lebeaux predicted that in industrial societies distinctions between welfare and other types of social institutions would become more and more blurred. 'Under continuing industrialisation', they said, 'all institutions will be oriented toward and evaluated in terms of social welfare aims'. (p.147) It is difficult in this to disentangle prediction from prescription, but at least on the surface many, if not all, of social institutions in contemporary industrial societies do appear to be increasingly under challenge to demonstrate that they do more good than harm to all the various human beings whose lives they affect.

Human institutions are to a greater extent being seen as man-made and capable of being changed. At its broadest this is what social policy is about. Society consists of human beings living together according to rules or norms or 'policies', which enable them to attain their individual and collective ends. As the newer values of social democracy have competed with older value systems, the process referred to by Wilensky and Lebeaux has become more apparent.

The moral ferment reflected in and created by these challenges in industrial societies is paralleled by similar moral concerns in other societies. This is manifest in the U.N. talk of the need for 'integrated development' in which social aspects of development not only are considered along with economic aspects, but they become the main criteria for integration.

These trends for human institutions in many societies to be assessed in terms of their impact on the lives of the human beings involved are giving rise to a plurality of teaching and research centres concerned with social policy in general or with selected specialised aspects of social policy. The developing pattern will vary from country to country, but it can include in addition to schools of social work, schools, departments, or institutes of economics, economic development, architecture, town and country planning, urban studies, public health, medicine, law, education, applied sociology, applied anthropology, political science, applied behavioural science, agriculture, and social administration.

The social concerns of each of these possible educational developments will

212 F. Pavlin, J. Crawley & P. J. Boas, (eds.), *Perspectives in Australian Social Work*, Melbourne, P.I.T. Publishing, 1980.

take characteristic forms, depending on the specialty and particular history of the educational body in question. Each will have its particular validity and contribution, but taken together and seen from a general community viewpoint, their composite pattern may not make much sense. One of the critical issues in teaching social policy and planning is, then, trying to encourage more adequate communication and sharing among these educational bodies, and among their products.

Alfred Kahn insists that planning will remain a coalitional activity, requiring a variety of roles and the perspectives of several disciplines and professions. Within each planning pattern generalists would be needed, but every planner should also have speciality competence in one or more of the fields covered. (p. 309)

My understanding of the British development of university departments of social administration (an older British term for 'social policy and planning'), as distinct from departments of social work (See Marsh, pp. 3-17), is that these do provide that society with a very useful educational and research facility. Such a department's courses are taken by a variety of students, not just social work students and those intending to make a career in social administration teaching and research, but students also studying different professions and specialised disciplines.

Richard Titmuss has listed (pp. 23-4) the following as the major fields of research and teaching in social administration:

1. The analysis and description of policy formation and its consequences, intended and unintended.
2. The study of structure, function, organisation, planning and administrative processes of institutions and agencies, historical and comparative.
3. The study of social needs and of problems of access to, utilisation, and patterns of outcome of services, transactions and transfers.
4. The analysis of the nature, attributes and distribution of social costs and diswelfares.
5. The analysis of distributive and allocative patterns in command-over-resources-through-time and the particular impact of the social services.
6. The study of the roles and functions of elected representatives, professional workers, administrators and interest groups in the operation and performance of social welfare institutions.
7. The study of the social rights of the citizen as contributor, participant and user of social services.
8. The study of the role of government (local and central) as an allocator of values and of rights to social property as expressed through social and administrative law and other rule-making channels.

At an even higher level of generalisation than this, the study area referred to is: What are the social needs of the population? What are the various needs-meeting mechanisms through which the population at large and various sections of the population meet their social needs? How effective and equitable are they?

The subject area was, in the earlier stages, tied closely to study of the social services narrowly defined, and especially of government-run services. More recently, attention has been extending in various directions:

1. to not just responding to social needs, but to studying why they take the form

- they do in different social groups,
2. to examining all the needs-meeting mechanisms, e.g. the family, the extended family, the neighbourhood, work groups, mutual aid organisations, self-help organisations, traditional voluntary organisations, commercial organisations, as well as organisations at all levels of government,
 3. to making explicit both the value and the factual bases of the definition of need, and of policy choices,
 4. to measuring and evaluating policy outcomes,
 5. to examining the social purposes and social impacts of physical planning,
 6. to examining the social purposes and social impacts of economic planning,
 7. to comparative studies especially between social sectors and between nations.

My own society has produced only a handful of people who have taken a generalist interest in social administration as a subject area, and there are no university departments of social administration, whose courses can be taken not only by social work students, but by students from other disciplines as well. Because learning in social administration is fundamental in social work practice, my own school plans and executes considerable teaching in this area, and so too do other Australian social work schools. There does, however, appear to be a strong case for the development of social administration as a subject area in its own right, not tied to any particular profession or discipline, but with a wide variety of schools and disciplines being associated with it. A school of social work could well take initiative in stimulating developments in this direction.

One of the ambiguities of 'teaching social policy and planning' is that such teaching may concentrate upon either (1) teaching *about* social policy and planning, where the focus is upon learning how, what and why social policy-making and planning occurs, which is primarily an analytic, descriptive exercise aimed at helping people to understand how their's and other societies function in these matters; and/or (2) teaching people how to perform effectively particular policy-making and planning roles. My belief is that the second focus should be based upon a sound knowledge of the first but should be distinguished from it.

Some Specific Questions and Issues

In the remainder of this brief paper I will merely list a selection of questions and issues which are raised by teaching social policy and planning to social work students. Many of these were identified in the preparatory work and discussions connected with the November 1972 ECAFE/UNICEF Seminar on 'Problems and Prospects in Schools of Social Work Contributing to Development in the ECAFE Region'. One of the ironies of educational planning in a school of social work is that often its own planning is weakest in those courses addressed to social policy and planning.

1. What are the objectives in students' learning of the individual courses and combination of courses they take in this general subject area?
2. Should they all gain an overview of the subject area before focussing upon more specialised aspects?
3. What are the boundaries of the subject matter? It obviously now includes the major social welfare systems (built around common social goals such as income security, health, housing, education, employment, recreation, and civil and

political rights; built around populations in particular localities; and built around selected population categories) and the interrelationships between these interlocking and overlapping systems. But should not the subject also include study of the relationships between economic, physical and social planning? In addition to each of these foci, could not it be argued that social policy and planning is usefully seen as a pervading perspective which can be introduced at all levels of social relationship and social organisation – in fact, wherever there are normative relations between people and groups of people?

4. Whatever sets of social norms or 'policies' are concentrated upon, how explicit is the teaching about the values in which the norms are embedded? How can the teaching convey what and whose values are at stake and in what ways? Policies are to accomplish goals. What is known about the meaningful goals for people in your society, and how they accomplish them?
5. Do you have to rely upon teaching materials drawn from other societies, mainly speculating about their relevance to your own society? What use is made of audio-visual material and field experience? How do you develop culturally relevant teaching materials for your own society?
6. The existence of particular norms and values in a society is a matter of fact to be discovered empirically. The social and behavioural sciences including history, have a major contribution to make to students' learning in these matters. How much this learning takes place in liberal arts courses or within specifically designed social policy and planning or human behaviour courses is a key educational planning issue, with no simple answers. There is obviously no one satisfactory pattern. However, unless hopeless confusion is to reign in the students' (and the teachers') minds, I believe each school has to try to decide upon a particular broad pattern of learning about these matters, in terms of which it can organise and assess outcomes.
7. Additional to helping students learn more about the way their society is organised and operates, social work students are expected to learn how to influence and change policies, and plan more effectively and efficiently. What they can do in a particular society will be determined by their knowledge of the actual conditions of that society, but what is feasible and what is desirable are separate, although strongly related, issues. Taking positions and acting accordingly on what ought to happen is the inevitable lot of the social work student of social policy and planning where he or she is directly involved. Value neutrality is not an option open to the social worker as a social worker. If this is the case, shouldn't the learning of social policy and planning *roles* by social workers include a solid grounding in moral and political philosophy – at least to the extent that learning in these areas helps students to work out coherent social philosophies on which to base and justify their actions? Trying to make explicit the criteria of justification for selecting particular courses of action rather than others, is especially difficult but crucially important learning for this next generation of social workers. It will be more so, the more influential they become, in the sense that their actions impact upon larger numbers of people. This is especially germane for countries where there are powerful social work elites. Even at the micro level of social relationships, however, social workers are being expected to be far more explicit about their value assumptions and are being

expected to justify their actions in moral and political terms.

8. How do social work students learn to perform particular social policy and planning roles when such roles have as yet been poorly delineated and articulated with each other, and with the policy and planning roles of other professions? What use is made of the relevant expertise of sociology in tackling these questions? What kinds of field education and under whose supervision would students learn these roles? Should the existing social policy and planning experience of social work practitioners be more systematically recorded and evaluated? And/or should attention be given to devising and learning social policy and planning social work roles which may not be currently strongly evident, but which seem to be warranted? Whose responsibility is it to ensure that these roles subsequently become established?
9. The size, educational and life experience, and the age and sex composition of the student body of the school are all likely to influence the teaching about social policy and planning, and the teaching of specific, high-level social policy and planning roles. For example, the teaching of specific, high-level social policy and planning *roles* may not make much sense to a primarily young, female student body at the undergraduate level. Cultural attitudes to age and sex roles which influence employment opportunity structures as well as student motivation need to be realistically considered within each society. Sweeping generalisations about these matters across all societies are not likely to be helpful, although there are groupings of societies with apparently similar circumstances who could learn from each other.
10. Finally, there is a range of questions and issues which are concerned with the teachers of social policy and planning. How many of these are full-time staff of the school? What is their professional and discipline background – both individually and collectively? If their primary professional and disciplinary affiliation lies outside of social work, how do they maintain active links with their own professional and disciplinary peers? Should only those with social work qualifications teach social work roles? How much teaching can be shared with social work field instructors, when not many of the present generation of social work practitioners have received a solid grounding in social policy and planning roles and are currently practising in such roles? What teaching is done by other schools and by actual policy makers? What is the best ‘mix’ of the various categories of social policy and planning staff? How are they encouraged to clarify and share common educational objectives for social work students? How much joint teaching should be undertaken?

A school of social work may be seen to take a position, either consciously or by default, on each of these various questions and issues. To be consistent with a policy and planning orientation, they should be matters of explicit concern. Only in this way is there any likelihood of brave words and aspirations being matched by effective action.

1. Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.
2. Alfred J. Kahn, *Theory and Practice of Social Planning*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

3. David C. Marsh (ed.), *An Introduction to the Study of Social Administration*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.
4. R. M. Titmuss, 'The Subject of Social Administration', in *Commitment to Welfare*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1968.
5. United Nations, *Problems and Prospects in Schools of Social Work Contributing to Development in the ECAFE Region - Report of the ECAFE/UNICEF Seminar on Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula*, Bangkok, 14-25 November, 1972 (E/CN . 11 / SD/ Sem . SWT/L. 3).

The discussion group at the Nairobi Conference had participants from South America (2), North America (5), Scandinavia (1), Europe (including UK) (5), Africa (6), and Asia (1). It was chaired by Joseph Neipris (Paul Baerwald school, Israel). The recorder Virginia Little (University of Connecticut, USA) sent me a helpful summary of the discussion and a list of the names and addresses of the participants soon afterwards. I noted my friend Dick Splane (University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada) was amongst them.

Elected to Executive Board 1974

In March, 1974, the chairman of the nominating committee of the IASSW, Dr Armaity Desai, nominated me to be a member of the IASSW executive board for a term of two years beginning at the next general assembly in July 1974 in Addis Ababa through to the 1976 IASSW Congress in Mexico. Nomination was the equivalent of election as the nominating committee presented a single slate to the general assembly.

The executive board always met at the time of the biennial congresses, and once between them. The association did not have sufficient resources to meet travel expenses for attendance at the board or congress.²¹³ I was willing to serve as member of the executive board, but said in my response:

Because active participation in international organisations is difficult from our neck of the woods, and because I don't like being only a nominal member of a body, I have hesitated before replying. I will certainly try to attend ... meetings of the Association but can give no guarantee that this will be possible.²¹⁴

Armaity Desai thanked me for accepting the nomination, with the comment 'It is difficult for many of us to travel to these international meetings, but we look forward to your cooperation, as so much can be done by mail'.²¹⁵ The new bye-laws adopted in Nairobi introduced 2-year terms for members of the executive board, but also an annual rotation for one-half of the board. To achieve this, all of us elected in Nairobi had our terms extended to 1977.

The Trondheim Meeting, 1973

Minutes of the last executive board meeting, in July 1973 in Trondheim, Norway, and a copy of the revised draft constitution were enclosed with the

213 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 7/3/74.

214 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine A. Kendall, 18/3/74.

215 Letter, Armaity Desai to R. J. Lawrence, 9/5/74.

letter of invitation. I particularly noted that at the outset, the meeting had passed a resolution to commemorate the great contribution Professor Richard Titmuss had made to social welfare throughout the world:

The Executive Board of the IASSW wish to place on record their profound appreciation and respect for the life and work of Richard Morris Titmuss. (He had died in April, 1973.)

Professor Titmuss was unique in the originality and in the universality of his contribution to social policy and administration. He had a passion for social justice and he believed it was served best by forthright advocacy based on rigorous and objective analysis of situations and trends. His steadfast concern was for ordinary people, especially the inarticulate and the oppressed. In his helpfulness and generosity to students, to friends and strangers from many lands, and to colleagues at all levels – from the janitor to the cabinet minister – he exhibited in his own life that ‘gift relationship’ which he made the theme of his last major work.

Although politically active, Professor Titmuss repeatedly showed himself to be above party politics; he refused to ‘trade in modish dogmas.’ ...

The IASSW constitutional revisions included changes required by incorporation in 1970, structural changes which recognised the emerging regions (in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and the Middle East, Latin America, and North America), restricting the board to not more than 40 voting members, and provision for the admission of individuals as associates.²¹⁶ The final half day of the Trondheim executive board meeting was devoted to one item – the membership status of one of its membership national associations of schools of social work, the Joint Universities Committee on Social Work of South Africa (JUC South Africa).

The South African Issue

Like other NGOs, IASSW’s consultative status with UNESCO had been suspended pending its demonstration that it was a non-discriminatory organisation. Under an amendment to its bye-laws, IASSW specified that a membership association of schools was required to be ‘in accord with the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and, specifically, with the principle of non-discrimination as a matter of policy in the conduct of their affairs’. The South African JUC formally approved this amendment in April 1972, and indicated that its constitution contained no discriminatory provisions and that all South African universities were represented in the organisation. At The Hague IASSW executive board meeting in August 1972, it was agreed that action on the membership status of JUC South Africa would be tabled pending further communication with non-white members of the faculties of the schools of social work that were members of the JUC.²¹⁷

The extended discussion on this item (fully and skilfully recorded in the

²¹⁶ This existed since 1956, but with only a volunteer secretariat it had never been implemented.

²¹⁷ *IASSW NEWS*, February, 1973. 37 board members representing 25 countries, 12 national associations of schools of social work, three regional associations, and three international organisations participated in the meeting.

minutes by Katherine Kendall) at the Trondheim executive board meeting in July 1973 resulted in a decision to continue affiliation of the JUC, provided it reaffirmed its adherence to the principle of non-discrimination as set forth in the IASSW membership requirements and met specified conditions that flowed from this requirement. Evidence had to be provided in 1975 that these conditions had been met.²¹⁸ IASSW president, Dr Herman Stein played (and continued to play) a central role in dealing with this extremely difficult issue. In April 1973, on the invitation of the University of Cape Town, he had visited South Africa to observe the issues that had a bearing on the question before the executive board. As a general statement, he saw nothing which would diminish his abhorrence for apartheid in any form. With only two or three exceptions, everyone he met in social work and education felt that affiliation of JUC should not be cut off.

The Nairobi Meetings, 1974

Due to an accident while on a UNICEF mission in Tanzania, Herman Stein was unable to attend the IASSW meetings in Nairobi in July 1974. In his absence, former president (now an honorary president), Dame Eileen Younghusband presided over the meetings of the executive board and the general assembly. I noted that for the first time a black South African (from Fort Hare University) attended the board meeting, although only as an observer. The board meeting was particularly well attended because a number of people were also attending a 2-day meeting of the expert group financed by the family planning project. The broad interpretation of the family planning project as social development had led in various countries to an emphasis in curriculum planning on new functions in social work. The formation of the new Asian Association of Schools of Social Work was seen as an outgrowth of the project, and there was enthusiasm among schools in the region to promote social development emphases, according to Dr Almanzor, an IASSW vice-president. Aida Gindy reported on the UN regional centres being established (in Asia, Europe, Africa, Latin America) on a recommendation from regional conferences of ministers responsible for social welfare and emphasised the long-term results that could be anticipated. The Asian centre was the first of the centres to be established.

In her report, the secretary-general Dr Kendall referred to the coming 50th anniversary which through most of its existence had been run by volunteers. At present there was a competent staff, but in 1976 or 1978, when the family planning grant came to an end, the IASSW might again need to become the concern of volunteers. The new by-laws, after extensive work and consultation, were adopted. If the secretariat moved out of New York, the by-laws could be easily amended.

218 9 voted in favour, 2 were opposed, and there was one abstention. The person representing the Scandinavian Committee of Schools of Social Work who voted for complete severance of relations did not believe JUC could live up to the requirement to be non-discriminatory. Although he did not like Scandinavians' penchant for making strong statements particularly on other countries, sometimes one had to make up one's mind not to go on. Minutes, Meeting of IASSW Executive Board, July 5-6, 1973, Trondheim, Norway.

Dr Dieter Hanhart (Swiss Committee of Schools of Social Service) raised the possibility for an alternative type of IASSW congress – not just an exchange of ideas around a central focus, but a discussion on research done from all over the world on certain topics and its implications for teaching. This would be a new stimulus for colleagues no longer interested in the congress program. It was argued, however, the entire program should not be research-oriented since many schools could not contribute at this level. A balance needed to be struck to ensure everyone would be equally interested in the program. Dr Desai questioned the frequency of the congress and wondered whether there might be a regional congress every two years followed by a world congress a year later. Dr Kendall reported ICSW might meet every three years after 1978. The ICSW had already accepted an invitation to hold the 19th Congress in 1978 in Israel, and at this board meeting IASSW did likewise.

A board work group²¹⁹ proposed that the Hanhart proposal as modified by the board discussion should be implemented at the 50th anniversary congress in 1978; that a theme should be selected now for the 1978 congress which could emphasise the knowledge that had been accumulated in the past half century; and that planning for it should begin in the current year. Planning proposals included the seeking of substantial funds to support the work that would be needed. The appeal for funds would emphasise that the project would – bring together and make available valuable social welfare data; bring together interpret, and make available the findings of research conducted in many countries; stimulate new research; and make an important and enduring impact on social welfare and social work education throughout the world.

In the subsequent board discussion, many commented favourably, but the point was made that while the interest was clear, the problem for schools was faculty manpower. Relatively few faculty were qualified and faculty people wore so many hats that often the best qualified persons had the least time. Dr Neipris reminded the board that the proposal was not aimed at new research but rather to bring together what was going on so we did not lose this. The board decided that a steering committee be selected by the president and secretary-general by the end of 1974, to proceed with a plan for the 1978 congress and report to the 1975 board meeting.

With the approaching retirement of Katherine Kendall (1976 or 1978 at the latest), the ending of Herman Stein's presidency in 1976, and the loss of income for staff when the family planning project finished, the future of the IASSW received serious discussion on 7 July, mindful of the gap between projected income and staff necessary to maintain a viable organisation. The president and secretary-general were asked to appoint a committee to prepare for the next board meeting a job description for the post of secretary-general, and to develop a tentative 5-year plan of activities on both a minimal and optimal basis. Delegates at the general assembly on 6 July had been agreed that – the secretary-general should be the 'anchor' person since the president

219 Mrs Grethe Sorensen (Denmark), Miss Hei-Man Lee (Hong Kong), Dr Richard Splane (Canada), Dr Richard Lodge (USA), Dr Dieter Hanhart (Switzerland), and Dr Joseph Neipris (Israel). The board met on 5 July and 7 July, which enabled the work group to meet on 6 July.

was elected for a term of office rather than being appointed to a position, and in addition, the association could not expect to secure a president who would give the amount of time needed; the location should be in a country where there was no problem of language, where worldwide communication was easily available and there were no barriers to free movement for all in and out of the country; accessibility to UN headquarters should not be underestimated since this relationship was essential, with regional cooperation seen as a plus; and additional financial resources must be sought.²²⁰

A Funding Proposal

In November 1974, I wrote at some length in response to a memorandum from Herman Stein about a possible 'joint venture' of the IASSW with the Browndale European Foundation, which would give the IASSW the opportunity to establish a European office with an assistant secretary-general, with the IASSW covering one-third of the share of establishing the office. 'The possibility of tapping European foundations, trusts, or government sources of aid is of the highest significance because the IASSW cannot survive on membership dues only and must not be limited to all its additional support originating in the United States.' A successful partnership could lead to broader support later on by the Browndale International Foundation and related sources as well as its European branch. Board members were asked for our views on the proposal, giving particular attention to the basic idea of a European office and its implications for the future of the IASSW, our preference for a Geneva or Vienna site.²²¹ My response asked obvious questions about the Foundation in question. I knew nothing about the foundation and wondered how many other board members shared my ignorance. Careful critical attention had to be given to the sources of IASSW finances to ensure they were at least congruent with IASSW values and purposes. There was the further issue of what strings would be attached to the funding. I did not see any funding source as appropriately entering into a 'joint' venture with IASSW, except in some loose sense of the word.

The IASSW is, and must continue to be, an autonomous world-wide organisation pursuing difficult professional aims. There seems to me to be considerable dangers in setting up 'a combined office', whatever this might mean beyond cost-sharing in the IASSW office. ...

Any location for the IASSW office obviously has problems for some of its members, and some aspects of its work. If the office shifts to Europe, the tapping of European financial resources is an attractive prospect, but the development towards world-wide funding, apart from membership dues, must proceed at the same time. ... In addition, every effort must be made to emphasise that the IASSW office is the office of a world-wide organisation. If it is thought, rightly or wrongly, elsewhere in the world, that IASSW has become Europe-oriented then its work will not prosper. It needs to be clearly world-oriented; and for this to be reflected as

220 Minutes, IASSW General Assembly of Schools of Social Work, July 6, 1974, Nairobi, Kenya.

221 Memorandum, Herman Stein to executive board, IASSW, 17/10/74.

much as possible in its organisational and funding arrangements. Because of the negative view of Western European industrial nations held by many in the Third World, IASSW will have to be especially sensitive to these matters I am mentioning.

On the choice between Geneva and Vienna as a possible location, in Geneva, near the U.N. may be preferable because this projects a clearer general international image.²²²

More than two-thirds of the members of the IASSW executive board sent 'thoughtful replies' to the Stein memorandum. There was definite interest in the proposal on the part of a majority of board members, but it was clear that more information was needed about the proposal and about Browndale before IASSW was in a position to come to a decision.²²³

International Conference on Social Welfare Every Three Years?

ICSW sought the views of IASSW on a recommendation to hold its conference every three years rather than every two years. This would permit more time for follow-up of recommendations of the previous conference, more time to prepare for the next conference, and would provide better opportunity for regional meetings between conferences. A three year cycle would also reduce travel expenses for individual participants. However, a three-year gap could be too long in rapidly changing social conditions and the need to keep abreast of current developments in social welfare. The growing impact of the ICSW in promoting social welfare would be lessened and its growing reputation as an effective social welfare body would be impaired. A longer cycle could make it difficult to recruit and retain members without the immediate stimulation of a conference. A great deal of revenue would be lost, since funds raised through fees was essential to the life of the organisation. IASSW board members were asked to comment on any aspect of this question, but at least on two points – what would be best for the ICSW? and, assuming that the IASSW would follow the lead of the ICSW, what would be best for the IASSW and its constituency?²²⁴

I responded just before the deadline in mid-January 1975, that my own preference would be for a three-year cycle, provided the change was part of an overall re-organisation of the ICSW's activities.

The proviso is all-important. Not long ago, I was a corresponding member on an ICSW committee which was supposedly reviewing the nature and function of its Conference. As far as I can tell at a distance, this review committee was appointed late, was given little time to work, its convenor was not active in seeking the committee's collective views and then presented mainly his own to the executive, and in any case the ICSW executive apparently did not want this particular review to spill over into looking at the broader issues which it inevitably raised – issues such as: What were the actual objectives of the ICSW? Does the ICSW constitution reflect present objectives? How are these objective operationalised? And then,

222 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr K. Kendall, 18/11/74.

223 Memorandum, Katherine Kendall to IASSW Executive Board, 30/12/74.

224 Memorandum, Katherine Kendall to IASSW Executive Board, 25/10/74.

what part does and should the world-wide Conference play in the achievement of the objectives?

Perhaps since that ineffectual exercise to which I have referred, the ICSW executive itself, helped by necessary staff work, has thought through more carefully the place of the world-wide Conference in its activities, but I doubt it. I see the Conference as ideally fitting into a developing network of ongoing regional and national working groups. Such an ongoing working network is much more likely 'to keep abreast of current developments in social welfare' and to make ICSW genuinely effective in social welfare promotion than a heavy reliance upon the present relatively frequent, large-scale, all-purpose, world-wide Conference, for which most 'members' have not specifically prepared and which tends to measure success in terms of numbers attending and proceedings produced.

A matching three-year cycle for IASSW conferences could also well be justified provided that, again, its world-wide conference is plugged into an ongoing system of regional and national working groups of social work educators.

In brief, then, a three-year cycle for both ICSW and IASSW world-wide conferences could encourage the planning and development of much-needed ongoing regional and national working groups, and make these less frequent world-wide conferences much more significant in terms of their preparation, their membership, and their follow-up. If a three year pattern is adopted without an accompanying stepping up of regional and national, and preparatory and follow-up work, both organisations could suffer along the (negative) lines mentioned in your memorandum.²²⁵

Early Planning for the 1978 IASSW Congress

In mid-October, 1974, Katherine Kendall requested from members of the executive board comments on a suggested plan for the 1978 Israel Congress, drafted by Dr Richard Splane after board discussion of a proposed format for this 50th anniversary occasion.²²⁶ Enclosed was the paper by Maxine Ankrah,²²⁷ 'Social Development Through Social Work Education', presented at the 17th ICSW in Nairobi in July, 1974, as a summary of the 17th IASSW Congress of schools which had immediately preceded it. She said the congress was unique not only because of the venue but because a majority of the participants came from developing countries.

... the direction is clear. The goal set in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, as well as by educators in the developed nations in North America, Europe, and Australia, has been adopted. That goal is an education that commits the profession to social change and human and societal development. A universal consensus on the objective greatly facilitates a determination on means.

I found the proposed plan for the 1978 congress attractive in principle, but the draft would require considerable further work.

²²⁵ Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr Kendall, 24/1/75.

²²⁶ Memorandum, Katharine Kendall to IASSW Executive Board, 17/10/74. See p.115.

²²⁷ Mrs Ankrah was the African regional representative for the IASSW.

Very careful preparatory conceptual work will need to be done, perhaps by the proposed steering committee, to provide adequate guidelines for the committee in each region and the search and discovery papers which presumably will be the responsibility of these committees. Without such guidelines, there will be overlapping and confusion, and the resultant material will not be comparable. Some of the points for clarification would be: Is the focus on knowledge as it has been actually used by social work education in each country? (The sociology of knowledge in each school and each country will indicate particular time-specific patterns of knowledge 'discovery' and use.) Is the focus on knowledge use throughout the course of social work education in each country? (The history of social work education in each country will rarely be a neat 50 years to coincide with IASSW's existence.) Alternatively, is the focus on evaluating the current types and states of knowledge used by social work education in each country, seeing these in a context of their historical development? Is the focus on all 'knowledge' used, including the pervasive North American variety, or rather is the focus on local research, local case studies, etc.? Is 'human values and objectives' a preferable topic rather than 'human needs' because the latter concept is essentially prescriptive anyway? What is to be the definition of 'social welfare' adopted for this project? (My preference would be to include at least all the social service sectors, health, education, income security, housing, etc. Learning about these [their politics; purposes; organisational patterns; manpower, economic and technological resources; and outcomes] is a crucial basic knowledge area in the curriculum in Britain, called social administration, in the U.S., social welfare policy and services. They provide a crucial context for social work practice, whatever the social work roles, and in fact most social work roles are an integral part of such services.) Wouldn't a full delineation of social work intervention roles be usefully related to the different levels and types of social organisations (or social systems)? The knowledge underpinning of each of these roles – the what, the how, and the why – could then be systematically charted.²²⁸

It had been decided to get a reaction to the 1978 Congress proposal from board members and all member associations and schools of social work, before setting up a steering committee, but not many responded perhaps because it was difficult to get people to respond to ideas projected for a congress to be held in 1978. On 28 March, 1975, I was asked to serve on the steering committee.²²⁹ Those committee members who were on the executive board hopefully would be available for a full-day meeting on 3 August, before the board meeting 4–6 August.²³⁰

The Paris Meeting, 1975

The next annual meeting of the IASSW executive board was at the Institute

228 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine Kendall, 24/1/75.

229 The members of the steering committee were Dr Richard Splane (chairman, Canada), Dr Joseph Neipriss (co-chairman, Israel), Dr Mia Berner Oste (Sweden), Dr Solendad A. Florendo (Philippines), Dr Dieter Hanhart (Switzerland), Mr Robin Huws Jones (United Kingdom), Dr John Lawrence (Australia), Dr Virginia C. Little (USA), and Dr Richard Lodge (Council of Social Work Education, New York).

230 Letter, Katherine Kendall to John Lawrence, 28/3/75.

of Social Work in Montrouge, a suburb of Paris, 4-6 August, 1975. I had been on sabbatical leave in the UK from July 1974 to January 1975, and again could not attend partly because of the cost from Australia. When I told Katherine Kendall, she wrote:

I, too, wish that our Executive Board meeting could have been better coordinated with your sabbatical in Britain. However, you do very well indeed in giving advice and good answers through correspondence so we shall count on your participation in the work of the Board and committees in that way.

She asked me about provisional IASSW membership for the new social work course in Tasmania....

With so many schools (6 were now listed as full members),²³¹ isn't it time that all of you organised a national association of schools or council on social work education? When that happens, Australia will have a permanent seat on our Executive Board and we would hope for a permanent item in someone's budget for travel to Board meetings. I am sure that this shining possibility is all you have been waiting for to start a national association!²³²

I wrote to Katherine with information about Australian schools not yet affiliated. She told me, in June, that about 30 people from all regions had already signed up for the Paris meeting, which was more than they had ever had before at a non-congress board meeting. 'We will miss you in Paris. It promises to be an interesting and significant Board meeting'. 'You will hear all about it in due course'. She had met Eva Learner on her way to Australia and would be interested to hear what was happening about a council on social work education in Australia.²³³

At this Paris meeting, the board had to decide whether JUC South Africa had met the conditions specified at Trondheim for maintaining membership in IASSW. President Herman Stein saw three options – 1. Accept the report received as having complied with the conditions and recognise the JUC as a full member in good standing. 2. Reject the report as inadequate and move toward disaffiliation. 3. Accept the report and continue affiliation with the proviso that the board would expect periodic statements of continued progress. The board discussion covered various questions such as the viability of an option that required continuing reporting; the possibility of additional universities opening their doors to non-whites; the feasibility of JUC representation by a non-white on the IASSW board at some future meeting; and increasing participation of non-whites in meetings and events sponsored by the JUC. General comments by board members on the JUC report were favourable. The third option was chosen, with the request that the executive board be informed in 1978 of continued progress. Dr Stein paid tribute to the objective way in which the board had dealt with a highly controversial issue. The board had striven to

231 Schools at Flinders University, University of Queensland, University of New South Wales, University of Western Australia, University of Melbourne, and University of Sydney.

232 Letter, Katherine Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 18/4/75.

233 Letter, Katherine Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 12/6/75. An Australian CSWE never eventuated.

balance fundamental principles and harsh realities.²³⁴

Another major item under discussion at the Paris meeting was IASSW congresses – evaluation of the 1974 congress and evaluation procedures; the 1976 congress; and the 1978 congress. It was concluded that the board needed systematic evaluation measures and to consider congress objectives and the weight to be given to them. The ICSW was no longer able to hold its 1976 Congress in Mexico primarily because of rising costs and inflation, and a decision on an alternative location hopefully in a Spanish-speaking country was being awaited, before any further plans could be made on local arrangements for the IASSW congress. (It was the policy of the ICSW, IASSW, and IFSW to hold their meetings in relation to each other, and preferably in the same place.) The board endorsed as the theme of the IASSW congress ‘Social Realities and the Social Work Response: the Role of Schools of Social Work’, with Dr Paulo Freire as the keynote speaker. Margaret Mathieu ‘sparked considerable debate and renewed consideration of the regional presentations by observing that there is no one reality within a country or within a region’. The board agreed that regional reports would be presented in writing through background papers, and that regional panels should be scheduled concurrently, with participants free to select the region of their choice. There would be no formal adoption of conclusions at the 1976 Congress.

Planning 1978 Congress

Dick Splane reported that he had received ‘thoughtful responses’ from three of us (Florendo, Lawrence and Little) who could not attend the 1978 Congress steering committee meeting which had been held on August 3, 1975, just prior to the board meeting. After the reactions to his initial ‘Draft for Discussion’ document, he had prepared a ‘Next Steps’ document for consideration by committee members. This was a helpful setting down of nine guiding assumptions and a proposed plan of action to implement them.²³⁵ Jo Neipris, the committee’s co-chairman, reported on the results of the steering committee’s discussion at its recent meeting. Since all the papers were to be research based, it was important to notify all members of the subject areas and to recruit speakers and writers as soon as possible. There was consensus that IASSW should not pay persons for preparing papers. However, funding might be necessary for some of the preparatory work involved, and also for bringing speakers to the congress. Funds might be difficult to secure, but some possibilities did exist and should be explored. After board discussion, it was agreed the core program drawn up

234 Minutes, Meeting of IASSW Executive Board, August 4–6, 1975, Montrouge, France. The following three paragraphs are based on these minutes.

235 My response was a substantial letter, John Lawrence to Dr R. B. Splane, 16/7/75. I agreed the steering committee must reach agreement on the guidelines and plans for action and regretted I was still unable to attend the forthcoming meeting in Montrouge. ‘It will be a rare achievement, but one worth aiming for, if the actual Congress itself can be essentially a working occasion with all the participants having read in advance and digested the Congress Papers. The Steering Committee will need to specify clearly, however, to what end the Congress itself, apart from celebrating an anniversary, will be geared.’ My letter concluded with a personal message – ‘I am particularly disappointed, Dick, that we haven’t seen each other since 1970. We must rectify that, but I can’t see how at the moment.’

by the steering committee at its meeting on 3 August should be reproduced and distributed to all board members and members of the steering committee for study and reactions. The results would be forwarded to an expanded steering committee. As soon as definite recommendations were made after this process, a specific program would be agreed upon by the congress program committee by the next board meeting. Invitations could then be sent out to persons to prepare papers for the congress. The chairman and co-chairman would continue in their present positions.

Dr Kendall reported that a majority of IASSW board members had favoured the existing two-year cycle for ICSW and the associated IASSW and IFSW congresses, and the IFSW had reported a similar response. The decision by the ICSW in Nairobi to meet at 3-year intervals was again up for debate, and she hoped a working party of representatives of IASSW, IFSW, and ICSW would explore the question together. The three organisations should work more closely together on plans for the meetings. Dick Splane was an elected member of the ICSW executive committee, and as an IASSW representative, would present this viewpoint to the committee.

By the end of February, 1976, the IASSW secretariat had received only about a dozen reactions from board members to the 1978 program proposals from the steering committee in August, 1975. Katherine Kendall observed, 'This may mean that an event scheduled for 1978 cannot command immediate attention. I hope it does not mean lack of interest in the proposals'. Steering committee members were sent a summary of the responses received.²³⁶ 'We should have a definite plan of action for discussion in Puerto Rico if we are to fulfil the hopes and ambitions that all of us have for the Anniversary Congress'. At a recent meeting of the executive/administrative committee in New York, it was decided not to convert the present steering committee into a large international program committee.²³⁷ Included amongst my responses in the summary was:

IASSW background paper important to cover development of IASSW, sketch of development of schools throughout the world, assess role of international cooperation in development of knowledge base for social work education. This paper should be available by end of '76 to aid those preparing material for workshops.

After a brief meeting of Katherine Kendall, Virginia Little, and Dick Splane in New York, in May, Dick sent to members of the steering committee a memorandum, 'Decisions on the Anniversary Program', which was a synthesis of suggestions received and 'decision sheets'. These covered the decisions to be made at its next meeting in San Juan in July: the congress theme and title; the congress format; the plenaries (location on the program, titles, speakers); the workshops (number, location on the program, titles, speakers); the case for single session workshops to which a separate identification such as 'discovery

236 Respondents mentioned in the summary of replies were: Wee (2), Lawrence (11), Huws Jones (13), Younghusband (10), Vissers (8), Mathieu (2), Hanhart (9), Simon (1), Van Rooyen (1), Matsumoto (1), Little (8), Berner-Oste (2), and Memet (1). The responses were organised under these headings: congress theme, plenary sessions (content, speakers), workshops, glossary, and international dimension.

237 Memorandum, Katherine A. Kendall to Steering Committee, Anniversary Congress, 1978.

groups' might be given; the preparation of background papers; organisational and procedural questions. We were asked to give our comments on each decision sheet, together with thoughts and suggestions. I provided a fairly full set of comments on some of the discussion sheets, very aware that I was again unable to attend the meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico.²³⁸ On the title of the keynote address, I suggested 'Discovery and Change in Social Work Education, 1928-78 and Beyond':

Either Dr Stein or Dr Kendall would cope with this particularly difficult task admirably. (On an occasion such as this, it seems that we want those with the best minds and most relevant experience and knowledge. If that points to the two I have mentioned, then so be it. The fact that they are both North Americans should not exclude them from serious consideration. Both have given distinguished service to social work education internationally, but I understand will by 1978 not be holding office in the IASSW.)

In September, Dr Splane reported many developments since the May memorandum, to which all members of the steering committee had responded. A Vancouver meeting of three of the members, the secretary-general, the president, and two invited participants (Marguerite Mathieu and George Hougham), had considered the matter. Brief progress reports had been given to the executive board and general assembly, with any views or suggestions being welcomed. All participants at the congress were asked five questions in an evaluation sheet about program content and organisation of the congress and major aspects of social work education. Following the San Juan congress, representatives of ICSW, IASSW and IFSW had discussed joint planning in the future, including the international conferences. The steering committee (Hanhart, Huws Jones, Kendall, Lodge, Neipris, and Splane, with Jona Rosenfeld an invited participant) had met three times in San Juan. At the final meeting of the steering committee, Katherine Kendall agreed to present the IASSW Anniversary address. A preliminary program with suggested speakers for the plenary sessions was largely developed at this meeting, and it was decided to enlarge the steering committee. Neipris, Splane and Kendall had since made further changes. The new draft clarified what was meant by 'workshop' and 'discovery group', proposed a program structure, and speakers suggested for plenary sessions. Giving the detail of all of this would be inappropriate, but the way I responded may still be of interest:

For the Congress theme, I prefer just 'Discovery and Development in Social Work Education'. 'Sightings for the Next Half-Century' is perhaps pretentious, and could encourage fantasy. 'Forward from 1978' could elicit the reaction 'Where else can we go?' and also it and the other sub-title seem to indicate that the Congress is primarily focussed on the future. On this latter point, there is expressed succinctly on page 5, number 5, the objective of the Congress - 'to identify and build upon knowledge that has been discovered in a variety of areas of importance to social work education'. For me, that has a 'past', 'present' and 'future' time perspective.

238 Letter, John Lawrence to Dr Richard Splane, 17/6/76, with attached discussion sheets and comments.

Your proposed paper on the IASSW had the same time perspective, and this is entirely appropriate for such an anniversary occasion.

The four plenary session topics seem well chosen. I would hope that the perspectives of the sociology of knowledge and politics of knowledge will be duly considered by those who are to prepare the first three papers. This will ensure that there is proper regard given to the social structures and political processes in which 'knowledge' is discovered, developed, transmitted, or lost.

The allocation of free times on late Wednesday afternoon and Wednesday evening seems desirable. Informal discussion with colleagues is often the most valuable feature of such a congress.

The revised view of Discovery groups (pp. 4-5) which sees them as of the same duration as the Workshops and needing similar leadership arrangements does point in the direction of eliminating them as a separate kind of group. Also it would not be unreasonable to expect participants in all the group occasions to have given some consideration to the group's topic prior to the Congress. I think I would call all the groups Workshops, and have similar arrangements in terms of size, preparation, and leadership for each. In the present proposal of Workshops and Discovery Groups (p. 2, number 13), surely both kinds of groups will be concerned with both the knowledge base and issues of social work education, so I don't see a valid distinction here.

Assuming all groups are Workshops, how do they fit in with each other, with the plenary session topics, and with the purpose of the Congress? There is little apparent coherence in the organisation of the Congress topic and its sub-divisions (see p. 7, number 2.) Inevitably there will be overlaps and gaps in the design of the Congress program, but these should be conscious and easily identifiable.

May I suggest on the basis of the current proposals, just as an example, the sort of plan which would be more apparently coherent?

Congress Theme:

Discovery and Development in Social Work Education

Congress Objective:

To mark the 50th Anniversary of the IASSW by holding a congress which identifies and builds upon the knowledge that has been discovered in a variety of areas of importance to social work education.

Program:

This objective is to be achieved through -

Plenary Sessions, with general papers on

- what constitutes knowledge and how it is discovered and developed;
- the impact on the knowledge base of social work education of knowledge discovered through research;
- the process of knowledge acquisition through teaching and learning in social work education; and
- the IASSW, and

Workshops

Each Workshop is to focus upon past, present and future knowledge in an area of

importance to social work education. Under consideration in areas (1) – (19) will be

- the type and level of knowledge
- its place in the knowledge base of social work education, and
- educational issues in acquiring the relevant knowledge for social work practice.

Workshop Areas

- I. The evaluation of social work practice with
 1. individuals;
 2. groups;
 3. organisations;
 4. communities; and
 5. nation-states
 6. the evaluation of generic social work practice which addresses various types of social systems.
- II. The social and behavioural sciences and the humanities as they relate to:
 7. individuals;
 8. families;
 9. groups;
 10. organisations
 11. communities;
 12. nation-states;
 13. international organisations;
 14. social change;
 15. ethnic groups and minorities;
 16. age groups;
 17. cultural values;
 18. communication;
 19. human biology;

III. Educational institutions and educational process.

Under consideration in areas (20) – (25) will be

- the type and level of knowledge
- its place in the knowledge base of social work education, and
- its effects on educational programs and outcomes
- 20. The auspice, structure, and resources of schools of social work.
- 21. The social work educators.
- 22. The social work students.
- 23. Curriculum planning and implementation.
- 24. The place of field learning in the curriculum.
- 25. Differences in education and in current social work practice.

Each of the above topics refers to ‘an area of importance to social work education’ which may be seen as an area of knowledge and of knowledge development appropriate for the focus of a Workshop. The number is clearly too many, but there are some obvious joint topics which the one Workshop could handle, for example (1) and (7), (2) and (8) and (9), (3) and (10), etc., and (20) and (21) and (24), or (24) and (25).

Don't take all this too seriously if you think it impractical or otherwise not useful, but something like what I have suggested would I think help to give more coherence to the Congress by relating most of its program more carefully to its objective. I think, too, it would help in the preparation of the joint document referred to (p. 7, no.3), if that idea is taken up – although the timing is getting rather tight for such a plan.²³⁹

People would have reasonable opportunity to discuss any issues they wish outside of the context of the Conference theme, on the Thursday morning as well as during the free time scheduled on the Wednesday.

I am sorry I cannot suggest names for Workshop leaders, because I unfortunately have not been in a position to get to know personally many of the people who would be possibilities.²⁴⁰

In July, 1977, Dick Splane hoped that I would find in decisions that had been taken about the anniversary congress 'a significant reflection of the ideas you outlined in your helpful and creative letters'. My proposal for a national document 'prepared and organised in accordance with the main workshop topics and guidelines provided by the Congress Programme Committee' had not been accepted. Dick had seen merit in the proposal, but 'Those opposing the idea referred to the history of such endeavours in the past, noting that the quality of such reports was very uneven, that when they were well prepared it was at great effort, that they were seldom well utilised and that this neglect produced understandable resentment.' He did not expect there would be support at the forthcoming meeting in Vienna for the type of national report both of us had had in mind.

A possible revival of the idea was to have national and regional reports focussed on research and its use in social work education in their area. This could be published in a supplementary volume to the congress proceedings. If this idea was endorsed in Vienna, would I be prepared to produce or assume responsibility for producing the Australian report? 'Edna Chamberlain and others have referred to the leadership you have provided to research and social work education and you would appear to be the person best able to take on this task'. There would be no financial help from the IASSW. They hoped a report might be available by May 1978 – in the three official languages of the IASSW. It would be as brief as possible, and provide bibliographies and other references for elaboration and follow-up. Topic headings were suggested.²⁴¹

I thought the idea worth serious consideration, but the preparation time had now become very short:

I am afraid because of my present commitments and a possibility that from

239 I had proposed that 'once a coherent program of workshops has been settled, perhaps the schools of social work in each country, through their national association, if they have one, or through a respected convenor, can be asked to prepare a joint document in advance of the Congress. This document could be prepared and organised in accordance with the main workshop topics and sub-topics and guidelines provided by the Congress Program Committee. If these documents were prepared sufficiently ahead of the Congress, then contents could be digested and used by the workshop (and discovery group) leaders. They could also be invaluable for those preparing plenary session papers.'

240 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr Katherine Kendall, 13/9/76.

241 Letter, R. B. Splane to R. J. Lawrence, 26/7/77.

September I will have the onerous job of President of the Australian Council of Social Service, I cannot undertake to be responsible for this report on research, if it is decided to go ahead with it.

If the idea is being pursued, I certainly think Australia should try to produce something and I would certainly be willing to assist, but I cannot accept the main responsibility. I would recommend that you ask Edna Chamberlain. I know she too is extremely busy, but she may be willing to act perhaps as a coordinator for compiling something.²⁴²

The proposal that there be national or regional reports on the utilisation of research in social work education was not, in fact, approved by the program committee meeting in Vienna. Dick Splane reported, however, that good progress had been made on the anniversary congress program at the meetings of the committee and the executive board. He hoped I would respond favourably to the proposal I would chair the sectional meeting on the impact of research on teaching social work practice with individuals and groups:

Much of the success of the Congress will depend on the quality of the Chairmanship of the four sectional meetings. I am well aware that a good case could be made for chairing the section on research and macro practice. However, we thought it would be good for someone with your type of background to guide the discussions in micro practice, the area in which the amount of research is probably greater than in the other three areas combined. ...

It is clear we take it for granted that you will be attending the conferences in Israel. It will be good to see you again. An incredible eight years will have passed since we became instant friends in Manila.²⁴³

The outline of the preliminary congress program indicated that after the keynote address by David Donnison on 'Discovery and Development of Knowledge', the second day would be devoted to 'Basic and Core Content in Social Work Education'. The day would open with a plenary session of two papers, with commentators. One paper would come from the West (Frank Loewenburg) the other from the Third World (speaker not yet finalised, although Angeline Almanzor had been approached). Concurrent sectional meetings occupied the rest of the day, with each section being examined by an international panel and subsequently by small discussion groups organised by language. A basic paper or papers on each subject area would be made available within each section to persons registered in advance for that section. Two sections focused on the knowledge base and impact of research in preparation for micro-level practice, and for macro-level practice; a third section on assessment of teaching effectiveness and the impact of research; and the fourth on the contribution of social work and social work education to social development, nationally and internationally.

I accepted the invitation to chair the sectional meeting on research and micro practice, but was transferred to chair the macro practice meeting which was more appropriate to my teaching responsibilities. When Helga Nowotny,

242 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr R. B. Splane, 11/8/77.

243 Letter, Dick Splane to John Lawrence, 1/12/77.

head of the European research and training centre, subsequently had to withdraw from doing the paper for this section, I was asked if I would do it instead. I had to decline, however, because of other commitments.

Tribute to Herman Stein

Before Herman Stein's IASSW presidency (1968-76) ended with the Puerto Rican congress, Katherine Kendall invited colleagues to send letters for inclusion in a farewell scrapbook. Katherine wrote about him:

Herman has excelled as an organizer and planner and in his ability to conduct meetings. No problem is too difficult and no material too complicated to yield to his powers of analysis and synthesis. While he has brought all of his executive and administrative skills to bear on his work with the IASSW, he has never forgotten that he is an educator and a scholar and that the job of the Association is to improve the quality of social work education.

As head of a school of social work and member of the executive board, I wrote a letter of appreciation to him:

Although few of us in our part of the world have been able to be actively involved in the IASSW, it has been a continuing source of confidence to know that a person of your wisdom and competence was at its helm.

I wish to express my deeply-felt gratitude, not only personally, but on behalf of my Australian colleagues, for your work in maintaining and extending the cause of social work education throughout the world. Only a person of the rarest gifts and commitment could hope to provide effective cross-cultural leadership necessary for international social work activities. Thank you for providing such leadership and not confining the application of your talents to more local, and more manageable affairs.²⁴⁴

Re-election to Executive Board

In June 1976, I was asked by Marguerite Mathieu, chairman of the nomination committee, to accept renomination as an executive board member for a further two years from July 1977 to the summer board meeting in 1979. Katherine Kendall wrote:

We both recognized that you may demur because you have not been able to participate personally in the Board meetings. However, your contributions and advice by correspondence have been so helpful that we urge you to stay with us a little longer. ... We certainly want you to be with us at the 50th Anniversary Congress in Israel and for that occasion it might be possible for you or for us on your behalf to obtain a travel grant to ensure your attendance.

At any rate, do stay on the Board until 1979 as this is going to be a difficult period for the IASSW and we shall need all the wisdom we can tap in making plans for an uncertain future.²⁴⁵

244 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr Herman Stein, 8/9/76 .

245 Letter, Katherine Kendall to Dr R. J. Lawrence, 16/6/76.

In my reply, I stated it was obviously unsatisfactory and certainly frustrating not being able to participate personally in the Board meetings. I was willing, however, to continue to make whatever contribution I could. I hoped that I might be able at least to attend the 50th Anniversary congress in Israel.²⁴⁶

In October 1976, Katherine wrote confirming my re-election as an executive board member. I would receive information about the IASSW meetings to be held in New York and Vienna in 1977. They particularly hoped I could attend the Vienna meeting next August. 'We face challenging problems in the years just ahead and will need your help in finding solutions.'

We have been deeply impressed by the excellent contributions you have made to our work through your thoughtful written responses to questions and issues. We know we would have benefitted greatly from your presence at Board meetings but since this has not been possible, your letters have been a wonderful substitute.

Katherine recognised I may not be able to attend the Vienna meeting, but 'we must make a special effort to bring you to the 50th Anniversary Congress in Israel.' Did I know of any foundations outside Australia which had funded Australians for attendance at international meetings? She would be glad to turn me into a project if I would furnish the ideas and possible sources of support. To date, however, she had received praise but no money as a result of her fund-raising efforts! 'Nevertheless, do let us see what we can do'.

All of us here send you our very best wishes and, on behalf of President Robin Huws Jones and your fellow Board members, our very special thanks for your willingness to accept another term on the Executive Board.²⁴⁷

1976 World Congress

The congress in Puerto Rico, 13–17 July, 1976, had the theme suggested by the Latin American Association of Schools of Social Work, 'Social Realities and the Social Work Response – the Role of Schools of Social Work', with a focus on the educational response to priority needs in countries and geographical regions. Reports were received from Africa, Asia, the English-speaking Caribbean, Europe, Latin America, North America, and Puerto Rico. The work of the congress was carried on in plenary and regional sessions, with the greater part of the time devoted to discussion in small groups. Proceedings opened with a world view of social realities as seen by Dr Eugen Pusic of Yugoslavia. (Dr Paulo Friere was unavailable.) Dr Jona Rosenfeld of Israel, in the second plenary session, made a presentation on the universal and particular in social work education, with commentaries from educators from Zambia, Ecuador, and the Philippines. In the final plenary, the outgoing IASSW president Dr Herman Stein outlined the realities that faced social work education as the profession reached for its proper place in the social, economic and political

246 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine A. Kendall, 28/6/76.

247 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall to R. J. Lawrence, 27/10/76.

environment to which it must respond.²⁴⁸ As previously, the congress was open to everyone engaged in social work education. In addition persons involved in training not directly related to the schools and interested in questions of social welfare manpower and training were also invited. The congress facilities were reported to be excellent – in the new Hyatt Convention Center.

New York Meeting, February 1977²⁴⁹

My good friend and colleague, Professor Edna Chamberlain from the University of Queensland, represented me at the meeting of the executive/administrative committee of the IASSW in New York 23–4 February, 1977. I noted with approval that Jo Neipriss reported that every effort was being made to keep all the activity of the 50th anniversary congress in Israel on the campus of Hebrew University. ‘This will be more advantageous than the use of luxury hotels and more in keeping with the image of the IASSW as an educational body’. The congress would be 14–18 August, a week earlier than originally scheduled because the ICSW would now begin on August 20. The anniversary banquet would be in the Knesset, the parliamentary building. Katherine Kendall had just visited Israel. All the Israeli schools were represented on the organising committee. The Paul Baerwald school, where much of the work of the congress would take place, had a beautiful building. The auditorium of Hebrew University, where the plenary sessions would be held, was across the street and was equipped for simultaneous translation. Participants should arrive at Tel Aviv Airport, not Jerusalem. I noticed that ‘Discovery and Development in Social Work Education’ (with no sub-title) was to be the theme of the congress, which was my expressed preference.

The committee had extensive discussion on the future of the IASSW secretariat, assisted by a chart outlining proposals for its relocation in Austria, Belgium, and Canada, and a summary of board responses to information circulated to all board members. There were no proposals from third world countries despite efforts by board members in the Philippines, India, and Kenya, to obtain offers of support. Various criteria for an appropriate location had been agreed upon at the Puerto Rican board meeting. Robin Huws Jones summarised these as freedom of communication, accessibility, sufficient income to ensure a paid secretary-general and a minimum headquarters staff, political neutrality with all nationalities welcome, and recognition of or concern with social work education. Marguerite Mathieu, an elected board member, presented a proposal of a cooperative arrangement with the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work, but it lacked funding and would not establish an independent secretariat. The other two proposals, however, were seen as potentially viable, serious contenders. Pierre Rozen, secretary of the Inter-University European Institute of Social Welfare, located in Marcinelle,

248 *Social Realities and the Social Work Response: The Role of Schools of Social Work*, Proceedings of the XVIIIth International Congress of Schools of Social Work, Puerto Rico, July 13–17, 1976, IASSW, New York, 1977.

249 The following paragraphs are based on the Minutes, Meeting of the IASSW Executive/Administrative Committee, 23–24 February, 1977, New York.

Belgium, presented the Belgium proposal. Dr Maria Simon, who represented the Austrian National Association of Schools of Social Work on the IASSW board, presented the Austrian proposal.

Dr Simon brought a communication from the Ministry of Education which expressed the interest of the Austrian government in the location of the IASSW secretariat in Vienna. 'The statement contained a formal invitation to the IASSW to relocate, affirming that the work of the IASSW would be a valuable complement to the work of the European Centre for Social Welfare Training and Research. It was noted further that a number of social service organisations were now considering the possibility of relocating their headquarters in Vienna.

(Dr Simon) explained that Vienna is interested in becoming an international city. Several United Nations units will be moving to Vienna in 1978. Of special interest to the social welfare field is the fact that the Centre for Humanitarian and Social Affairs of the United Nations with all of its social welfare activities will move from New York to Vienna. The Division of Social Affairs of the U. N. office in Geneva will also move to Vienna and the ICSW has recently expressed interest in relocating there. The convergence of so many key social welfare organizations, together with the fact that the European Centre for Social Welfare Training and Research is already located in Vienna, should make Austria a particularly hospitable place for international social welfare and social work activities.

With respect to the stability of the financing, ... budgets are developed annually and there is no guarantee that subsidies or other allocations will continue indefinitely.

It would be a definite advantage to have a Secretary-General who could speak German as this would facilitate relationships with various government officials, etc. as well as making it easier to live in Vienna.

The minutes of the meeting traversed the many hours of discussion that ensued after the presentations. Careful comparison of the pros and cons of each location did not result in a decision and it was agreed that a final decision should be taken at the next meeting of the full executive board, after further clarification on a number of issues: the extent of the differences in financial support, could funds be allocated for program activities in developing countries, the strength and duration of the financial support, and to what extent could staff be recruited from outside the country? The Vienna board meeting was now 24-26 August, extended by a day to give time for further discussion.

The Changing International Social Welfare Climate

In April 1977, the secretary-general of the UN Economic and Social Council circulated a statement he had received from the ICSW, the IASSW, and the IFSW, organisations which had consultative status with the Council. This strongly supported a recent resolution adopted by the Commission on Social Development which called for an expert study on the operational effectiveness of the social development activities within the United Nations. 'Our organisations are deeply concerned with what we see as a lessening emphasis on

“social development” while great emphasis has been placed in recent years on “economic development”. ... We have seen a continued decline in support of the social development programs of the United Nations and a resulting decline in the “operational effectiveness” of the social development structure.

Vienna Board Meeting, August 1977²⁵⁰

With the relocation of the IASSW secretariat the most significant item on the agenda, there was excellent attendance at the next executive board meeting in Vienna. A new agenda item was a letter from the Association for Social Work Education in Africa (ASWEA) indicating it would be difficult or impossible for its member schools to participate in the anniversary congress if it was to be held in Israel. The matter had been previously discussed at length in San Juan by all three of the international social welfare bodies and they had overwhelmingly supported holding the congress in Israel.

The board reaffirmed its earlier decision. Dr Neipriss indicated efforts were being made to find financial support for African colleagues who might wish to attend the congress. Dr David Macarov, with the assistance of the IASSW secretariat, would be organising an exhibit at the congress which would concentrate on the 50 years of the IASSW.

Several board members questioned the adequacy of the dues scale for IASSW membership which still related to the per capita GNP in 1970. The Scandinavian regional committee had voluntarily raised its members' IASSW dues from \$75 to \$100, but a general increase was obviously needed. The treasurer was now to chair a committee to review the fee structure, both for organisations and individual associates. Only 34 of almost 500 schools were in arrears under the existing structure.

Schools in exceptional circumstances could have their fees temporarily waived. The number of individual associates since the inception of the program in 1973 had totalled 1,194. As of June 1977, there were 780. Associates were recruited primarily in connection with the biennial congress because of a reduced fee and a considerable loss could be anticipated after the first membership year transpired unless interest developed in the on-going work of the IASSW. Katherine Kendall suggested possible informal get-togethers of IASSW associates at the time of national meetings of educators. Individual associate numbers would make this a possibility in Australia (14), Brazil (10), Canada (42), Hong Kong (18), India (13), Israel (15), Puerto Rico (44), South Africa (33), Scandinavia (21), Switzerland (15), United Kingdom (13), and the United States (333).

A decision was finally reached on the future location of the IASSW secretariat after further wide-ranging up-dated consideration in the board on the respective merits of the Austrian and Belgium locations. In a closed ballot of board members entitled to vote, a clear majority favoured Vienna, to take effect in September or October 1978. According to the minutes taken by Katherine Kendall,

250 The following paragraphs are based on Minutes, Meetings of IASSW Executive Board, August 23-26, 1977, Vienna, Austria.

The decisive factor in the end appeared to be the emergence of Vienna as the new international center for social welfare activities. The transfer of all United Nations social welfare activities from New York and Geneva to United Nations City in Vienna in 1979 and the discussions underway with respect to the relocation of the International Council on Social Welfare, International Social Service, etc., all seemed to point in favour of Vienna because of the desirability of a close relationship to United Nations and related activities. The potential influence of the United Nations Regional Centre for Training and Research in Social Welfare on developments in social work education in Europe seemed to be of special importance to the IASSW which could cooperate more fruitfully with the Centre if both are located in the same city.²⁵¹

It was agreed that knowledge of German would be highly desirable for a new secretary-general, but it was not essential as English was in common use. Since English was the language of communication for the IASSW, this could prove a limiting factor in the recruitment of a new secretary-general.

Regional program reports at the board meeting indicated worrying developments for social work education in Europe. Some board members viewed current developments in Europe as a crisis in social work education. Others saw the situation as serious, but part of a long continuing process of continuing growth, now entering a new stage. As schools moved into the universities, many qualified and experienced social work educators without university degrees were being replaced by other social scientists with inappropriate teaching responsibility. German schools were at the university level, but as technical schools. There were several university chairs in social work for advanced programs, but occupants of the chairs were not social workers. Universities were preparing to offer degrees in social work, but had little knowledge of what was to be taught and did not recruit social workers for faculty positions. In Switzerland neither the universities nor the schools were moving in the direction of university education for social work. The Swiss schools wanted to settle at the level of technical high schools. In Austria, schools were on the same level as teachers' colleges. University courses had been discussed, but the schools preferred to stay out of the university system. They were under the Ministry of Education and all had the same curriculum, which was now too short. And so on. The Council of Europe had several times initiated and then dropped social work education projects which involved equivalence of qualifications in the region. Dr Heinrich Schiller, who represented the German association of schools on the board, had been involved with the IFSW who was working with the European Economic Community on the subject. He commented to the board that the problem was 'so large, so complicated, and with so much diversity of training patterns that comparable qualifications can hardly be seen as a realistic goal'. The board considered proposals for IASSW action on European concerns and Dr Hanhart, coordinator of the European Committee of the IASSW, agreed to bring together a European group to propose a plan of action.

251 Dr Helga Nowotny, executive director of this centre, and Dr Frank Pavlin, a visiting researcher at the centre from the University of Queensland, attended the board meeting as guests.

The board did not receive a report from ALAESS, the Latin American regional group. However, the president Robin Huws Jones called attention to 'a grossly unfair attack' on the IASSW in the first issue of a new journal, issued by the Latin American regional centre for training and research in social welfare, which was 'an outgrowth of ALAESS and closely related to it'. (Board action to deal with this became unnecessary after ALAESS elected a new president, Dr Seno Cornely of Brazil, and a new board, at the same time as the IASSW board meeting.)

A New Secretary-General

In the eventually of Katherine Kendall retiring in 1976, a statement of the functions of the IASSW and the qualifications for the secretary-general was approved at the Montrouge executive board meeting in 1975. IASSW was described as the international professional membership organisation and spokesman for social work education. While its activities were governed to a considerable extent by the availability of resources, its minimum administrative and program functions included: holding of annual meetings of the executive board, organisation of biennial world congresses, action on membership applications, representation of the interests of social work education through consultative status with the United Nations, UNICEF, UNESCO, Council of Europe and Organisation of American States, and maintenance of cooperative relationships with regional associations of social work education, the ICSW, the IFSW, and other appropriate non-governmental organisations.

Over a period of years, these basic functions have been extended through the cooperation of member schools and regional associations, and through the service of volunteers to incorporate seminar and workshop activities, educational consultation, investigations into special problems, and production of reports and other materials.

Special funding from 1971 to 1977 had resulted in providing data on schools around the world, a quarterly newsletter, inauguration of individual associates, regional consultation to member schools on curriculum development and faculty training, expert group meetings and regional seminars, production of teaching materials, publication of proceedings and reports, consultations on new educational programs, more active work with other organisations, and an international documentation centre. Various suggested future activities were referred to.

The statement on the duties and qualifications of a secretary-general was clearly ambitious, and yet it generally reflected capacities and attributes which had already been demonstrated by Katherine Kendall.

The Secretary-General of the IASSW should have the capacity to stimulate strong leadership from within the organisation through effective working relationships with officers, Executive Board members, and volunteers. This leadership will include the ability to work successfully under varying circumstances with a wide range of people with differing values and points of view, a breadth of mind, and a flexibility of approach that meets the interests and needs of diverse social and cultural conditions.

Proven administrative ability is clearly a prerequisite, and the Secretary-General should ideally have had experience in maintaining contact comfortably with operations which are widely scattered geographically. Highly desirable would be a talent for public relations and for locating financial resources and making them available for programme activities. The Secretary-General must enjoy working with people, have a command of at least one official international language in addition to English, have excellent verbal and written communication ability, and be free to travel extensively. Useful attributes would be a sense of humour and an optimistic outlook on life.

Through professional education and career experience, the Secretary-General would be expected to have a broad and deep knowledge of social work education which should be combined with an understanding of both its universal characteristics and the extent to which individual programmes may be forged by the political, social, economic, and cultural forces at work within any particular geographical area. Familiarity with other fields and capacity for interdisciplinary cooperation would be highly desirable.

In March 1977, this material on IASSW functions and its secretary-general was sent to all of its members by a search committee appointed by the IASSW president,²⁵² asking for nominations of names for the position. The expected salary would be at about the level of a dean or director of a school of social work in a developed country.²⁵³ By the time of the Vienna meeting in August, all but four candidates had been eliminated from the final stage of the selection process. These would now be interviewed by members of the committee. The committee unanimously recommended that the position be offered to Miss Marguerite Mathieu, executive director of the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work. In February, 1978, the board was notified by the president that Marguerite Mathieu had just accepted the position. Robin Huws Jones believed her appointment would win universal approval and pleasure. She had had much relevant experience as a social work educator, as executive director of a vigorous national association of schools in a country with a tradition of international cooperation, and as a member of the executive board and an office-bearer of the IASSW.

At Board meetings and in Committees we quickly came to appreciate her good judgment, her combination of candour and diplomatic skill, and her steadfast commitment to the principles that international social work and social work education stand for. Her command of English and French and her working knowledge of Spanish are enviable assets. Her sense of humour seems to me an added bonus!²⁵⁴

The IASSW could now go to its 50th anniversary congress in Jerusalem, with the major decisions taken on its future location and its new secretary-general, after a long, anxious process which had taken up a lot of time and energy.

252 This consisted of the officers of the IASSW, who represented different parts of the world.

253 Letter, Dr Ake Elmer, chairman, IASSW search committee, to regional and national organisations, members schools, and members of the board, 1/3/77. Enclosed was the statement on the IASSW and the secretary-general.

254 Letter, R. Huws Jones to board of directors, 3/2/78.

Clearly IASSW was entering a new phase of its existence.

Tribute to Katherine Kendall

In response to a request from Robin Huws Jones, I sent a letter of deep appreciation for Katherine Kendall to be incorporated in an album which would be among the gifts presented to her at the anniversary banquet in Jerusalem.

In paying tribute to one of your colleagues, you once wrote, 'one answer to doubt and uncertainty about the relevance of social work in an age of discontent is to live the values we have so long professed'. You have succeeded in living these values in the frequently troubled international context, demonstrating their relevance to people of many nations.

As a geographically distant member of the Executive Board of the IASSW, I have had special admiration of the quality of your written contributions – your memoranda, reports and letters. Contact had always been constructive and encouraging.

I have a very clear memory of your visit to my School with Mildred Sikemma in 1970, and your positive comments about our program, despite our poor accommodation which you assured me was not uncommon circumstances for a school of social work.

Your 'Dream or Nightmare' Younghusband Lecture was an especially wise and balanced assessment at a turbulent and painful time.

There are countless ways in which you have served your fellow human beings. Your influence will continue through those who have learned from your example, through the further development of the IASSW, and through the wisdom you have distilled on paper. Selfishly I hope your retirement will free you to write your memoirs.

With warmest best wishes and gratitude.²⁵⁵

²⁵⁵ Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Dr Katherine Kendall, 26/4/78.

Chapter 9

ICSW 50th Anniversary Monograph

In mid-October 1977, I received a letter from Professor John Turner of the School of Social Work of the University of North Carolina, USA, inviting me to prepare an article for a monograph around the general theme 'Human Well-Being – the Next 50 Years: Social, Economic and Political Action'. This would be published by ICSW as part of its 50th anniversary program. An international committee²⁵⁶ had been given the task of selecting a dozen creative, thoughtful and knowledgeable persons to address this theme. A number of sub-themes had emerged in the committee's deliberations.

1. The inter-relationship of the well-being of urban and rural populations – implications.
2. Poor, middle and rich income countries and their inter-relationships.
3. Economic development and social justice.
4. Social development and human services.
5. Human rights and human development.

Each writer would, however, address the theme from a perspective of the writer's choice.

The concluding paragraph of the History of ICSW states 'The need for a strong, vital, international organisation to represent the welfare of people everywhere has never been greater'. The need for fresh, tough-minded and creative assessment of where policy and effort should take us in the future has never been greater, and maybe, the opportunity for progress has never been greater. The monograph is one important way such assessment can be set forth.²⁵⁷

The invitation placed me, and I was sure at least some of the other contributors, in a considerable dilemma. We were being given only until the end of the year to submit our article, a hopeless timetable if the task were to be seriously addressed. Although it might not be realised in the northern hemisphere,

256 It consisted of 14 people – from Ghana, Hong Kong, Costa Rica, Brazil, Kenya, France, Japan, Germany, Canada, Yugoslavia, USA (2), and Israel, and ICSW secretary-general Katzki.

257 Letter, John Turner to R. J. Lawrence, 26/9/77.

from mid-October to mid-December was a peak period for senior academic administrators when the academic year runs through the calendar year. Perhaps the responsible thing to do would have been to reject the invitation, but I did not – because an alternative contributor would have had even less time for preparation, I hoped some extension of the deadline might be possible, and I was attracted by the challenge of the topic. On 19 December, I wrote to John Turner:

I am about to go on leave with my family and will be returning to work on 9th January. Although I have tried to fit in some preparation for the article amongst other responsibilities over the past two months, I am still in the early stages. On present indications, I will need at least until the end of January to prepare the article. If this is unacceptable, I would appreciate knowing immediately so that I may gracefully withdraw from the list of contributors.

One hope that I would have for the future is that planning by the ICSW would be more long term and reasonable than has been the case with this proposed monograph.

My own contribution will perhaps take the form of a discussion of the general topic 'Human Well-Being and Human Rights in the Years Ahead'. All three concepts 'human well-being', 'human rights' and 'the years ahead' are likely to be discussed, taking care to distinguish factual and normative aspects. The underlying theme may well be whether or not morality as analysed in the article, is likely to be extended in the years ahead, and how our social, economic and political arrangements can become more moral. Issues of cultural relativity versus universal standards, will necessarily be considered. One of the dimensions will be a consideration of whether so-called social welfare arrangements, on analysis in particular instances, actually extend morality or in fact limit it.

I hope these comments are of assistance. I will certainly try to get the article to you as soon as I can.²⁵⁸

I was not alone in being granted a necessary extension, but this did not delay the eventual printing of the monograph *Human Well-Being: The Challenge of Continuity and Change*, in time for distribution in English and French to all participants of the 19th International Conference on Social Welfare in Jerusalem.²⁵⁹ Kate Kastki, ICSW secretary-general, wrote on 19 July, on behalf of the monograph committee and its coordinator, to express their deep appreciation for my paper. ICSW was producing 'a document of which it could be justly proud and which does honour to its Fiftieth Anniversary'.²⁶⁰

In his preface, John Turner described the monograph as:

... a highly stimulating exploration of the common yearnings of all people to use the instrumentalities of government and voluntary effort to remove unnecessary physical and social hardships from the lives of the masses, and to extend dignity

258 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to John Turner, 19/12/77.

259 *Human Well-Being; The Challenge of Continuity and Change*, 50th Anniversary Publication, Paris 1928 – Jerusalem 1978, Conference Organising Committee, Jerusalem, for ICSW, New York, 1978.

260 Letter, Kate Katski to R. John Lawrence, 19/7/78. \$200 was sent to each contributor 'for expenses incurred', but not as an honorarium.

and social security to all of a nation's citizens within the limits of knowledge and resources.

... the authors of these papers, without a common framework for use in their preparation have explicitly and implicitly called for the rejection of governmental policies whereby the 'have-nots' are treated as misfits; policies which too often blame or punish them for their plight; policies which call for administering to the poor but not relinquishing them from their poverty; policies which use resources to care for but which are not shared with people on a pro-redistributive basis. The counterside of their rejection is an appeal to transfer the social welfare business or enterprise from a residual orientation into a human investment and development framework.

While the ideas may not be new, the collection of these voices represents a strident crescendo of the humane spirit. They require being listened to. Marked with reason and historical perspective they represent a comparative picture on the international level of the direction in which social welfare must travel in the immediate future. ...

ICSW president, Lucien Mehl,²⁶¹ provided a thoughtful introduction to the monograph which ranged over and tied together the ideas and comments of the various authors, and made its own judgements. It ended with:

... the coming of a society which is more free and more just will not be the result of a joyous, spontaneous generation. What is needed is much know-how, method, preparation, and organization; and even more lucidity and tenacity.

The topics and authors of the articles in the monograph were:

- Well-Being as Envisioned by the African Woman: Yesterday's Memories, Today's Hopes, Tomorrow's Realities
Marie Catherine Azizet Fall Ndiaye (vice-president, ICSW (Africa))
- Social Welfare and the Disparity of Sociological Relations between Men and Women
Maurice Champagne Gilbert (French Canadian, formerly director of human rights body, Quebec)
- Facing the New Era: A Plea for a New Approach to Human Well-Being
Sugata Dasgupta (Dept of Social Work, University of Queensland)²⁶²
- The Dilemma of Service versus Income Transfers in the Process of Social Development
Abram Doron (Assistant director, Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Hebrew University, Jerusalem)
- The Urban Bias in Developing Countries and its Implications
K. E. de Graft-Johnson (professor of sociology, University of Ghana)
- Human Well-Being and Human Rights

261 Born in 1918, he had degrees in philosophy and law from the University of Paris, and a diploma of advanced studies in political economy from the National School of Administration. He was 'conseiller d'état' in France and director of external training at the National School of Administration.

262 Director, Ghandi institute of studies in Varnasi, in his native India, and later head of institute of social change in Calcutta, India, he was well known for his advocacy of a 'no poverty society'. I shared many of his concerns, but thought his writing lacked rigour.

- R. John Lawrence* (head, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, Sydney)
- The British Welfare State and its International Context
Robert A. B. Leaper (professor of social administration, Dept of Sociology, University of Exeter, United Kingdom)
 - New Developments in Japan's Social Welfare Policy
Yuichi Nakamura (professor, Japan School of Social Work, Tokyo)
 - Towards World Welfare
Eugen Pusic (professor, University of Zagreb, Yugoslavia)
 - Population Growth, Age Structure, and Wealth
Dieter Schafer (professor of social policy, University of Trier, Federal Republic of Germany)
 - Toward Freedom from Economic and Social Deprivation
Elisabeth Wickenden (consultant on social policy, New York)

My contribution was as follows:

Human Well-Being and Human Rights

Human rights is an important contemporary topic, one that is apparently related to human well-being throughout the world, and its importance in the next half century is likely to increase not diminish.

Reflecting reaction to the horrors of Nazism, fascism, racialism, attacks on nation states, and a total war which cost the lives of 50 million people, the Charter of the United Nations (1945) states:

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small ... have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

International developments since then have included: the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948); the International Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and on Civil and Political Rights (1966); various other more specialised UN human rights conventions; a number of regional conventions on human rights; the committees, commissions, and courts associated with these various international instruments (See, for example, A. H. Robertson, *Human Rights in the World*, Manchester University Press, 1972; United Nations *Yearbook on Human Rights*, New York, United Nations, 1946 – present.); the UN sponsored Human Rights Year in 1968; the 14th ICSW Conference on 'Social Welfare and Human Rights' (International Council on Social Welfare, *Social Welfare and Human Rights* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1969.); a number of other international conferences focused on human rights including the recent thirty-five nation conference in Belgrade; the activities of nongovernment organisations like Amnesty International; a current United States President with an active human rights policy in international affairs.

At the level of the nation-state, over two-thirds of the world's nations now have bills of rights, and others have seriously considered the need for such bills. (For example, in 1973 the Australian Attorney General introduced an abortive Human

Rights bill into the Australian Parliament. At the time, he referred to 108 of the 147 independent countries of the world as having bills of rights.) With a threefold increase in the number of nation-states since 1945, largely through the process of decolonisation, it has been a period of extensive nation building in which bills of rights have played a significant part, at least at the symbolic level. (Ivo D. Duchacek, *Rights and Liberties in the World Today: Constitutional Promise and Reality*, Santa Barbara, California, ABC-Clio Press, 1973.)

Within nations and across nations, various groups of people have asserted their 'human right' to particular freedoms or kinds of treatment. Drawing up charters of rights for one group after another has become a popular modern political practice.

Yet despite all this activity, systematic, multidisciplinary, comparative study of human rights is in its infancy (see Richard P. Claude, ed, *Comparative Human Rights*, Baltimore, Maryland, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), and while this continues to be the case the connections between what are called human rights and actual human well-being in any particular society will remain uncertain, and primarily matters of faith.

The concept of human rights is complicated and confusing, at least partly because the human condition is also complicated and confusing and is variously defined and valued. However, analysed carefully and taken seriously for both empirical and prescriptive studies, it can be a useful focus in a consideration of future human well-being. It is a widely used contemporary concept. It is generally positively valued. It points to a need for legitimacy in social behaviour. It makes us be explicit about the different rules and rule systems we live under and whose purposes they are furthering. It emphasises human beings' capacity to choose their courses of conduct and the need to justify these. And finally, it helps us to be aware of the moral claims of our fellow human beings.

To talk about a person having a right is meaningless unless there is a correlative duty *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 the context of rules and correlative duties. Duties are obligations to act in specified ways.

As human beings have become aware of other societies and other ways of doing things, and as their own rules cease to be satisfying in changed circumstances, they have become increasingly conscious of the particular rules they live under. The rules no longer are seen as part of the natural order but are seen as essentially man-made. As such they require justification and can be altered by human decision.

Over a period of time for any one person or group of persons, it is theoretically possible to discover the actual rules through which they live their lives, and rights and duties associated with these rules. The resultant profile is likely to contain at least four different kinds of rules: traditional rules or conventions, legal rules, religious rules and genuinely moral rules. (S. I. Benn and R. S. Peters, *Social Principles and the Democratic State*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1959, chapter 1.) One discovers what sort of rule it is for the person or the group, often not from content, but from the way the rule is seen to originate and be maintained (*Ibid.*)

Informative though this profile of actual rule-following behaviour may be, it will give us little understanding of the well-being of the person or group unless we know their value systems and the outcomes of their rule-following, and the relevance of

their rules to their real life circumstances. Only in the case of genuinely moral rules, and the rights and duties arising from these, will thought be given to the interests of the person or group, balancing these with the claims of the other people involved in their situation. (Ibid.)

It is a lawyer's or politician's mistake to think that rights exist only when they are legally recognised. Rights exist wherever there are recognised rules, whatever form the rules may take. There are obvious advantages, however, especially in a complicated modern state, to have many matters regulated by and enforced by law. Law attempts to standardise rules across a society. Other rule systems are often much less comprehensive in their scope and apply only to particular population subgroups.

A person's or group's actual rights and duties are often not clear because human rules are frequently vaguely stated if they are stated at all; they can go untested for long periods; they can be variously interpreted; and people have multiple group affiliations. Further, if a person or group has a recognised right to do something but does not know about it, should this be included in the person or group's normative profile? Or again, if the person or group does not actually exercise a right because they do not agree with it, or do not wish to spend the necessary time or use up scarce resources, should this be included in the profile?

In brief, then: talk about particular rights in the absence of recognised duties to give effect to these rights is badly misleading; there are many different rights and duties arising from the actual rule systems that exist in contemporary society; and there is no immediate relationship between the well-being of a person and the rules followed – further data on the purpose, sanctions, and outcomes of the rules are necessary.

A detailed empirical analysis of rights along the lines sketched here would give us a much better understanding of their nature. Clearly, they are embedded in our rule systems and social institutions and are therefore culturally specific and cannot be realistically understood apart from the culture within which they operate.

Characteristically, however, especially in the political arena, rights are often not talked about descriptively and empirically. In fact, they are often talked about prescriptively, even though the language appears to be descriptive. It is commonly asserted, for example, that children have – not ought to have – certain rights, in situations in which clearly they do not have them in the sense that the necessary correlative duties are recognised. Perhaps older notions of natural law and natural rights carry over into this prevalent and confusing practice, it being asserted that children have the rights in question by their very nature irrespective of their recognition or nonrecognition by a particular society at a particular time.

If we are asserting that children or some other group of people ought to have certain rights, that surely is the best way of expressing it. This is then quite obviously a prescription which calls for justification, and the rights in question should not become an actuality until and unless the justification is convincing and a rule is established under which the correlative duties are recognised.

Increasingly, justification of any rule, and any rights and duties arising from a rule, is only convincing if it is argued in terms of its effects on the interests of all the people involved. This is now seen to constitute genuine moral justification. But to argue in this way and to establish a morally justifiable rule, we need to be talking about real

people living in an actual society at a particular time, with limited resources and conflicting as well as complementary interests. Moral judgements have emerged as the practical way in which humans try to balance the claims of various interests, considering relevant arguments as impartially as possible and not settling the issue by force or partisan bias. The one underlying norm for moral justification is 'respect for persons,' and this at the very least sees every human being as a source of claims and interests, and of morally relevant arguments, in trying to decide what to do.

There is good reason to believe that, possibly for the first time in the history of the world and despite burgeoning numbers of human beings, there is today a widespread and perhaps increasing commitment to this primary norm of respect for persons. Nowhere is it acceptable to treat human beings as merely means to others' ends. Two observers of the world scene have stated:

Perhaps the most striking change since World War II is an unprecedented sense of a world community. All people are now regarded as fully human, and every nation as having more or less equal sovereign rights. An adventurer or specialist no longer 'discovers' a new geographical area and legally or morally displaces the indigenous rulers as if they had no rights. Almost no group is considered as 'objects' whom others have the right to enslave, kill or plunder. (Herman Kahn and B. Bruce-Briggs, *Things to Come: Thinking about the 70's and 80's*, New York, Macmillan Co, 1972, pp. 123-4.)

I realise that to many, this statement may appear as a grossly inaccurate and wildly optimistic view of the contemporary world. Yet I do consider that there is a heightened awareness of the norm of respect for persons around the world and a growing commitment to it, fragile though it may be.

Historically, particular conventional and legal rights have often been won by sectional groups but have then been extended, through social and political processes, to others in the same society, and then in other societies. However, groups which have won their privileges earlier can often continue to get more than their fair share of their society's benefits and have a continuing excessive influence on their society. Increasingly, these structural inequalities are being questioned, at least in Western societies.

Another historical process has been conversion of many rights into duties, especially by state action. For example, the right to vote can be converted into compulsory voting, the right to primary schooling can become no longer a right but a duty; that is, one would no longer have any choice, one would be obliged to vote, to attend school. Political philosophers have tried to gloss over the difficult moral questions involved in these situations by talking about people being 'forced to be free' or 'following their own real will' when they are conforming to 'the general will'. This is specious and should be recognised for what it is.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights contains an amalgam of conventional wisdom reflecting earlier concerns about the need to restrict arbitrary government and the need for citizens to be involved in government, and later concerns about the need for positive government to achieve a range of economic, social, and cultural purposes. It offers 'a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations' – a remarkable claim, considering the widely diverse circumstances and cultural values of the peoples of the world. It can be seen as universally relevant

only because of the high level of generality of many of its statements, and because it is not necessarily talking about actual rights. Its conventional principles serve as guides to reflection in actual decision-making situations, but they do not set down what rights morally ought to exist in such situations. Only an understanding of the actual people involved and their circumstances can do this, and even then there can be sharp moral disagreements – if not about relevant factors to take into account, then about how much weight to give to these factors.

The Universal Declaration does not and cannot list all the morally relevant factors in human decision-making, but it does list many which have been historically important. Further, the inclusion of the newer positive economic and social rights with the older civic and political rights serves as a constant reminder to national leaders and sectional groups that the general welfare requires both types of rights.

The fashion of incorporating bills of rights in national constitutions runs the danger of placing excessive power in the hands of the judiciary and the legal profession, especially when the bill's statements are vague and general. According to the Attorney General of the Australian state of New South Wales, 'the imprecise language [in a proposed Australian Government Bill of Rights] is totally inadequate to the task of determining what are the detailed rights and obligations of people living today in highly organised communities'. He further saw the central government's bill as a take-over from the Australian states. (*Sydney Morning Herald*, April 16, 1974.)

There does seem to be an important need to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the different rule systems we live under in the contemporary world, and to decide what 'mix' makes best moral sense. If we could think through and past present ideological clichés and examine carefully the actual world of competing complementary rules and rule systems and the interests they further, we could begin to restructure them more effectively in morally satisfying ways.

I believe that we could make considerable moral progress in the next half century:

1. If we insist on only one universal fundamental human right, 'the right for every person to be impartially considered as a source of claims and arguments in matters which affect them'.
2. If we take this right seriously and make it effective by an extensive range of participatory and other arrangements through which people's interests can be considered. Special care would be taken to ensure that the interests of the inarticulate, the handicapped, and people not yet born are duly considered.
3. If people with important decision-making responsibilities are held morally accountable, and receive relevant moral education to assist them to become so.
4. If those who claim that certain rights for particular people ought to exist are forced to spell out the rules that would give rise to the rights and the correlative duties expected of individuals and institutions. This would need to be sufficiently specific to know what is involved so that the nature of the commitment can be determined and considered for moral justification.
5. If the granting of rights is always periodically reviewed so that their justification can be related to the actual effects of the rules and not just their prospective effects, and so that changing social, economic, and political conditions can be taken into account.

6. If the use of power in its various forms is kept to a minimum, so that people who are claiming rights stick to arguments and people accept duties not just because they are forced but because they see the correlative rights as morally legitimate.
7. If there is reasonable balance in the constellation of rights and duties that each person and each group of persons have at any one time, and throughout their lifetime.
8. If we obtain better understanding of how various group memberships influence our life conditions and life chances.
9. If there are clear and accepted norms, or rules, in important areas of people's lives so that in these matters they receive their due as a right, not merely as an act of mercy, or of charity.
10. If we do not lose sight of the fact that any one person is more than just particular roles and statuses which he or she performs and occupies, and which are the source of particular rights and duties.

Those concerned with human well-being around the world could use these ten points as a morally relevant framework for restructuring and developing their institutional arrangements in the coming half century.

The coming generation is going to need to make unprecedented decisions about who is to count as a human being. In the issues of abortion and euthanasia there are already sharp moral disagreements about definitions of a human being, and some of the current biological experimentation could lead to frightening prospects.

Another increasingly lively issue related to rights is likely to be the rights of other living creatures on this planet. Human beings have been accused of 'species-ism' in recent philosophical work. Do only the members of our own species have claims to concern? Are we entitled to consider other living creatures as of no account? Some traditional religious rules have protected some of God's creatures from human destruction, and these are likely to be strengthened by a recognition of the right to life of at least those creatures who have survived the human species up to now.

On a survival criterion, the human species in the last fifty years has been remarkably successful, and it is likely to be even more so in the next fifty years – assuming that we avoid suicidal thermonuclear and biological warfare. At the time of the first meeting of the ICSW in 1928, the world contained about 2,000 million people. Currently, there are about 4,000 of us, and by the year 2,000, there could very conceivably be over 6,000 million. (W. D. Borrie, *The Growth and Control of the World Population*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970, pp. 6, 287.)

The gap in life expectancy between people in rich and poor nations is closing rapidly so that a life span of about seventy years is likely to become a universal norm. With the virtual elimination of premature death, only efficient birth control, in both developing and industrial societies, can keep population growth within the capacities of the social, economic, and political systems through which human beings attain their welfare. (Ibid., pp. 295–96) Impressive though the burgeoning numbers may be in relation to survival, they raise serious issues for human well-being and for the rights which realistically humans can be guaranteed. Existing social, economic, and political systems will in fact need to be greatly expanded and adapted to cope with these numbers and with the rising general aspirational levels of modern humanity.

If the increasing numbers continue to be disproportionately concentrated in the countries least able to provide reasonably satisfying conditions of life, the gap between them and their fellow human beings in industrial countries will widen. Further, the latter are rapidly using up the earth's scarce natural resources, possibly putting their own children in jeopardy, to say nothing of the rest of future mankind.

These kinds of consideration are likely to call for strengthening the international system, and some necessary reduction in the autonomy of the nation-state. It has been urgently argued that with the advent of nuclear weapons the nation-states' traditional thinking about war as an instrument of national policy has become dangerously outmoded and must be urgently replaced by an international decision-making and control system, if the human species is to have any hope of survival. (See John Somerville, 'Human Dignity, Human Rights and War', in Rubin Gotesky and Ervin Laszlo, eds., *Human Dignity: This Century and the Next*, London, Gordon and Breach, 1970, pp. 185–213.)

It is easy to persist with comfortable ethnocentric viewpoints if one is living in an affluent nation and gives no thought to the longer term, or the rest of the world. Yet increasingly such viewpoints must be morally challenged, and new morally justifiable social, economic, and political arrangements forged which take account of our human interdependence on this planet. What rights and duties people ought to have should not any longer be determined only within nation-states. Working out morally justifiable effective world policies to ensure an equitable distribution of life's burdens and benefits among all people is the formidable task ahead. This will require far greater understanding of the complicated normative and value systems through which we live.

Although there are still people, like some Marxists and some liberals, who have not lost the typically nineteenth century Western faith in the inevitability of human progress, they tend to be a dwindling group. There is now a widespread fear that our species could disappear from the face of the earth because our technological cleverness has not been matched by our moral capacity. The human species, like the dinosaurs, would then be another episode in the planet's history. This idea is in danger of becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy if people 'lose their nerve' in the face of this possibility and retreat into private local worlds, or transcendental meditation. An alternative is that for the first time in human history, we have a realistic possibility of achieving reasonable conditions of life for all human beings. But hoping for it and uttering high-sounding moral exhortations will not achieve this possibility. It will be achieved only if we have increased courage and will to understand how we make and are responsible for our own life conditions, and are willing to use our knowledge and intelligence to restructure our social, economic, and political arrangements in ways that make them morally accountable.

There are links between human well-being, rights, and morality. I believe that the notion of genuine morality provides the most justifiable guide in helping humans decide on their future.

Chapter 10

50th Anniversary World Meetings 1978 Jerusalem

After the social welfare and social work world meetings in Manila in 1970, it was not until 1978 that I finally managed to get to the next ones – in Jerusalem. These were intended to be particularly special as celebrations of the 50th anniversary of both the ICSW and the IASSW. Given the nature of the occasion, the work I had done in connection with both the IASSW congress and the ICSW conference, and the fact that professor Ron Baker could act as head of school in my absence, UNSW granted me leave from 10 August to 1 September, paid my air fare, and provided some additional financial assistance for accommodation in Jerusalem. I sat with my friend and Queensland colleague Professor Edna Chamberlain on the flights there and back, and was especially grateful for her company, particularly during the long and tedious wait in Athens Airport on the way back.

10.1 Sight-Seeing and Social Occasions

In Jerusalem, I was booked into the moderately-priced Jerusalem Towers Hotel, 23 Hillel Street, located in the city centre, within easy walking distance of the Old City and the major historical and holy sites. These three weeks in Israel provided not only the experiences of the two special world conferences and associated activities, but also the opportunity to see something of this remarkable but very tense and troubled area of the world. Before giving some account of the content of each of the conferences, various other social, sight-seeing and learning activities will be described.

On Friday, 11 August, on our first day in Jerusalem, Edna Chamberlain, Betty Dow and I caught a bus from the Central Bus Station to Jericho. The landscape was very barren and desolate. In the hills was a sea level notice; the Dead Sea was in the distance. Above Jericho was Mt Temptation (Christ's 40 days and 40 nights in the wilderness). Archeological remains showed the old Jericho wall had collapsed by an unusual event (Joshua and his trumpets?). A spring gave Jericho its water. Nearby were the remains of Hisham's Palace. We returned by cab to the Damascus Gate in Jerusalem, and went to the Western Wall of the old temple. Large numbers of Jews were praying, dressed for their

sabbath (from sundown to sundown). Dr Maev O'Collins joined us for a meal and after-dinner walk.

After reading in preparation for the congress, in the late afternoon on Saturday, 12 August, I walked to the Old City – saw the Via Dolorosa (with its 9 stations of the cross), and 'Christ's tomb' in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. On Sunday, 13 August, after our board meeting and the final session of a research seminar, I returned with Dick Splane to the Hilton Hotel and met his wife Verna and her friend, who was an associate dean of the local school of nursing (Verna was vice-president of the International Council of Nurses). Her friend had settled in Israel in 1939. She took us to the Jaffa Gate and Citadel, and to the Western Wall. Her husband Eli Freud, a conductor and organist, joined us for a meal. He was keen to visit Australia and took my address.

On Monday morning, 14 August, before the briefing session at the Baerwald School of Social Work (11/30am-3pm), I went for a walk seeing the YMCA (went up the tower), King David Hotel, Montefiore Windmill, nearby artists's quarters, up Mount Zion to reputed King David's Tomb, rooms commemorating the holocaust, and the room of the Last Supper. I had lunch with Ruth and Syd Bernard on Tuesday, 15 August, and caught up with a lot of Michigan news. After my discussion group that afternoon, I went to a party at David Macarov's home – Charles Schottland, Eileen Younghusband, and Eileen Blackey were there. After the 8.30pm congress reception at the Israel Museum by the Municipality of Jerusalem, we looked at the Museum's collection, which included the Dead Sea Scrolls in an incredibly protected building. Back at the hotel, David Scott talked with me until midnight.

At lunch with Robin Guthrie on Wednesday, 16 August, we talked about social administration and social work in the UK. Early that evening (6–7.30pm) was the reception by the IASSW executive board to honour Katherine Kendall, with speeches by Herman Stein (the MC), Armaity Desai, Mildred Sikkema, Eileen Younghusband, and Robin Huws Jones. From 8pm congress members had the reception and Israeli Folklore evening at the Jerusalem Theatre – dancing, singing, and a superb clarinettist (leader in the Israeli Orchestra). On Thursday, 17 August, Jim Dumpson and I had lunch together. The 50th anniversary banquet was held in the Knesset (Parliament) at 8pm that evening. The next evening, Mary McLelland, David Scott and I had dinner at the home of Hilda and Wolfgang Matsdorf. Hilda Matsdorf was a colleague when I taught at the University of Sydney, and Wolfgang (Bill) had been a social worker in the NSW prison system. They did not regret their decision to leave Sydney to live in Israel, but they found the continuing insecurity difficult to cope with.

Histadrut Tour – 1

Saturday, 19 August, was a particularly memorable day. Bob Hawke, as president of the ACTU since 1969, had visited Israel in 1971, 1973 and 1976, and had established strong relations with the Histadrut, Israel's powerful organisation of trade unions. He had provided David Scott with a letter of introduction to the Histadrut. (His wife Hazel worked at the Brotherhood of St Laurence,

where David was executive director.) David invited Walter Lippmann²⁶³ and me to join him on a remarkable tour provided by courtesy of the Histadrut. At 7am we went to Tel Aviv by cheroot to meet Michael Zieff and his driver at 8am. Michael was information officer of the Foreign Affairs Department at the Israel Histadrut, responsible for the Asian region. He had been in Australia for two years and had shown Bob Hawke around in 1973. We went on a 500km trip, returning to Tel Aviv at about 9pm. Our tour took us north – Haifa road, Nazareth, Mt Tabor, Tiberius on the Sea of Galilee, the beautiful Baniyas waterfall and swimming area, the Lebanon border, and the Golan Heights area, where Michael had fought as a tank gunner. The Syrians had lost over 1,000 tanks; the Israelis about 150, because they had better leadership, commitment and training, according to Michael. We had lunch at a fish restaurant on the Sea of Galilee. At the En Shemer Kibbutz, over 50 years old, we had a discussion with a member of the Histadrut Foreign Affairs Department. He had been at the kibbutz since the 1930s. It was a story of water and malaria, but a very high standard of living was now enjoyed.

On the morning of the next day, Sunday, 20 August, I visited the Mount of Olives, Garden of Gethsemane, and the Virgin Mary's tomb, with Inger Jo Haaland, a social work teacher from Stavanger in Norway. Inger and her Swedish friend Harriet Jacobsson returned home after lunch. I walked to the Conference Centre to register for the ICSW conference and to a general briefing session at 5pm. Australians met at 6pm.

Like the IASSW, The International Conference on Social Welfare had a reception at the Israel Museum, an Israeli Folklore program (at the convention centre), and a home hospitality evening (on Friday, 25 August). It also had a concert (at the convention centre) as part of its 50th anniversary celebration session. There was plenty to capture and hold the interest outside of the work sessions of the conferences, although these were, of course, the main reason for being in Israel. On Tuesday, 22 August, before the folklore program, I had dinner with Dan and Christabel Saunders,²⁶⁴ and Eva Byrne. On Wednesday, 23 August, I had a discussion in Dick Splane's room with him and Norbert Prefontaine about possible candidates for the next ICSW presidency, and had lunch with Dick. Lucien Mehl congratulated me on my contribution to the ICSW monograph, at his reception before the 50th anniversary celebrations before the concert in the concert centre. At 8pm on Thursday, 24 August, I attended the farewell dinner for Kate Katski.

On Friday, 25 August, I met Syd Bernard and a group of other people connected with Michigan University for a guided tour by Ehud Sharmai, a friend of Syd's who had been in Ann Arbor undertaking post-doctoral studies in genetics – Allenby Memorial, Abyssinian church, walk along the wall of the Old City from Damascus Gate to the Lion Gate, and walk to the Western Wall. In the evening five of us enjoyed private hospitality in a very pleasant

263 Walter Lippmann, a German Jewish refugee to Australia in 1938, became a businessman and a prominent member of Melbourne's Jewish community, active in Jewish and migrant welfare. He was a Zionist, keen for Australian Jews to have their identity respected in a 'multicultural society'. In ACOSS, he was a board member.

264 Dan Saunders was the dean of the School of Social Work in Hawaii.

home. I talked mainly with Edna Ben-Dev, wife of a diplomat. She was a third generation Israeli who had lived in Canada for 15 years. We talked about the wars, the tensions, children's attitudes and what it was like being a parent in Israel. At the outbreak of the Six-Day War, she had managed, at some risk, to collect her children from school and get them home safely. When she rang to tell her husband, he didn't seem interested. All he kept on saying was that he had just heard wonderful news but couldn't tell her what it was. He had, in fact, just heard that the Israelis had destroyed Syria's airforce on the ground, crucial to the successful outcome of the war.

After the day-long meeting of the general assembly of the International Federation of the Ageing (IFA) at the Hilton Hotel on Saturday, 26 August, David Hobman, Charlotte Nusberg, and I returned to the American Colony Hotel (Lawrence of Arabia had been centred there), and we were joined there for dinner by Jack and Beulah Ossofsky, and two British journalists. Dinner at Cohen's restaurant for nine of us connected with the IFA followed a reception at Belgian House, Hebrew University, for the IFA by the university, on Sunday, 27 August.

I enjoyed a two-hour discussion with Abraham Doron, acting director of the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, on Monday, 28 August, followed by lunch with David Macarov at his home. We talked about social policy. He and his wife drove me to shops near my hotel, where I bought an Elat stone bracelet for my daughter Ruth's birthday present. In the evening, a 'light and sound' performance of various historical phases of Jerusalem were dramatized in the courtyard beside the Citadel Tower of David, near the Jaffa Gate.

Histadrut Tour – 2

On Tuesday, 29 August, I rang David Scott at 6am. I was due to go with him and Rosie (a Victorian social worker from the state social welfare department) on another day-long trip with Michael Zieff, but I had woken at 4am feeling very unwell with stomach pain, diarrhea, and cold sweat. Both of them had also had stomach problems but were still going on the trip. After some hesitation, I decided to join them and met them at the Ram Hotel at 7am. We caught a cheroot to Tel Aviv where Michael met us with a cab hired by the Histadrut. We drove south to the Arab town of Gaza and picked up at the army headquarters a lieutenant (who acted as our guide), a major, and a jeep with armed soldiers.

We saw the largest of the Arab refugee camps (30,000 people. There were 170,000 people still in refugee camps and a further 60,000 now outside them.). It was just north of Gaza. Conditions were grim – no running water, sewerage, or electricity. The army was not permitted to intervene to any great extent because it was occupying the territory. UNRRA was mainly responsible. There had been much terrorist activity in the area in the late sixties and early seventies, but it had been quiet since 1973. We saw a housing estate provided by Israel, but there were problems with two-storied houses for Arab families. Much of the building was now by Arab families with money from employment. The average family had 6.5 children. Our guide claimed many families held onto

refugee status for the benefits and many old people, now dead, were still on UNRRA's books. We drove to a nearby industrial complex to see some of the work opportunities – a factory making cane furniture, another making metal potts, etc. Children were working machines, but the army could not do anything about it.

An excellent mainly fish lunch was provided in a restaurant in Gaza, but I could only watch. On the way back to Tel Aviv, we visited En Mordecai Kibbutz, named after the Jewish leader of the Warsaw ghetto uprising in 1943. A museum on the Holocaust was subdued but impressive in a quiet way. The kibbutz was destroyed by the Arabs in 1948. A life-size portrayal of the battle field commemorated the defence and final capture of the kibbutz. It was rebuilt five months later. 40 kms south of Tel Aviv was the fairly prosperous planned city port of Ashdod.

We had a drink at David Scott's hotel in Tel Aviv (he was leaving next day for London, then New York). Michael Zieff was not satisfied with our military guide, who was only six years in Israel from one of the Latvian countries. He was not well enough informed about the social and health aspects of the settlements and had not emphasised how much improvement had occurred under the Israeli army despite its supposed restriction to 'security' matters. Michael had given us an intensely interesting running commentary, during our trips with him. He seemed well pleased when I said his guided tours had stimulated my desire to read far more about this land of great historical and contemporary significance for three of the world's major religions (Judaism, Islam and Christianity), and he invited Trish and me to stay with them for a week when I came back to Israel. As Rosie and I left to catch a cheroot back to Jerusalem, I spotted Abba Eban in the foyer of the hotel. I had a vivid memory of watching him on television in Ann Arbor arguing Israel's case in the UN Security Council in the Six-Day War in 1967.

Back in Jerusalem, I had fish for dinner with Edna Chamberlain and Kerstin Tovarnstrom (a Swedish social worker), thankfully without any stomach problems. My two days spent as a guest of the Histadrut were an unexpected privileged highlight of my visit to Israel.

On another day, although it is not recorded in my diary, Edna Chamberlain, Lionel Sharpe and I visited Tel Aviv. Lionel was a Jewish Melbourne social work colleague who was active in the AASW. His niece was our guide in Tel Aviv. A highlight was the Jewish Diaspora Museum which told the story of Jewish communities around the world from about 2,500 years ago when the Jewish tribes were exiled from the land of Israel. I kept a photographic record of various activities and sights during these three weeks.

THE WORK MEETINGS IN JERUSALEM

Now for some account of the meetings I attended in Israel, the main point of going there – a board meeting of the IASSW, the sessions of the IASSW congress and then of the ICSW conference, and an executive board meeting of the international federation of the ageing (IFA).

10.2 IASSW Board

Board Membership

The IASSW board of directors met at the faculty club, Hebrew University, 9am-4pm, Sunday, 13 August, and again for two hours, on Friday, 18 August, at the Moriah Hotel – after the congress and the meeting of the General Assembly of Schools of Social Work. Under by-laws adopted in 1977, four-year terms of office for elected officers and board members were adopted, instead of two-year terms, with half taking office every two years at the time of the biennial general assembly. The nominating committee put forward almost the same slate for 1978–82, as had been elected in Puerto Rico since except for one person (RJL) they were then new to the board.²⁶⁵ Under the new by-laws, there were just two vice-presidents with one elected every two years. Vice-presidents no longer carried responsibility for regional program activities but acted for the president, as needed, and served the international interests of the Association.

Additional to the 12 elected members of the board were the 21 who were appointed by national and regional associations. The nominating committee noted therefore that countries which did not have national associations or which had a very large number of member schools should receive special consideration in the selection of candidates. It observed the excellent geographic distribution of officers and board members and the almost 50–50 ratio of men and women. A chart of all of the board members as of July, 1978, showed the geographical distribution: Africa (35 member schools) – 4 members; Asia and Pacific (101 member schools) – 8 members; Caribbean (2 member schools) – 1; Europe (215 member schools) – 12; Latin America (41 member schools) – 5; and North America (103 member schools) – 4. Four of the board members came from the regional associations – in Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe [Scandinavia], and Latin America. Seventeen came from national associations – in Africa (1), Asia and Pacific (4), Europe (8),

²⁶⁵ The slate proposed for 1978–82 and subsequently elected in Jerusalem consisted of: Vice-president – Dr Vukani Nyirenda (University of Zambia); Treasurer – Dr Merle Hokenstad (Case Western Reserve University, USA); and Board Members – Prof. R. J. Lawrence (University of New South Wales, Australia), Mrs Dora Papaflessa (YWCA School of Social Work, Athens, Greece), Dr Richard B. Splane (University of British Columbia, Canada), and Mrs Esther C. Vilorio (University of the Philippines). Those elected in 1976 who, under the new by-laws, would serve until 1980 were: President – Mr Robin Huws Jones (United Kingdom); Vice-president – Mrs Sybil E. Francis (University of the West Indies, Jamaica); and Board members – Sra Lila de Mateo Alonso (Universidad Central de Venezuela), Mr John Ang (University of Singapore), Dr Eugen Pusic (University of Zagreb, Yugoslavia), and Dr Abdelmonem Shawky (University of Menya, Egypt).

Latin America (2), North America (2).²⁶⁶

Preludes to the Congress

A successful research seminar organised by the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work at the Hebrew University on 13 August was a prelude to the Congress, and participants agreed that a similar occasion might be organised in connection with the Hong Kong Congress in 1980.²⁶⁷

A second congress prelude took the form of an anniversary lecture on the first 20 years of The Paul Baerwald School by the eminent social work educator Dr Eileen Blackey, who had been the school's first director.²⁶⁸ This was in the afternoon of Monday, 14 August, prior to the opening plenary session of the congress that evening. Her lecture which interwove the development of the school with the development of the state of Israel and world trends in social work education, set us firmly in context.

Looking at the present and the future, Dr Blackey claimed that world-wide in the late '70s, the schools of social work were dedicated to various ways to a deeper understanding of their societies. In Israel, the relative simplicity of the mass problems of the early years of the state had been replaced by a sophisticated, complex set of social change phenomena, giving rise to concern about people's identity and integration into the community. A shift from a remedial and residual approach to a developmental social welfare approach was called for. Dr Blackey asserted that there was now a recognised need for each country to develop its own societal patterns, human and social needs, institutional provisions and political structure.

266 'Report of the Nominating Committee, 1976-78', IASSW, New York, 1978. Dr Maria Simon (Austria) chairman of the committee, presented the report to the General Assembly of Schools of Social Work, Jerusalem, 18 August, 1978.

267 Many interesting research papers were presented, including one from Audrey Rennison on the motivation, commitment and perception of social reality amongst our first-year students at UNSW. I was particularly interested in the British research by Professors Olive Stevenson and Phyllida Parsloe on the implications for social work education of the social work task in a unified 'generic service' provided since the early 1970s by local governments in the UK. Unfortunately, IASSW board members could only go to its 4-5pm session.

268 Eileen Blackey (1902-79) had been the founding dean of the school, 1957-63, and was an emerita professor of UCLA where she was dean during the turbulent years 1963-68. See on the internet, University of California in Memorium 1980 - article by D. Howard, et al. This gives an account of her contributions to 'staff development in social welfare agencies; formal social work education; supra-national social welfare service; and political and social activism in support of liberal causes, specially minority and women's rights'.

10.3 19th International Congress of Schools of Social Work, 14–17 August, 1978

The theme chosen for the Jubilee Congress was ‘Discovery and Development in Social Work Education’, and the stated objective was to identify and build upon the knowledge that had been discovered and developed for social work education through the years with special emphasis on the contribution of research. My long-term involvement in the program planning had obviously given me an added interest.

Attending the congress proved to be a stimulating experience both because of the people and the content of this Golden Jubilee occasion, and because of the setting of historic Jerusalem and the contemporary state of Israel. The 251 participants came from 36 countries – Australia (9),²⁶⁹ Austria (1), Belgium (2), Brasil (4), Canada (9), Chile (1), Columbia (1), Cyprus (2), Denmark (1), Ecuador (1), France (3), Germany (19), Greece (2), Haiti (1), Holland (6), Hong Kong (9), India (6), Italy (1), Jamaica (2), Japan (1), Kenya (1), Korea (3), Nigeria (1), Norway (8), Papua New Guinea (1), Philippines (2), Singapore (1), South Africa (6), Sweden (8), Switzerland (9), Thailand (2), Uganda (1), United Kingdom (23), USA (49), Venezuela (2), and Israel (53). Almost a half came from just three countries – the host country Israel, the USA, and the UK. In a report I subsequently wrote on the Congress for ‘ARASWE Post’, I observed there were only 34 of us from the Asian region – ‘a small number given the size and diversity of our region, the special nature of the Congress, and the fact that the next Congress is to be held in the Asian region, in Hong Kong’.²⁷⁰

Avraham Harman, Hebrew University president, and Dr Israel Katz, minister of labour and social affairs in Israel, welcomed us at opening session of the Congress, in the Wise Auditorium in the evening of Monday, 14 August. (Dr Katz was a former director of the Paul Baerwald School and a striking example of a social work educator who had taken direct responsibility for social policy formulation and implementation.)

A Sobering Keynote Address

David Donnison²⁷¹ then delivered a sobering address for an opening to a celebratory occasion. In his discussion of ‘The Discovery and Development of Knowledge’, he explored ideas which had influenced the practice of social work: knowledge as power as he put it. What had been the most important ideas influencing social work in the past generation, and what contribution had schools of social work made to these ideas? With distinguished exceptions

269 Edna Chamberlain (University of Queensland), Yvonne Cullen (University of Sydney), Betty Dow (Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria), Laki Jayasuriya (University of WA), John Lawrence (UNSW), Margaret Lewis (UNSW), John Rimmer (University of Melbourne), Audrey Rennison, (UNSW), and Lionel Sharpe (Preston Institute of Technology, Melbourne).

270 R. J. Lawrence, ‘The International Congress of Schools of Social Work, Jerusalem, Israel, August 14–17, 1979’, *ARASWE POST*, November, 1979.

271 Chairman, Supplementary Benefits Commission, UK; visiting professor, London School of Economics and Political Science, and University College, London.

(Dame Eileen Younghusband was one) the influence of the profession's teachers had often been a conservative one.

If I could present a more cheerful review of your work I would. Many of you, I fear, will not be pleased by my picture of social work education. Some will reject it, or say that it describes my own country. It is indeed from Britain that I draw most of my evidence. But I do not believe my conclusions apply only to that country. In fact I would go further and say that they apply to many other forms of professional education besides the schools of social work.

He selected and highlighted seven significant ideas and innovations which had occurred in Britain during the period since the Second World War. (1) The idea that assured national minimum standards of living should be available to everyone as a right of citizenship through full employment, comprehensive social insurance schemes, free education, a major subsidised public housing program, and largely free medical care. (2) Resulting partly from developments associated with this idea and partly from entirely different initiatives, there came a revolution in mental health services away from custodial institutions with lessons for other fields of social provision. (3) The redefinition of poverty as exclusion from the continually evolving opportunities available to the mass of the population. (4) Failure to resolve the economic difficulties of a late capitalist economy led to rising unemployment, heavily concentrated in depressed regions and the inner cities, with government being seen as the organised power of the ruling class. (5) A movement largely derived from North America for the unification of social work theory, practice and training, based on a common core of knowledge about human growth and behaviour, and common principles of therapeutic professional practice. (6) A unification of most of the different social services and professions into much larger departments of social services. Then a wholesale reorganisation of local government, creating fewer and much bigger local authorities, imbued with a managerial ethos derived from operational research, systems theories and applied mathematics. (7) The continuing development of new forms of social care for newly recognised needs. In most of these the customers or clients are not clearly distinct from, or dependent upon, those who provide the service.

Donnison believed the schools of social work had contributed rather little to the ideas which he had outlined and to the developments which had followed them. They had made a fairly modest contribution to the whole array of ideas and developments which had affected social work since the Second World War. With one or two distinguished (and sometimes temporary) exceptions, the schools had not played a large part in generating or testing new knowledge; they had not done the most important research contributing to social work thinking or to the evolution of the settings in which social work was practised; and they had not responded promptly to some of the demands for new forms of practice and training. Donnison pointed out that the most important ideas in other professions did not usually originate in their training schools, and professional training schools tended to be conservative. More research, however, was not necessarily the answer. Good research could puncture the assumptions of the powerful and be the destroyer of obsolete paradigms, but there was

no positive correlation between the size or the technical sophistication of a research project and its innovative capacity.

This lack of innovation in professional schools mattered because they did not provide foresight about social trends and their students had less interesting and demanding education than they deserved.

Donnison referred to a study he had made of those who had played a part in formulating new proposals for the British social programs. They were people who tried to see the world as it actually was, without preconceptions, taking public and official perceptions of problems seriously, but not confining their own thinking to these. They respected the role of the politician, but did not themselves wish to become politicians. They also kept in touch with the world of scholarship, drawing on the ideas and findings of many who did not themselves wish to play a part in political action and had scant concern for the problems which engaged the activist. Many of the reformers had a shared liberal, progressive, social democratic ideology, summarised by Donnison in seven assumptions.

The schools of social work had been ill-equipped to contribute to this new thinking, because their professional model had been in general therapeutic.

The great American and central European gurus of the profession knew – many had reason to – about human pain, grief and inner conflict, but they had little love for government or bureaucracy. And Americans, whether of the Right or the Left, tend to be suspicious of government. But in Britain, as in most urban industrial societies, the tides of reform were collectivist, populist and bureaucratic, creating universal services which had to be accountable to mass electorates more concerned with poverty, crime, homeless families, battered wives and babies, the ‘old and cold’ – all the stuff of newspaper headlines – than with neurosis and private anguish.

Donnison was not, however, saying that if social workers and their teachers joined the radical liberal movements of their countries all would be well, for social democratic ideology itself was now in disarray. A larger political and philosophical reappraisal would be needed before anyone could launch a sustained new movement for social reform, or develop the body of knowledge such a movement would call for. Economists and political scientists would be even more urgently needed in a reappraisal, than sociologists and psychologists.

Finally Donnison observed that however successful we might be in reformulating our social philosophies and developing a body of knowledge suited to our times, there would still be deprived children, unhappily married couples, and handicapped, damaged and lonely people who needed the help of social workers. Under a heading ‘a new school’, he prescribed a need for an institution which brought together social work, research and teaching, and opportunities for teachers and students to participate in social action and the movements contributing to social changes in ‘our field’.

Donnison said he would not have come to speak to us if he did not admire the work which good social workers did – often with people abandoned by psychiatrists, lawyers and other more highly paid professions, or the great social work teachers, who had helped so many to acquire the perceptivity, subtle empathy and severe self-discipline which good social work demanded. He

was specially delighted to be meeting in Jerusalem because he revered Jewish scholarship and experience which had contributed so much to social work and the bodies of knowledge which informed our work.

Donnison was not a social worker, but a highly respected British social policy scholar, who had taught social policy for social workers, not social work practice. His paper did not mention the troubled and ambiguous relationship social work had had with social policy in Britain in the development of social work education. The 'new school' of social work ideal he mentioned was already a reality in some other countries with better and longer established professional structures. The discovery and development of knowledge in British schools of social work could only have been expected to be retarded, when most of the schools were small, not full-scale professional schools, compared with other professional disciplines and with social work schools elsewhere. Strangely for a social policy scholar, there was no obvious awareness of the significance of the educational structures and professional career paths in determining what could or could not be achieved by social work in a society.

The Second Plenary Session

In Search of Universal Core Curriculum Content

The second plenary session was on the Tuesday morning, 15 August – before the meetings of the four concurrent groups. Dr Frank Loewenberg (director, Bar-Ilan University School of Social Work in Israel), presented a paper on 'Basic and Core Content in Social Work Education'. Distinguished from basic content which was what was necessary for elementary practice, core content was seen as elements of value, knowledge and skill which were common to all social work modalities, specialties and roles, and not restricted to any one curriculum level. Dr Lowenberg used five widely accepted premises to provide a framework for his search for core content – every nation had its own social and developmental goals, social workers should play a significant role in meeting these goals, different goals required varied social work interventions, a social work curriculum must be relevant to a country's needs and goals, and needs of the learners and the abilities of the teachers were perhaps even more important than curriculum content.

Dr Lowenberg commented that while the actual incidence of commonalities and differences may not have changed in the past decade or two, there appeared to have been a shift to focussing on differences, at least partly because elements once seen as universal were now seen as Western culture-bound. Lack of consensus about a practice model presented a problem to social work educators trying to identify a core curriculum within a country. The wide differences in practice modalities in various societies made seeking a transnational core content very much more difficult. Yet despite the difficulties, identifying a core content would ensure that essential content was retained in conditions of exploding demands on a curriculum, and when there was student pressure for an open curriculum. In addition, international core content would be a preparation for a lifetime of professional service avoiding a limited focus just

on local and immediate problems, and it would enhance recognition of social work as an independent profession.

There were dangers, however, that social work education and practice might be prematurely frozen, and that the so-called universal core content might again be Western culture-bound. Further, some had argued that social work was a 'highly segmented profession' even within one country and its members disagree on what were its core practices.

Dr Lowenberg finally offered a tentative list of seven core outcome principles for every educational program. Briefly, these referred to a social worker's understanding and behaviour in relation to person-to-person and person-to-society interdependence, scientific method, ambiguity, self-awareness, value conflicts, change, and fatalism and control. Frank Lowenberg put forward his paper as essentially a discussion document.

Four prepared commentaries followed his paper.

A Brazilian, Dr Seno Cornely (president, Latin American Schools of Social Work) discussed Dr Loewenberg's core principles in a South American context. His emphasis was on political understanding, planning, conflict, and activist roles.

In her commentary, ARASWE president, Dr Armaity Desai, emphasised the substantially different social realities and therefore appropriately different educational responses in, for example, third world countries compared with post-industrial countries. A recent review of social work education in India was cited as an example of identifying broad subject areas within which courses at different educational levels could be developed to reflect local needs and emphases.

The commentary by Marguerite Mathieu (executive director, Canadian Schools of Social Work, secretary-general elect of IASSW) acknowledged the importance of cultural differences, but emphasised certain global, universal values, and warned against the profession rejecting rational values in rejecting certain values described as Western.

The final commentary came from Papua-New Guinea, an emerging nation with great cultural diversity. Dr Maev O'Collins (senior lecturer in social work, University of Papua-New Guinea) gave a sensitive account of the need to include and balance the various competing claims and stressed the importance of open learning systems.

The Third Plenary Session

Growing Understandings in Social Work

On Wednesday morning, 15 August, Dr Henry Mass (professor, School of Social Work, University of British Columbia, Vancouver) presented a paper on 'Research and the Knowledge Base'. This was the wording of the topic given to him, but he preferred to focus on 'some relationships between inquiry and understanding in social work'. He asserted there were two major kinds of understandings needed in social work to guide our efforts: 'first, what we learn about human needs or the inequities among people requiring social provisions,

and secondly what we learn about our policies, programs and practices and their consequences'. We seemed to be developing bodies of theories of both kinds, but in quite separate topical arenas. A third set of theories oriented social welfare's contributions to relieving the conditions and consequences of the world's greatest human problem, poverty – a problem of far greater scope than social workers alone could resolve. Here, as elsewhere, we were drawing upon other disciplines – for example, economics, political science and sociology – 'to begin to understand what we can do that is ... life-bettering for people, ... not worsening their chances for a better life'. The generalised understandings social work was developing were probably best formulated by problem area, focused in part on need and in part on differential interventive approaches, given certain variations in the need situation. His paper used the field of child dependency to provide an illustration.

One kind of inquiry was an agency-specific inquiry which could grow into a regional and then perhaps a national or even cross-national study. Thus we developed understandings of what worked and why – or under what conditions. Was this 'research' contributing to our 'knowledge base'? Or was it an integral part of any practice, taught to our students as we taught them other ideas and other practice skills?

Among the values of social work we teach, a prime value is that what we do, as in any profession, is not our personal gain but for the benefit of those we serve or work with and for. And as best we can, we need to discover in what ways or for what persons our services provide benefits. This calls for systematic study, the results of which may buttress or modify present practice propositions. But in any event, our understandings, whether strengthened or changed, develop.

Another set of propositions or understandings were derived from a relatively large number of empirical studies in the problem area. Maas was very aware of the diversity of backgrounds of the members of the Congress. He quoted an address by his friend and one-time sponsor at LSE, Richard Titmuss, to the 1964 IASSW Congress:

One of the paradoxes of international conferences of this kind is their custom of expecting the impossible from speakers and from those who have, perforce, to listen to them. We are expected to address our thoughts to immensely broad subjects which virtually defy definition in one language and culture let alone fifty; to explore topics which will have meanings in societies preoccupied, at one end of the spectrum of wealth and poverty, with how to make self-consciousness bearable in human relations and, at the other end, with how to alleviate mass famine and disease.

Maas insisted that our so-called 'knowledge-base' developed in one part of the world must not be applied uncritically in another. In the child welfare field, understandings had been developed on the basis of a sizable body of systematic inquiries over the past few decades and in many national settings. And as new programs like permanent planning were being tested now, evidence was being presented in the journals and monographs on the processes and effects of what was being done. This was professional work at its best – in which

understandings and inquiry enjoyed a mutually supportive and expanding life, together with practice, which was their reason for being.

For understanding and inquiry to grow well and be used in any field of practice, favourable conditions were needed. From his observations of the child welfare field of practice, operating in a field of almost universal public concern, he speculated on what such conditions might be. First, the workers should be clear about their mission, and relatively secure in and committed to its pursuit. The workers might then comfortably and without disguise express whatever dissatisfactions they might have about their available means for attaining their goals. Second, the presence of at least a tentative framework for making sense of what we, as social workers in a given field, were doing and why, and also some concepts for understanding the problems to be addressed. Facts did not have meanings except within some theoretical or ideological context. Third, practice distrustful of inquiry would ignore its propositions, and vice versa. Comparisons of current thinking about the nature of science and art would lead to better understanding and trust between social welfare practitioners and those undertaking scientific research.

Maas proposed a number of propositions for social work educators. 1. Since understandings were steadily changing, students should be educated in a non-dogmatic, open-minded way that sharpened their capacities for thinking and their curiosity. 2. Education should focus on purposes and their underlying knowledge assumptions as much as on social problems and populations at risk. 3. Social work understandings in different problem areas might profitably develop through linkages with relevant affiliated sciences or with sub-fields that drew on a few disciplines, like child development in the child welfare field. 4. Thoughtways and skills of inquiry should be taught as an integrated part of all kinds of social work practice. Inquiry was a smaller or larger part of any interventive strategy. There were times when inquiry should be the total or only means of interventions. 5. Social work practice as a craft called on both art and science for its basic orientations, and these were not so diverse or discreet as we had once thought. 6. The aims and methods of inquiry some social work colleagues reacted to with distrust belonged to a science of past times or to a present-day science inappropriate to our purposes. The primary, useful device in most of our inquiries ought not, at this time, be a computer. It should be the human mind, oriented by humanistic values.

Sectional Topics and Discussions

Additional to these plenary sessions, were four concurrent sectional meetings and associated small working groups. Section A concentrated upon teaching social work practice with individuals and groups, with Ken Daniels (New Zealand) and Professor K. N. George (India) from our region contributing commentaries. The main paper for Section B which focused upon macro-level practice came from Dr Sumati Dubey (India). Mrs Evelina Pangalangan (Philippines) provided a commentary for Section C, which discussed teaching and learning in social work education. The final section dealt with the contribution of social work and social work education to social development

and had the benefit of commentaries from our regional colleagues Professor David Chi (Korea), and David Drucker (Burma).

In his orientation briefing on 14 August, Dick Splane emphasised the importance of the four concurrent sectional meetings to the achievement of the objectives of the congress. He provided detailed guidelines for each of us with particular roles – the plenary chairmen, the presenters of papers already provided to the participants, the panellists, the group leaders, and the recorders.

In May, Katherine Kendall had told me that the macro-practice section I was chairing would probably be the largest and would be in the main auditorium which had simultaneous interpretation available in Spanish and French. This would make my job more difficult. I would need to work out a strategy to keep things moving or at least to keep it from becoming a series of set speakers. Interpretation requirements would impede exchanges between the panelists and between them and the audience. ‘Good luck and send along any thoughts you have as they might be helpful to other chairmen as well’. I suggested that we invite each person in the audience, while the initial panel presentation was taking place, to write on specially provided pads of paper, one or two major issues or questions which they would like members of the panel to discuss, and to be explored in the subsequent working groups. The planned format for the section’s plenary session would be for Dr Dubey,²⁷² author of the main paper, to have 10 minutes to summarise his major ideas and each of the four panelists would have 10 minutes, with the chairman possibly making a 10-minute commentary before an hour of exchange among the panelists and with the audience. Additional to Dr Dubey’s paper already available, papers from the panelists were to be sent to the secretariat for translation and distribution. When I wrote to Katherine on 27 July, I undertook to prepare myself as chairman to comment on the set of papers and try to relate them to our task in section B of the congress. She had requested that I send her my comments on the Dubey paper for distribution, but I thought it unwise for this could confuse my role as chairman.²⁷³

Regrettably, Dr Dubey was unable to be with us at the congress, so at the outset of Section B plenary session, I gave a summary account (not a critique) of the structure of his paper on our topic, ‘Contributions of Research to Macro-Level Practice in Social Work’.

- the fields and roles of macro-level practice²⁷⁴
- 4 factors which have increased recognition of the importance of macro-level practice by social workers
 1. need for a development orientation as well as a rehabilitation in social

272 Dr Sumati Dubey was professor and head, Department of Social Welfare Administration, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay, and also taught comparative social policy in the St Louis School of Social Service.

273 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Katherine Kendall, 27/7/78. They may, in fact, have been seen as too critical, anyway.

274 Dubey mentioned such fields as social policy, social planning, and human services administration, and social planner, social policy analyst, and social welfare administrator roles. However, there was no discussion or analysis of these as fields and roles social work shared with and competed for with other occupations.

welfare

2. need to understand and influence broad policy formulation
 3. need for effective organisational structures to achieve policy goals
 4. need for social work knowledge, skills and values in management of human services organisations
- Substantive knowledge areas for social policy and planning and the research implications of these
 1. policy and planning processes
 - conceptual models of stages – special attention to (a) process of defining social problems and deciding on the level of complexity and why, and (b) the role of beneficiaries in the process
 2. substantive contents of social policies, or analysis of distinctive policy domains
 - (a) models or frameworks – Gil's, Titmuss's – largely descriptive
 - (b) Dubey's framework – classifies societies according to their economic system, their political system, and their state of development
 - suggests social policies are associated with particular types of societies
 3. knowledge base for human services administration
 - (a) organisation theory
 - (b) management and administration theory
 - different designs for different purposes
 - Evaluation of various methods and forms of macro practice
 - (a) need for more uniform program design to make programs testable
 - (b) need for more reliable measurement instruments
 - (c) need to test theoretical assumptions on which programs are based

Commentaries followed from Srta. Maria das Dores Costa (Department of Social Work, Center of Applied Social Sciences, Natal, Brazil),²⁷⁵ Robin Guthrie (assistant director, Social Service Department of Health and Social Security, UK), Christoph Hafeli (School of Social Work, Zurich, Switzerland), and K. E. Graft-Johnson (head, Department of Sociology, University of Ghana). In addition, we had the benefit of a contributed paper by Stewart Millar (University of Kent, UK), which focused primarily on social policy as a branch of social science. Small discussion groups subsequently met 2.30pm to 5pm; and 11am to 4.30pm the next day after the third plenary session paper by Dr Maas.

The Fourth Plenary Session

The morning of Thursday, 14 August, the final day of the congress, was spent in open and other meetings, followed by the fourth plenary session when John Ang (Department of Social Work, University of Singapore) and Dr Ruby Pernell (Case Western Reserve University, USA) provided reflections on the congress – based on the plenary papers and the reports from the rapporteurs of each of the concurrent sections.

²⁷⁵ She was currently a doctoral candidate, Tulane University, USA. Neither Dr Cornely or the proposed French panelist eventuated.

A Remarkable Closing Address

In the afternoon, Katherine Kendall capped this 50th anniversary congress with a remarkable address at the closing plenary session –

The IASSW 1928–1978: A Journey of Remembrance

It all began in July 1928 when social workers, government officials, philanthropists, charity organisers, and many ordinary and some extraordinary persons of goodwill converged in Paris for a Social Welfare Fortnight. It was a massive effort, inspired by Dr Rene Sand of Belgium, to mobilize worldwide support for a new approach to philanthropy. More than 3,000 delegates from 42 countries responded.

As recorded in the opening paragraph of the three-volume Proceedings of the First International Conference of Social Work, the new approach to improvement of ‘the technique of philanthropy’ was proclaimed as social work and the key to its development was seen as social work education. ...

One section of the Conference, chaired by Dr Alice Salomon of Germany, was devoted entirely to social work training and it was there that Dr M. J. A. Moltzer of the Netherlands made the specific suggestion that a committee be appointed ‘to write to all the trainings schools of social work asking them whether they would be prepared to become members of an International Association of Schools’.

Social work education was put forward as the way to achieve new goals for philanthropic activities and better results from humanitarian enterprises. Had this been achieved? There was no simple or clear-cut answer. Social work had passed through cycles of high and low esteem but Katherine Kendall believed we could discern a sweep of development that had been erratic yet generally upward. She based her account on the archives of the IASSW and her own unparalleled experience with the organisation since initially being elected its honorary secretary in 1954.

In each of four periods she observed in the history of the IASSW, her account introduced a few of ‘the remarkable people’ associated with the IASSW, noted the progress of the association and the problems faced, and highlighted some of the developments in social work education. The four periods were: The Beginning Years – 1928–1939, The Restoration Years – 1945–1954’, The Years of Consolidation – 1954–1966, and The Years of Expansion – 1966–1978.

In the years of consolidation, the European-American based International Committee of Schools of Social Work was transformed into a truly International Association of Schools of Social work, new schools of social work being launched, and joining the IASSW, in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. The number of member schools increased from 217 (27 countries) to 350 (in 46 countries). In 1968, with a legacy from Jane Hoey, an independent IASSW secretariat was established. From 1971, IASSW finally had its own office, independent of the CSWE, thanks to a 6-year grant from the US Agency for International Development for a family planning project. This project had ‘opened the door for cooperative work with member schools in the developing world to a degree never before imagined ... and led to greatly increased national and regional cooperation, particularly in Asia’.

Katherine Kendall saw the distinguishing feature of social work education in the late 1960s and early 1970s as dissonance, which had replaced the concordance of the previous period. There were welcome signs that extreme positions might be yielding to a more balanced view of the responsibility of social work to foster both individual and societal change. All social workers wanted a better and more just society. There was reason for optimism for the future of the association. The present membership was close to 500 schools in 70 countries. With support from the Austrian, Canadian, and Swedish governments, as well as membership fees, a small but independent secretariat was assured in Vienna and program activities in the third world could be continued. Katherine Kendall's hopes for the future were modest but the dream in which they resided were not:

Social work educators come together in international organisations and at international meetings because there is a common heritage and purpose that are important to us. We wish to join our strengths and overcome our weaknesses. We hope to share interests, problems, and achievements and learn from each other. Our kinship as professionals promotes acceptance of the differences that are understandable and desirable in an international community of schools of social work. And, bound by shared values and by methods that are still being forged and tested, we work toward common goals of human betterment and social justice.

... It is extremely difficult for an individual school or a regional body of an international organisation to think of the greater good when its own existence is in jeopardy but unless we have a larger vision for social work education than our own survival, we shall achieve little. The fading influence of United Nations activities in the field of social welfare is an example of what can happen when the vision is gone and only the bureaucracy remains. If nationalism, regionalism, or parochialism is our only concern, social work education as an international force will become fragmented and impotent and no-one will benefit. It is my hope that we shall find creative and supportive ways to unite nationalism, regionalism, and internationalism in a common cause and mutually beneficial endeavours.

The address concluded with a re-affirmation of the value system of the profession.

A response to human experience that combines compassion with competence based on scientific knowledge is desperately needed in a world in which concern for human welfare and human rights is beginning to be matched – and threatened – by a growing belief in hatred and violence as the way to address human and social problems. ... Our belief in such simple notions as respect for human worth and dignity and the right of everyone to a decent life in a decent society has persisted, despite the difficulties that exist in many parts of the world in working toward their realisation.

In proposing a toast to the future, at the 50th anniversary banquet in the Knesset on the Thursday evening, Dame Eileen Younghusband asked:

... Can we reasonably hope that we bequeath to the future more solid achievements than we inherited from the past? If so, what will our successors do with them?

Will they add steadily to more useable knowledge? Or will social work tear itself apart in ideological conflict? Will it be more active alike in social research and social reform than we, to our shame, have been?

Will it keep alive the spirit of zest and adventure? Or will social work education become a preparation for a career with good promotion prospects in ever larger bureaucracies or for lucrative private practice? Will some basic sanity and integrity keep it moving forward in spite of all the odds: progressing because it continues to believe that its essential purpose is concerned with better human relations, with fostering social wellbeing in a world rent by man's inhumanity to man?

Will it still be conscious through all the mists of jargon that its driving force comes from harnessing knowledge to compassion?

... A continuous chain of generations links the present and the future: a future that rests upon the shoulders of fine young people who are today's students... Let us hope that they may be not so much be shocked by our ignorance and our benighted attitudes as impressed by our dedication and the brightness of some of our ideas. We bequeath to them our mistakes to rectify and our achievements to build on ...²⁷⁶

Katherine Kendall's 'Stupendous Send-off'

Presentations to Katherine Kendall on her retirement were the highlight of the anniversary banquet. After her return to New York, Katherine sent an omnibus personal letter, to greet and thank her very many colleagues and friends, describing her 'stupendous send-off into retirement' in Jerusalem.

The banquet in the Knesset was, of course, the high point because of the place, the overflow crowd, the full moon, the warm, witty toast and loving tribute by Jan de Jongh of the Netherlands, who became President of the IASSW when I entered the scene as Secretary in 1954, the presentation of 'the book' (a published collection of my articles from 1950-1978 in a beautifully bound copy) with nice words from Terry Hokenstad of the United States, the gift of a 'magic carpet' in the form of a travel fund to enable me to attend future Congresses presented with a charming introduction by our current President, Robin Huws Jones of the United Kingdom, a warm and meaningful message from Israel Katz who is now the Israeli Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, and fond embraces with countless friends from all around the world. It was quite a night!

But then there was also a garden party at the home of Prof. Monica Shapira arranged by Board members and close friends, and masterminded by Herman Stein, our immediate past President. This was pure unadulterated fun with star performances by a number of people. ...Dame Eileen Younghusband presented, as a gift from the Board, a magnificent hand-crafted silver necklace ... Ake Elmer of Sweden, Sybil Francis of Jamaica, and Terry Hokenstad marched out bearing three enormous volumes of letters from friends around the world. What joy it was to see those messages and to hear from scores of colleagues, many of whom span the 25 years of my association with the IASSW. ...

²⁷⁶ Current IASSW president Robin Huws Jones used this quotation from the honorary IASSW president to conclude his foreword in the printed proceedings of the Congress.

The final accolade came at the General Assembly of Schools of Social Work held immediately after the Congress, where I was elected an Honorary President for life. I didn't need this splendid honor to serve the IASSW in whatever way I can to be useful, but it was certainly nice to receive it. ...

Katherine was busy winding up the New York office by the end of October, sorting files to see what needed to remain for posterity (and research!). She would like to try a little leisure, but suspected she would find it hard to take.²⁷⁷

Appreciation from Robin Huws Jones

In a letter after the congress, the IASSW president Robin Huws Jones, observed that without appropriate preparation by the authors, commentators and chairmen of the various panels, the discussion sessions which followed might have been either too abstract or anecdotal. 'It was generally agreed that the plenary panel and the four concurrent sessions which followed were unusually valuable'. I was thanked for my contribution in chairing the macro sectional meeting.²⁷⁸ He also sent a further letter:

The Programme Committee carried a great responsibility and the thickness of the files in Dick Splane's office pay tribute to your cooperation and your concern that the programme should be worthy of the occasion. ... The Congress was said to be the best or one of the best that we have ever held.²⁷⁹

I distributed a copy of my account of the content of the Congress for the *ARASWE POST* to all the members of my own school of social work at UNSW. A note from Ron Baker, 10/11/78, thanked me for my 'clear and informative' write-up. He was particularly interested in Lowenberg's paper, which he found 'helpful, but very generalised' covering categories that to (his) mind had been 'gone over' for years. He wondered what, if any, specific practice theories Lowenberg would regard as universal and core.

277 Letter, Katherine Kendall to her friends and colleagues, 10/10/78. Katherine jotted on mine, 'I was awfully glad you were there.'

278 Letter, Robin Huws Jones to John Lawrence, 27/9/78.

279 Letter, Robin Huws Jones to John Lawrence, 12/10/72.

10.4 ICSW 19th International Conference on Social Welfare, 20–27 August, 1978

With about 1300 registrations from 56 countries, the ICSW Conference was obviously a much larger occasion than the IASSW Congress.

In making my contribution to the ICSW 50th anniversary monograph, *Human Well-Being: The Challenge of Continuity and Change*,²⁸⁰ and in my general social welfare orientation under-pinned by global moral concern, I was particularly interested in how the grandiose theme of the conference, 'Human Well-Being – Challenges for the 80s – Social, Economic and Political Action', was tackled.

A Basic Working Document

Professor R. A. Leaper (professor of social policy at the University of Exeter, UK, and ICSW vice-president) provided 'a basic working document' (48 pages) on the conference theme for all participants. It had been hoped by the program committee, as part of new methods of working, that this would be based on responses to a questionnaire and guide-lines sent out through regional offices to all national committees in membership of ICSW. The resulting data was incomplete and of variable quality,²⁸¹ however, and inevitably Leaper's document had more questions than conclusions. Leaper's document used 12 headings: Human Well-Being, The Demographic Base, Family and Society, Migrants and Minorities, The Use of Land and Natural Resources, Economic and Political Changes, Social Policy (the variable evolution towards greater government responsibility, the role of social workers and allied professionals), Employment and Income Distribution, Health, Housing, Education, and Social Security. Attached to the report was an appendix which provided population statistics for each country and area of the world, and material on comparative living standards between regions and countries within each region.

On the concept of 'human well-being', Leaper observed:

To consider seriously what forms of social, economic and political action contribute most to human well-being demands a clarity and unanimity of ultimate and short-term objectives, and a choice of priorities, about which general consensus is not yet evident. It is not surprising therefore that few national committee responses attempt an analysis of the elements of 'well-being' and that there is little explicit reference in them to recent writings which have called into question the general direction of human societies of various ideological positions, which place high priority on the increase and wider distribution of material goods of all kinds.

... it would be wise for any conference participant who is invited to commit himself (or herself) to Human Well-Being, and to action to achieve it in the 1980s, to pause to discuss the real concepts behind the rhetoric, before passing on to the complex questions of instrumentality. In what consists 'Human Well-Being'? If it is a social and not an individual concept (unlike human happiness?) can we

²⁸⁰ See pp. 170–6.

²⁸¹ There was no response at all from the African region.

reach sufficient general consensus about its components to ensure that 'the social, economic and political action' we take is tending towards a common goal?

The Australian Delegation

The secretary-general of ACOSS (Ian Yates) organised meetings for the Australian participants in Melbourne and Sydney on 17 July. As co-convenor of the ACOSS International Committee, I chaired the Sydney meeting of 14 who would be going to Israel from New South Wales. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the general and particular contributions that Australian participants could make to the conference. The total Australian 'delegation' of 36 met just prior to the conference – on registration day, Sunday, 20th August. We were booked in various hotels. The conference headquarters was at Binyanei Convention Center and the adjoining Jerusalem Hilton Hotel where all the conference sessions were located.

A New Participatory Structure

The conference organisers adopted a new, ambitious, participatory structure.

More than ever before, we will count on our participants to make this a successful gathering. What does success of a Conference mean? It does not mean participants listening to many learned papers and sitting through long sessions without actually participating in them. It does not mean hearing presentations and just asking questions for clarification. Success of a Conference means that participants are involved in planning their discussions, in giving their views and sharing their knowledge. It means that they go home with different attitudes or confirmed in their existing convictions, with increased knowledge and ready to apply in practice what they have discussed and newly acquired.²⁸²

The conference was divided into four sections of roughly equal size, each structured the same and dealing with inter-related subject matter. Participants were assigned to sections to ensure equitable national representation in each, and were expected to remain in their sections for the four days of sessions. Each section commenced and concluded its work with a plenary meeting. All plenary meetings were provided with simultaneous translation in English, French and Spanish. A speaker or a panel introduced the subject of the day's discussions. This was followed by delegates joining open table discussion groups of 10–12 people. Each day's work was intended to encompass the major constituents of well-being for consideration as a basis for policies and programs of action. All sections dealt with the same subjects concurrently.

The overall themes for each day were: Physiological and Material Needs (Monday), Economic and Security Needs (Tuesday), Education, Culture, Values and Communication (Wednesday), and Human Relationships, Individual – Family – Community (Thursday). Within each section, groups of tables treated the subject under four different focuses – Policy development and planning, Implementation and service delivery, Research and evaluation, and Regional

282 *'ICSW News'*

and international cooperation. Approaches were suggested, but not prescribed, for each of these. Individuals discussing Policy development and planning were given a choice of 8 tables – The Child, Youth, The Middle Years, The Older Years, The Disabled (Physical and Mental), Social Deviants (Drugs and Crime), Displaced Persons (Refugees and Migrants), and Volunteer Roles. Tables for Implementation and service delivery had the same eight interest areas. All tables had signs showing what topic was discussed and in what language. Each table had a discussion leader who remained at the same table through the period of the Section discussions. Participants could change tables, but had to remain in their section.

Each of the four focuses in each section had a rapporteur who reported to the section rapporteur, who reported back to the section each day, and sent the report to David Scott, the Australian who summarised the conference at the closing conference session. A section chairman presided over the section plenaries and monitored discussion within the section. The four section chairmen were Charles Schottland (USA), Y. F. Hui (Hong Kong), Manuel Perez-Olea (Spain), and K. E. de Graft-Johnson (Ghana).

The conference had only three overall plenary sessions. At the opening session on Sunday evening, 20 August, ICSW president Lucien Mehl delivered the keynote address, 'Human Well-Being: a Concept of Social Science and a Target of Social Policy', and this was followed by a reception by the host committee. The presentation of the Rene Sand award and a concert featured in the 50th anniversary celebration session on Wednesday evening, 23 August.

David Scott's Final Comments

At the closing plenary session, on the morning of Sunday, 27 August, David Scott commented on both the discussions and the organisation. The radically different structure to increase opportunities for participation had worked well. Generally people fitted into the design easily. Belonging to a table group and then to an identifiable mini-conference of 200 people and finally to a large group of 1200 had enabled people to be more involved. Some had moved around, but not in sufficient numbers to disrupt the organisation. Attendances in discussions had been maintained better than most would have expected. Some approved the design, but felt it had restricted learning opportunities which could also have come from an expert working party.

The African region had received little consideration in the conference and had only a few participants. David Scott also observed the absence of socialist countries 'which in some areas surely provide alternatives in ideology and organisation, and critiques that would be helpful to us'.

Scott obviously could not summarise the 50th anniversary monograph, Professor Leaper's background paper, 24 other papers, and the table, focus and section reports from the 16 hours of meetings. He chose to focus on what seemed new and relevant areas of consensus or disagreement in all of the material, finishing with a comment on the thrust of the conference discussions. People seemed to feel an era was drawing to a close. An urgent reappraisal was needed, particularly of the impact of technology on society. In both the

west and the developing world, there was a more critical attitude to economic growth and industrialisation, but the locus of power and influence was increasingly difficult to locate in both types of society, and was often beyond national boundaries.

Strategies such as community development; tested structures such as kibbutzim and co-operatives; basic education; appropriate technology; the surviving extended family and local level forms of organisation suggest that the developed countries can, with profit, look more to the third world for models which are derived from more natural and more simple responses to basic human needs. The problem, as one speaker said, is that we have interrupted too many of the natural rhythms of individual and community life, replaced them with expensive costly structures and established a want-creating society.

There seems to be considerable verbal agreement about these propositions but in practice not much evidence of personal or organisational commitment to change.

Commitment and greater knowledge of the elements and processes of changing some things and preserving others, is the real challenge for the 1980s.²⁸³

Because of commitments with IFA meetings, I was unable to attend the final afternoon of my discussion group or the final plenary session. (I thought the time allocated to discussion groups had been too long, anyway, and I also had a printed copy of David Scott's concluding comments.)

283 David Scott, 'A View of the XIXth International Conference on Social Welfare – The Discussions and the Organisation', Jerusalem, August 17, 1978.

10.5 International Federation on Ageing

The International Federation on Ageing (IFA) was formed in London in 1973. It decided to hold its next meetings, in conjunction with the ICSW Conference in Jerusalem, rather than in conjunction with the Congress on Gerontology in Tokyo, because it wanted its members to play an active role in the Conference's very interesting program.²⁸⁴ The Australian Council on the Ageing (ACOTA) asked me to represent the Council and its chief executive officer John Crisp at the various IFA meetings, 24–27 August.²⁸⁵ John Crisp sent me relevant material both on the IFA and the Australian body, and we had a briefing session on 4 August in Sydney. He was on the executive board of IFA and was willing to stand again, but would have to continue to be a corresponding member if the regular meetings continued to be held in Europe or North America. There was no prospect of an international travel budget. Bill Kerrigan, general secretary of IFA, was a good correspondent and he had good staff of about four or five, including a social worker, Charlotte Nusberg, editor and program specialist. ACOTA had written to the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Social Security to support a World Assembly on Ageing and an International Year on Ageing in 1982. In relation to the IFA symposium on mandatory retirement on the morning of Friday, 25 August, ACOTA was getting its own policies developed on retirement age and retirement preparation, and would like to see flexibility of retirement.

The IFA program which I attended consisted of: a meeting of the executive board, 2.30–5.30pm Thursday, 24 August, followed by drinks and dinner for board members and wives as guests of the Brickfields;²⁸⁶ the symposium on mandatory retirement (with a panel of experts from France, UK, Sweden, USA, Israel, and Yugoslavia), 9.30am – 12.30pm, Friday, 25 August;²⁸⁷ and then a two-day meeting of the members of the IFA 26–27 August, with a session on the final afternoon devoted to a presentation on the situation of ageing in Israel, by the Association for the Planning and Development of Services for the Aged in Israel.

At the end of September, Bill Kerrigan wrote to me:

Now I am back in Washington, I wanted to thank you for your most effective presence at the IFA meeting. You were a real tower of strength and good sense. The success of the meeting was due to a large extent to your presence at it.

As you will be aware from the meeting, I have returned to just about total immersion in problems of the World Assembly on Aging and the World Year.

While everything seems to be moving smoothly, and preliminary vote in favour of the World Year is even better than I had understood it to be at the meeting, I

284 William M. Kerrigan, general secretary, IFA, to John Crisp, chief executive, Australian Council on the Ageing, 15/2/78.

285 It provided \$400 as a contribution to my expenses.

286 Isabel Strahan, a very experienced Melbourne social worker associated with the COTA movement in Australia, attended this and all of the other meetings. Cyril Brickfield (USA) was legal counsel for IFA.

287 This was scheduled in the ICSW program at a time available for international organisations to hold such meetings. It was held in the Jerusalem Hilton.

note that Australia did not express itself on the matter in this preliminary vote. A copy of the results of the preliminary vote as of September 1 is enclosed.

While Australia has in the past been most supportive on questions of aging in the United Nations, I would be most grateful if you would use your powers of persuasion to persuade the Australian representatives at the U.N. to vote for the proposal for a World Assembly and a World Year, when it comes to vote, probably in mid-November. Of course, anything I can do to be useful at this end – briefing the Australian delegation on the pros and cons of the World Year and the World Assembly, or anything else useful – I will be delighted to do.

Once again, thanks for being in Jerusalem, John, and thanks for anything you can do as regards the World Assembly.

I haven't forgotten your very kind invitation; I may be showing up on your door-step sooner than you think!²⁸⁸

I responded with:

... Your comments on my contribution to the Israel meetings were over-generous, but I appreciated them all the same. I was pleased to have been involved and was impressed by the friendliness and constructive climate of the meetings, which clearly owed a great deal to the way you, Charlotte and David²⁸⁹ work.

John Crisp has been away on leave until yesterday. I have now rung him and conveyed the contents of your letter. He will take immediate action to get the President of ACOTA to persuade the relevant people in Canberra that the Australian representatives at the U.N. should vote in favour of the proposed World Assembly and World Year.

I am looking forward to seeing you here in Australia – any time.²⁹⁰

On the same day, I wrote a brief report to John Crisp on the various Israel meetings I had attended on behalf of ACOTA and himself, and enclosed the various papers I had received in connection with the meetings. He would be receiving in due course the minutes and the useful set of papers from the symposium. As I had already indicated to him, he was re-elected as a member of the IFA executive board, even though it was realised his attendance at meetings was almost impossible. The view taken was that it was more important to have a spread of geographic representation on the board. He could, however, resign at any time if he felt the arrangement was not working out.²⁹¹

John thanked me for my work on their behalf. He had received a letter from Mr Kerrigan expressing appreciation for the effective contribution I had made to the meetings.

On 17 November, Bill Kerrigan wrote that last night the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations had voted to hold a World Assembly on Aging in 1982, and they also had voted to consider at a later time proclaiming a World Year of the Aging. We could all be pleased at the outcome of this

288 Letter, William M. Kerrigan to John Lawrence, 28/9/78 – signed 'Bill'.

289 Senior vice-president David Hobman had taken over as president when Bernard Nash resigned in July 1977. He was elected for a full term at the Israel meeting of members.

290 Letter, John Lawrence to Bill Kerrigan, 19/10/78.

291 Letter, R.J. Lawrence to John Crisp, 19/10/78.

important matter. The long-term support of the IFA for a World Assembly had had an important, perhaps crucial impact on the United Nations and on the national delegations which voted for a World Assembly.²⁹²

Bill Kerrigan subsequently became secretary-general of the World Assembly on Ageing, 'a United Nations initiative in response to the rapid ageing of the world's population'. More than 100 member states were represented at the Assembly in The Hofburg Palace, Vienna, 26 July to 6 August. Government ministers led 30 or more of these delegations. The Australian delegation consisted of the hon. Ian Wilson, Dr Sidney Sax (vice-president of ACOTA, formerly director of the Social Welfare Policy Secretariat, Department of Social Security), Professor Gary Andrews, Anne Brennan (policy officer, Department of Social Security), and Cliff Picton (chief executive of ACOTA).²⁹³

292 Letter, Bill Kerrigan to John Lawrence, 17/11/78.

293 See 'World Assembly on Ageing', *Australian Journal on Ageing*, 1: 3–11.

50th Anniversary World Meetings 1978 – Jerusalem



Outside city wall – Jerusalem



Jerusalem street



Walter Lippmann and David Scott - street, Jerusalem



Lionel Sharpe's niece (Israel), Ken Daniels (NZ), Lionel Sharpe (Australia) – Tel Aviv



Barren and desolate landscape – bus trip to Jericho



Wailing Wall (section, Herod's temple) – western side, Temple Mount, old city, Jerusalem



Dome of the Rock, with Wailing Wall (foreground) - Jerusalem



Modern housing in Jerusalem



City wall - Jerusalem



Walter Lippmann, Michael Zieff (Histadrut driver/guide), and David Scott - Lebanese border



Banias waterfall and swimming area



David Scott, shore of Sea of Galilee (largest freshwater lake, Israel)



Norwegian colleague Inger Jo Haaland - Mount of Olives



Garden of Gethsemane - at foot of Mount of Olives



Damascus gate – entrance to old city



Jerusalem wall walk – Hebrew University Mt Scopus on the horizon



Armed soldiers on wall walk



David Macarov – IASSW Congress building (Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Hebrew University)



Second Histadrut tour – to Gaza strip with army escort



Sea-shore south of Tel Aviv near Gaza



People and their housing – Gaza strip



Gaza strip housing



Children – Gaza strip



Dome of the Rock – Jerusalem

Chapter 11

Regional Joint Seminar, Melbourne 1979

I was on the planning committee for the regional seminar, jointly sponsored by IFSW-Asia and ARASWE, held in Melbourne, 21–24 August, and greatly appreciated the outstanding work of the convenor, Louise Arnold, and the secretary, Judy Dunster, in making the seminar a considerable success. Louise, a senior lecturer at the University of Melbourne, was a member of the ARASWE executive board and was soon to become its vice-president. Originally from South Africa, she was deeply interested and involved in aid and technical assistance to Asia. She spent a sabbatical year in India in 1976–77. The planning committee raised funds to assist the travel expenses of some of the participants and arranged for local educators and practitioners to provide home hospitality. With the approval of Ray Golding, dean of our faculty, I used some of our money for part-time teaching to meet the travel expenses of Dr Armaity Desai from Bombay and Cora de Leon from Manila, in return for them providing seminars in Sydney. Shirley Barnes, a lecturer in our school, provided home hospitality for Cora, and Trish and I offered it to Armaity, but she graciously declined. At a meeting of the ARASWE general body during the Melbourne seminar, Armaity Desai provided a brief history of the establishment of ARASWE and a resume of its activities in its first five years, with her as president and Esther Vilorio as secretary.

The seminar topic, ‘Diversity and social justice: the role of social work and social work education’, resulted in a substantial publication.²⁹⁴ I can recall subsequently being pleased when Professor Phyllida Parsloe, visiting from Bristol University in the UK, told me she was impressed by the quality of the papers at the seminar.

294 Louise Arnold and Winsome Roberts (eds), *Diversity and social justice: the role of social work and social work education*, proceedings of a seminar, Melbourne, August 21–24, 1979, Department of Social Studies, University of Melbourne, pp. 176. I can recall subsequently being pleased when Professor Phyllida Parsloe, visiting from Bristol University in the UK, said she was impressed by the quality of the papers at the seminar, for I particularly valued her opinion.

Laksiri (Laki) Jayasuriya's Contribution to Australian Society

Professor Laki Jayasuriya provided one of the papers. By now, he was well settled in Australia and since 1974 had been foundation professor, Department of Social Work and Social Administration, at the University of Western Australia, in Perth. I had met him initially at UNSW in late 1968 when he was a visiting lecturer in the Department on Postgraduate Extension Studies.²⁹⁵ Appointed in 1969, foundation professor of the Department of Sociology and Social Welfare, and then dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, at the University of Ceylon, Laki had tried, unrealistically, to get me to release my UNSW social work staff to help him establish his department in Ceylon. He migrated to Australia in the early 1970s and had quickly become involved at a national level in migrant affairs, including as a member of the Whitlam government's Immigration Advisory Council, and the Committee of Community Relations. 1975–77, he was on the ACOSS board of governors. In 1977, he had attended the ICSW/IFSW Asian regional seminar on social policy in New Delhi. In 1984, Laki Jayasuriya was awarded an AM, in recognition of his contribution to Australian society.

Born and educated initially in Ceylon,²⁹⁶ Laki had won a university gold medal at the University of Sydney in 1953 with a first-class honours degree in psychology, and also a prize in anthropology. His doctorate from LSE in 1960 was in social psychology, with a study of adolescent motivation. Laki became a social policy scholar, as I had done, but unlike me, he did not have a social work qualification which was a problem heading a school of social work. He was, however, professionally qualified for membership of the psychology profession, becoming a fellow of the British Psychological Society in 1989. As will have become apparent, I thought it a mistake for a contemporary social work school to be called 'social work and social administration'. Laki was awarded honorary membership of the AASW in 1993, in recognition of the work he had done for the social work profession.

My Contributed Paper

At the joint seminar in 1979, I contributed a paper, which briefly analysed the concept of social justice, drew attention to the increasing pluralism of Australian society and some recent governmental anti-discrimination measures, and listed some problems for social work education and practice in our increasingly multi-cultural society. I concluded with a review of the argument of the opening paper by Dr Dasgupta and provided a brief, but trenchant critique of it.

295 Derek Broadbent, head of the department, took us out on his yacht in Middle Harbour.

296 He and I were both born in 1931.

The Concept of Social Justice²⁹⁷

'Social justice' is essentially a moral concept. 'Just' and 'unjust', or 'fair' and 'unfair' are used almost as often as the basic moral terms of 'right' and 'wrong', and 'good' and 'bad'. Theoretically, the idea of justice has been closely related to the idea of law and legality, and in fact the Latin word 'jus' meant the same as 'law', and today the term 'justice' is still used more heavily in legal circles than elsewhere. We, however, separate the concepts of legality and moral justice. Or, putting it another way, what is legal may or may not coincide with what is morally just.

There does, however, continue to be an important connection between the concept of justice and that of rules – in this case moral rules. Moral rules are decisions or judgements to which certain rational criteria have been applied. They need to be distinguished from what are sometimes called moral conventions or customs, which are traditional rules accepted uncritically as guides to behaviour.

If we say that a law, or convention, or decision, or a situation, or a society, is unjust we are condemning it morally, using particular sorts of reasoning. What sorts of reasoning?

An old view is that justice involves people getting what is due to them, but as I have mentioned, what is due to people by laws or customs may be considered unjust. We still need to decide how to assess what are just dues? If these are determined by valid moral principles, does social justice result? For example, is a society just if its system of distribution and retribution is governed by valid moral principles?

This seems attractive, but there are difficulties in simply equating justice with acting rightly. Acting with mercy, with benevolence, or returning good for evil may be right but they can scarcely be described as just. The concept of justice seems, then, to be limited to only some right-making considerations. What are they?

The typical depiction of justice as blindfolded suggests the treatment of similar cases in a similar fashion. Injustice arises from treating similar cases differently. But that is only really a formal requirement of reason. You do the same with instances of the same kind. Or, putting it another way, justice requires having rules and acting on them. We still do not know what the rules should be, or how cases of any particular kind should be dealt with.

Central to the idea of justice is the comparative distribution to persons of something valued or disvalued – benefits, costs, advantages, status, goods, opportunities, penalties, punishments, deprivations. All such value concepts are cultural as well as personal artifacts. They are the criteria in terms of which a person chooses which path to follow and which to avoid. People who have shared the same cultural environment are likely also to have roughly similar value systems, but no two persons are identical in their value systems, and people who come from different cultural environments often have sharply conflicting values. Even within the one person, conflicting values may be operating, or at the very least, differing

297 References for this section – John Hospers, 'Justice', *Human Conduct: An Introduction to the Problems of Ethics*, London, Rupert Hart-Davies, 1969, Ch. 9, pp. 416–468.; William K. Frankena, 'The Concept of Social Justice', and Gregory Vlastos, 'Justice and Equality', in Richard B. Brandt (ed), *Social Justice*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1962; and S. I. Benn and R. S. Peters, 'Justice and Equality', *Social Principles and the Democratic State*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1959, Ch. 5, pp. 107–134. References in the rest of the paper are not reproduced here but are available in the printed proceedings.

emphases at different times and in different circumstances.

If this is the empirical reality, how is it reasonable to make interpersonal comparisons, and especially the inter-group comparisons, which are centrally involved in the concept of social justice? How can our rule-making possibly take into account the diversity of human beings and their values and interests? Clearly as a description, the maxim that all persons are equal is just not true on any dimension that one can think of.

Very briefly, the moral way out of the problem seems to be to assert that justice demands that all persons ought to be equally considered, with none having a claim to better treatment than another in advance of good grounds being produced. In deciding between competing interests of persons, it is only reasonable to treat persons differently if they differ in some way that is relevant to the distinction being proposed. A satisfying life and its conditions are not the same for all, due to their differences in need and potentialities.

What, more specifically, are the relevant differences in human beings which allow us justly to discriminate between them?

If a case comes under established rules, what is relevant is set down and doing justice, or at least administrative justice, is to act according to those factors and not others. But as already emphasised, the rule itself may be considered unjust on moral grounds. If opinions vary widely on what are relevant grounds for treating a person or a group in a special way, there will be considerably differing views on what constitutes unjust action.

Even when there is agreement on what are the relevant differences to be taken into account, there is still the question of the degree to which the differences matter, and justice involves not only deciding on what are relevant differences, but giving due weight to them. This is essentially a matter of judgement, not calculation according to some pre-determined formula.

In making rules, and deciding on their moral justice, we are prescribing what ought to be the case and not just describing a particular state of affairs. If I say that a rule or a particular state of affairs is socially unjust, I am actually taking a position, about which I can be expected to provide evidence from the real world on how it affects the lives of the various persons involved, but I cannot prove that I am right no matter how much evidence I marshal. This does not mean that evidence is irrelevant. On the contrary, it is crucially necessary but it is only a necessary and not sufficient component in moral decision-making. The other component is the values or ends to be achieved. Any judgement of what is socially just can be attacked on both factual and value grounds.

Historically, as well as in Dr Dasgupta's paper, actions and debate in the name of justice have in fact concentrated on what is seen as injustice or unjustified inequalities. Certain existing inequalities in treatment have been seen as resting on unreasonable or irrelevant differences between persons, such as sex, their race, or their age, and people are accused of sexism, racism, or ageism, if they persist in referring to a person's sex, race, or age, when these are considered morally irrelevant to the matter in hand. It is, however, not so regarded if the case is successfully argued that negative discrimination in the past now warrants some degree of positive discrimination in their favour, using some kind of compensation principle. But there can be sharp moral differences on how much and for how long.

The Cultural Pluralism of Australian Society

Australians have become increasingly aware of the extent to which Aborigines, women and migrants are systematically discriminated against in comparison with the other members of the society, especially white, English-speaking males. There is now much talk about Australia being a multi-cultural nation, especially since the Galbally Report on 'Migrant Services and Programmes' to the Commonwealth Government in 1978, and its subsequent endorsement by the Prime Minister.

Since the end of the Second World War, Australia's total population has almost doubled to over 14 million people. In this period 3.35 million migrants have arrived and about 80 per cent have settled. They and their children born in Australia have been responsible for about half of the nation's post-war population growth. A peak migrant intake of 185,000 was reached in 1969-70, but by 1975-76, it had fallen to 52,000, reflecting the conditions of economic recession and unemployment. In the past 6 years the proportion of migrants from Britain and other European countries has fallen from 70 per cent to less than 40 per cent, while there has been significant increased migration from the Middle East and Asia, and more recently from South America.

Since 1975, Australia has received 23,000 refugees from Indo-China, largely from Vietnam. Despite impressions to the contrary, only 2,000 have arrived in unauthorised boats. Since the recent 70-nation Geneva conference, Australia has increased its refugee intake from Vietnam to 14,000 per year, and, according to its Immigration Minister, Mr Michael MacKellar, could well accept more. There are, however, signs of a racist backlash.

In his 1978 Annual Report, Mr Al Grassby, the vigorous Commissioner for Community Relations, referred to a strengthening of the forces of tolerance and to the absence of any significant following in Australia for racist and extremist organisations. However, he stated, 'Widespread attitudinal discrimination persists, the inadequacy of public and private services for the multicultural population remains a serious problem, and the gap between Aboriginal Australians and the rest of the community continues to affect every aspect of life in every part of Australia'.

From a population of possibly over 300,000 when Europeans first settled in Australia in 1788, the Aboriginal population fell to about 67,000 in 1933, but since then it has risen to 116,000 in 1971, and is still rising with a growth rate exceeding 2% a year despite high mortality rates. Also in the recent period has occurred an active attempt to re-establish pride in a person's Aboriginal identity.

The Galbally Report highlighted the fact that now in Australia there are about 100 different languages and dialects spoken. Over 20% of our current population are born overseas and over half of these are from countries with very different languages and cultures. ...

It is not surprising that in his opening address at the recent IYC National Conference, Australia's Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowan, chose to highlight the subject of multi-culturalism, including the position of the Aboriginal Australians. At this same conference, Professor George Zubrzycki pointed out that by world standards Australia is the second largest migrant country after Israel.

This cultural diversity inevitably is raising social justice issues about the degree of cohesion in Australian society. The Galbally Report used the following guiding principles in its recommendations:

- (a) all members of our society must have equal opportunity to realise their full potential and must have equal access to the programs and services;
- (b) every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage and should be encouraged to understand and embrace other cultures;
- (c) needs of migrants should, in general, be met by programs and services available to the whole community but special services and programs are necessary at present to ensure equality of access and provision;
- (d) services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients, and self-help should be encouraged as much as possible with a view to helping migrants to become self-reliant quickly.

These would appear to be morally relevant principles, however difficult they may be to apply.

In identifying areas of greatest difficulty, the Report referred to those who arrive with little or no understanding of the English language and who remain at a disadvantage because of that. Difficulties are greatest immediately after arrival, particularly for migrants who come from countries without a long established tradition of migration to Australia or for those who are refugees. Those who do not learn adequate English continue to be at a disadvantage and often suffer considerably in employment through isolation from social contact and in many other ways, and are often not effectively reached by existing services. This group included particularly large members of those who are isolated at home (especially women), elderly migrants, migrant women at work, those from smaller ethnic groups whose own support services are limited, and the children of migrants.

Governmental Anti-Discrimination Measures

In recent years, there have been a number of legislative and other governmental experiments to try to tackle what is seen as unjustified discrimination. The South Australian Prohibition of Discrimination Act of 1966 relied on criminal court action. Only four such actions had been taken when the Act was replaced by the South Australian Racial Discrimination Act in 1976.

The first national government initiative was the Whitlam Government's ratification in 1973, of the ILO Convention No. 111. This committed the Government to eliminate discrimination in employment and occupation. 'Discrimination' includes 'any distinction, exclusion or preference made on the basis of race, colour, sex, political opinion, national extraction or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment and occupation'. National and State Committees investigate complaints of discrimination, conduct a national educational publicity campaign to promote equality of opportunity in employment, and advise the government on how best to extend the policy. They have no statutory base and operate only through persuasion. 40% of their actual case load has consisted of dealing with discrimination grounds, such as homosexuality and age, which are not included in the ILO Convention.

In November 1973, the Australian Attorney-General introduced in the Senate a Human Rights Bill based on the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was eventually dropped after long debate, especially about the use of a 'bill of rights' for Australia. The 1973 Racial Discrimination Bill was based on the UN

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. After much amendment it was eventually passed in 1975. It makes it unlawful to discriminate on the ground of race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin throughout Australia in various areas, particularly in employment, accommodation, access to places and facilities, and the provision of goods and services, and it established the office of the Commissioner for Community Relations.

In 1977 a Human Rights Commission Bill was introduced into the national parliament, but ran into trouble over its infringements of States rights. After discussion with the States, the national government now intends to introduce legislation to establish a Human Rights Commission late in 1979.

At a State level, in addition to the South Australian Racial Discrimination Act of 1976, there is the State's Sex Discrimination Act of 1975, the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Act of 1977, the Victorian Equal Opportunity Act of 1977, and currently the Tasmanian Parliament are considering an Anti-Discrimination Bill.

Briefly, at present racial discrimination throughout the country is covered by the Commonwealth Act, while the New South Wales and South Australian legislation gives protection against discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status and race and Victoria on the grounds of sex and marital status. The main areas covered employment, education, provision of goods and services, and accommodation.

Chris Ronald's recent book on 'Anti-Discrimination Legislation in Australia' is especially helpful in bringing together all these various recent anti-discrimination legislation initiatives. All this legislation is, however, based on the individual complaint system. It is no substitute for taking other action to achieve a more socially just society, and it is still too early to assess the moral effects of these legislative initiatives.

So far I have very briefly discussed the concept of social justice, I have drawn attention to the increasing cultural pluralism of Australian society, and I have mentioned various governmental initiatives to try to eliminate discriminations which are claimed to be based on morally irrelevant grounds.

Problems for Social Work Education and Practice

I would expect all the above matters to be well represented in an Australian social work curriculum. However, some of the problems as I perceive them are:

1. It is not easy to achieve adequate teaching in moral and political theory, which will develop students' ability in conceptual analysis, and in justificatory argument.
2. Grasping the age, sex, class, and locational realities of the dominant culture is already a demanding task.
3. There is a shortage of adequate teaching materials on the various cultural minorities who now constitute so much of Australian society.
4. It would be impossible to cover even all the main cultural minorities in an initial professional education.
5. What is recorded about minorities is often highly unrepresentative of the total group.
6. Knowledge of the home culture in the country of origin does not necessarily give insight into migrants' behaviour in a foreign land.
7. Language is a massive barrier to understanding. There are few multi-lingual

social workers. Those who have linguistic skills are in great demand and perhaps are excessively powerful.

8. While almost all currently employed social workers have to deal with aspects of all the diversities and claimed injustices I have been highlighting, not many have specialised in working with particular ethnic groups.
9. Social work students drawn from different ethnic groups often do not wish to practice social work exclusively with these groups.
10. The schools of social work devote too much of their resources to initial professional education and not enough to continuing education, yet the knowledge and skills required for professional practice need periodic review and revision in a changing society.
11. The respective roles of the schools, the agencies, and the professional association, in continuing education, and also in social action, are not clear – especially since the development of the Australian Social Welfare Union has at least temporarily weakened the professional association in this country.
12. Finally, there are a number of interrelated points dealing with the current size, nature and deployment of the professional social work work-force. There are only about 4,000 professionally qualified social workers in employment in Australia. They are predominantly female, but hopefully in the developing anti-discriminatory climate this will become less relevant in determining status and functions. There is a shortage of people with middle-level and senior experience. The deployment of the social work work-force reflects agency histories and individual choice. No-one has the responsibility or the power to direct social workers into particular forms or areas of service, and existing service systems inevitably are competing for the limited number of qualified workers. Although there is some recent unemployment amongst qualified social workers, Australian society can scarcely be described as having an over-supply of them in terms of the needs of the population.

My final task was to provide a critique of the opening paper provided by Dr Dasgupta, which was not a simple matter. 'No doubt you will all have your own reactions to it, partly because it is stated in such general terms which leave room for very different interpretations.' I decided to set down, in a couple of pages, my understanding of the argument of his paper, before providing the following critique:

I have conceptual, factual and value problems with various parts of (Dr Dasgupta's) argument.

Throughout, social justice is seen solely in term of the removal or maintenance of deprivation. But until you specify who specifically is being deprived of what on what basis, it is difficult to pass a meaningful judgement about the justice or injustice of a situation. We could agree that no human being is being adequately considered if he or she does not have the bare necessities of food, clothing and shelter, but what about literacy and an adequate general education, mobility, health, recreation, political and civil rights, freedom of choice?

The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights sets down aspirations for all people irrespective of their particular society. And is not the current United Nations understanding of development now primarily in these terms, not in the

crude economic, technical terms castigated in this paper? I thought that 'balanced development' – economic, social and political – had been the conventional wisdom for some time. Increasingly it has been accepted that economic growth in itself does not constitute development, if by development you mean an improved state of affairs for the lives of the people affected. ...

There is, of course, growing concern about the rate at which the world's natural resources are being consumed. But to inflict zero economic growth on Third World countries would be morally outrageous at this stage. Economic growth is surely critical to achieve improved life conditions in these countries. The crucial problem is how it can be controlled and modified and the benefits and costs equitably distributed.

I find odd, the absence in Dr Dasgupta's paper of reference to the role of a nation's government in its economic and social system. The strengths and weaknesses of capitalist, socialist, and mixed models of development in achieving just conditions of life need to be related to the circumstances of each country in the region.

Peter Berger's book, *Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change*, gives a clear exposition of the critiques that have been mounted against both capitalist and socialist models of development. Dr Dasgupta's paper echoes the critique against capitalism. Berger believes there are good grounds for repudiating capitalism in the Third World, but not necessarily in Western countries where it has produced a better life, materially, for larger numbers of people than any previous or contemporary socio-economic system in human history.

There are clear value conflicts between the two models of development, and people and nations have choice between them. There is the privacy of the individual against that of the collectivity. There is freedom as against belonging. There is acceptance of an 'adversary model' of society as against the ideal of 'harmony'. All these alternatives are, however, matters of degree rather than absolutes.

Dr Dasgupta freely uses the terms 'exploitation' and 'violence'. At base, he seems to be putting forward a crude, economic class view of each society, with the rich deliberately exploiting the poor, and creating violence on them. The terminology is that of the so-called radical left. The common social scientific analysis of social stratification in terms not only of economic classes, but also of status and of power, is not undertaken. All significant social differences are seen as in some sense economically determined, but even then only according to a simple rich/poor split ignoring the material wealth continuum in each country.

I frankly do not recognise the professional social work that I know in the mean, ignorant, and self-serving caricature of social work that has been presented. Education for social work is, and has been for a long time, at least in countries where there is some measure of political freedom, essentially concerned with the way the country's economic, political and social system impacts on the life and life opportunities of its citizens, singly, in groups, and in communities. Understanding the nature of different dependencies, contracting, client self-determination, professional self-understanding, and other concerns, have been long established concerns and safeguards against professionally qualified social workers serving their own interests at the expense of the clients, or, in other words, exploitation. Further, the view presented is highly cynical about human motivation. Only economic class interests, however vaguely these are defined, apparently operate.

I would acknowledge that more professional social work resources should perhaps be channelled into local grass roots communities. However, not to have professional social workers also working at the other levels of social organisation in each nation would be a prescription of even greater social injustice than now exists.

Regional Joint Seminar 1979 – Melbourne



Dining with Seminar participants, including (from the right) Vera Mehta, RJL, Elizabeth Ozanne, and Laki Jayasuriya



Another Seminar dining occasion – (from the left) Frances Donovan, Laki Jayasuriya, ?, Ahmad Fattahipour, RJL, Vera Mehta, Louise Arnold, Armaity Desai, and Edna Chamberlain

Chapter 12

IASSW 1979

In March, 1979, the chairperson of the Resources Development Committee of IASSW, Terry Hokenstad, wrote to me seeking help in identifying an Australian representative on the committee.²⁹⁸ My colleague Ron Baker was willing to be a corresponding member of the committee, but we had no travel funds for him to be in Vienna for the next meeting of the committee in August prior to the board meeting (or for me to attend the board meeting). Ron would, however, be on sabbatical leave later in the year and would be in Vienna for about three weeks in September, so he would be able to discuss the committee's work with Marguerite Mathieu.²⁹⁹

12.1 Planning the Hong Kong 1980 Congress

As a corresponding member of the Program Committee for the 20th IASSW Congress in Hong Kong, I responded to a first draft of program proposals sent to me by my Filipino friend and colleague, Esther Vilorio, who was chairman of the committee:

You have, in fact, already received two lots of comments and ideas from me. First were those I sent to Robin Huws Jones after the Jerusalem Congress, which I gather Marguerite Mathieu passed on to you. Secondly, I was largely responsible for drawing up the initial draft of the Joint Planning Committee's proposal for the ARASWE and IFSW (A) regional seminar to be held in Melbourne in August 1979.³⁰⁰

As I indicated previously, I agree with your view that the regional seminar's topic can productively be closely linked with the topic for the Congress. An advantage of the regional seminar over the Congress, as it stands at present, in handling a topic, is that both social work educators and social work practitioners are jointly considering social justice issues and the respective roles of educators and social workers. Has the IFSW firmly determined its topic for its 1980 Congress? 'Where does social work stand on issues of societal conflict and justice?' is a question that needs to be addressed jointly and collaboratively by both social work educators and social

298 Letter, Terry Hokenstad to John Lawrence, 26/3/79.

299 Letter, John Lawrence to Terry Hokenstad, 18/4/79.

300 Esther had stated in her letter, 17/1/79, that she had drawn heavily from this proposal, which had been developed further by Dr Armaity Desai and other Asian colleagues.

work practitioners, by both schools of social work and the organised profession.

It may be impossible to organise at this stage, but if it is not, I would suggest:

1. That the research workshop at the beginning of the week should be a joint IASSW/IFSW occasion. (This could be organised for the IASSW and IFSW by the Chinese University of Hong Kong).
2. That the opening ceremonies and the first plenary session in the evening of July 28 should be a joint IASSW/IFSW occasion.
3. That the Keynote address at this joint occasion should be 'Social Work and Issues of Societal Conflict and Justice'.
4. That the IASSW and the IFSW Congresses then run parallel until the afternoon of July 31 when the outcomes of the two Congresses are shared, again in a joint plenary session.
5. That the morning of July 29 should open with the IASSW Congress's second plenary session which would focus on 'Social Work Education and Issues of Societal Conflict and Justice'.

I realise that joint planning between the two organisations is more complicated, and that there are particular apprehensions and even jealousies which would need to be overcome. As I see it, however, my proposals have the advantages of

- giving full recognition to each organisation's autonomy
- recognising that we are basically partners in the one enterprise of professional social work, which requires the interdependent functions of education, research and practice
- making it possible through interlocking Congresses, for a social worker not to have to choose exclusively one or the other, or to spend an inordinate length of time at the conferences, if they are arranged end on
- allowing organised international social work to give more adequate attention to major social work concerns than can be given if the educators, or only the current practitioners are involved
- allowing the host to concentrate local dignitaries in one opening occasion.

It may be too late to move carefully in the directions suggested, this time round, but I believe that unless we do, sooner rather than later, we remain culpable.

In addition to the above, I might make these comments on the program in the first draft:

1. As you know, I am in favour of an Open Forum early in the Congress, but I think that the people who wish to take advantage of this should be expected to undertake focused preparation on the important issue they are proposing to raise. A one page statement on each issue which could then be given to the delegates on their arrival at the Congress would help the Open Forum to be more productive.
2. I wonder if the proposed concurrent regional meetings should take place after, not before the concurrent discussion groups. The latter would perhaps provide some more general basis before discussions were regional focused, although this will depend on their particular sub-topics and composition.
3. It seems reasonable for the regional members to be asked to examine the implications of the theme for the program of their regional association. But given the very modest resources of the regional associations and their

present limited influence and scope, a range of other strategies must also be included in the discussions – strategies at the school level, at the national level, and between schools and nations in similar circumstances in different regions.

4. It is proposed that a regional meeting will in turn took at developing and developed countries in a region, or will at least some of the time be spent in parallel discussions? The latter would seem to have some merit.

I hope these comments are of assistance, Esther. Ignore them, if they are not. I will try to respond promptly to further drafts. I think this is a very promising first draft.

I am sorry I will not be at the Vienna board meeting to discuss the Congress and other matters. At least I can hope that I might see you in Melbourne in August.³⁰¹

On 1 June, 1979, Esther Viloria sent to members of the program committee for response by 31 June, a document in two parts – Congress Organisation/Planning, and Program Content. The first contained ‘the very substantial’ proposals I had sent for desirable collaboration with the IFSW, and she ‘strongly felt’ these required deliberation by the committee. The ‘Program Content’ took the form of an imaginative lengthy questionnaire which incorporated comments received from the first draft. Responses would help her to prepare for further review at the IASSW board meeting in Vienna in August. Esther presented her duly revised program for the Hong Kong Congress to the board meeting. The congress theme, ‘Societal Conflict and Justice: Issues for Social Work Education’, was to be explored in plenary sessions, discussion groups and regional meetings. In addition, an open forum was being scheduled to allow for fuller expression from the participants of other related issues of interest to them. An advance working paper would be circulated to all IASSW member schools and regional and national associations of schools, together with the sponsorship of activities by regional associations on the theme of the Congress, such as seminars, workshops, the publication of related papers, etc.³⁰² No reference was made to collaboration with the IFSW, I assumed because it was impractical at this stage. Esther told us of the various revisions which resulted from the board meeting and a follow-up meeting she had with the IASSW president, secretary-general, and the chairman of the local arrangements committee. The open forum idea was gone, and the advance working paper was being seen as not feasible.

On the day before the conclusion of the congress (25 July, 1980), I received a small gift with this touching note:

To my dear, dear John (an esteemed friend since the Expert Work group of 1973).

An affectionate reiteration of deep appreciation for figuratively and literally wiping the sweat from my brow – a token

From Esther

301 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Mrs Esther Viloria, 13/3/79.

302 Esther Viloria, Chairman Congress Planning Committee, Report on 29th Congress, Hong Kong 1980, to the IASSW Board of Directors Meeting, 6–7 August 1979.

12.2 Significant Issues

I was particularly interested in two of the papers prepared for the IASSW board meeting in Vienna, August 1979 – a welcome position paper by Marguerite Mathieu, the new secretary-general, on IASSW's relationships with ICSW and IFSW, and a worrying report by Katherine Kendall (former IASSW secretary-general, now an honorary president) on the 26th session of the U.N. Commission for Social Development, 20 February to 9 March, 1979.

IASSW, the ICSW, and the IFSW?

Marguerite had attended the last joint meeting of the three associations in Jerusalem in 1978, where another plea had been made for joint planning of the biennial meetings with the possibility of shared concurrent sessions, but she had expressed the view that to be meaningful, such joint activity could only be the result of on-going collaboration around issues of common concern. Her paper proposed collaboration within the limits of the aims, programs and resources of the three organisations which shared a common goal but with different and complementary emphases. They were all concerned with the planning, implementation and manning of the social welfare and social service delivery system, but they approached this common goal differently.

ICSW is a vast forum where social policy specialists, social welfare administrators and professionals from several disciplines can meet to discuss broad issues related to human welfare. As such, it has a unique role to play.

IFSW groups together associations of practising social workers to look at issues which professional social workers meet in their practice and to promote good standards of practice.

IASSW is a membership association of schools of social work and organisations dealing with issues related to the education and training of the manpower required by the social welfare system. Its chief concern is the promotion of professional education.

The IFSW and IASSW spoke for the profession of social work, practice and training, while the ICSW was much broader in scope. The differentiation had bearing on the type of collaboration which could take place between the three organisations. Collaboration required the mutual recognition, acceptance and respect for each other's specific goals and competence, and required advance planning, the setting of long and short-term objectives and the designing of cooperative and complementary activities to be co-sponsored by the three organisations or any combination of them. Marguerite Mathieu suggested various procedures to improve the relationships between the organisations, and suggested a plan of action to achieve these.³⁰³

303 Marguerite Mathieu, 'Position Paper on IASSW's relationships with ICSW and IFSW', for discussion at IASSW's board meeting, August 1979.

Weakening of Social Development Concerns at the United Nations

The U.N. Commission for Social Development was one of six functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Katherine Kendall reported that there was some question of its survival if social matters were to be dealt with in a special session of ECOSOC. The appointment of a group of experts to study the operational effectiveness of the social development activities within the U.N. (strongly supported by the ICSW, IASSW, and IFSW at the 1977 session of the commission) had been delayed because the restructuring of social development activities within the U.N. had not been completed. A working group on 'the social aspects of development activities of the U.N.' was to be appointed when the necessary funds were found.

Katherine concluded her report on the latest meeting of the social development commission with these important personal observations:

As a long-time observer (since 1947) of the work of the Social Commission of the United Nations, the IASSW representative cannot help comparing the status and performance of the present and recent Commissions with their predecessors of another era. Many more countries are now active in the work of the Commission which is all to the good, but there has been a loss in status and effectiveness. Formerly, ministers of social welfare or equally knowledgeable experts served as delegates. The discussions were taken very seriously as a means of promoting a higher standard of social welfare around the world. Many of the present delegates are undoubtedly able people but they are not experts in the field of social welfare or social development. More disturbing, however, is the obvious lack of leadership within the Secretariat. More than one 'old-timer' delegate, in private talk, referred nostalgically to the days of Julia Henderson and the difference it made in the work of the Commission to have strong staff guidance and support. Yet, it is perhaps not fair to fault the Commission and the Secretariat for a situation that is probably a reflection of what may be world-wide confusion on the boundaries and importance of social welfare and the distinguishing characteristics of social development.

Except in the broadest sense, the Commission does not act as if it really knows what its task is in relation to the work of the U.N. There is rhetoric galore and all the cliché phrases but it is difficult to discern any clear concept either what they mean by social welfare or social development or one in relation to the other. The current concentration on special groups (women, aged, children, migrants, disabled, etc.) has led to fragmentation with no apparent linkage of these separate activities to each other or to a central theme. It is rather plaintively noted by a number of delegates that all these special groups reflected 'human fragility' which should be considered within a comprehensive framework of social welfare services. The delineation of such a framework for social welfare in *all* its aspects – remedial, curative, preventive, and developmental – would do much to dispel the present confusion and lead to a clearer picture of the social welfare totality that must be taken into account in planning the U.N. programme and in promoting social development. The ICSW, IASSW, IFSW, and, I believe, a number of Commission

delegates have pinned their hopes on the newly authorised expert group.³⁰⁴

Attached to Katherine's report to the board, was a submission made by the IASSW on two agenda items for discussion at the session of the Commission for Social Development – review of social research and training capabilities in developing countries; programme objectives for the medium-term plan 1980–1983 and progress report for 1977–1978; and 'on the threat of a diminishing influence of the Commission for Social Development and the United Nations Secretariat in the field of social welfare training – a situation which we trust can be corrected'.

Non-Discrimination Membership Criterion of IASSW

This continued to be a matter of considerable importance for the IASSW. At the IASSW board meeting in Vienna in August 1979, membership and violations of human rights was again discussed. The president and secretary-general had been invited to attend the general assembly of the Scandinavian Committee of Schools of Social Work. Some of the Scandinavian schools were considering disaffiliation from IASSW because it held its Congress in Israel and retained membership schools from countries such as South Africa, Rhodesia and Chile. The representative of the Scandinavian committee reported that while all the schools strongly objected to apartheid and violations of human rights, only a small minority supported disaffiliation. Board members recalled that maintaining ties had helped South African schools in their fight against apartheid.³⁰⁵

A meeting of the executive committee in Vienna on 16 December, 1979, discussed a motion from the Scandinavian Committee of Schools of Social Work, which requested the board: (a) to publicly support the anti-apartheid movement, (b) to require South African schools to reject apartheid and work to reach equality between the races, (c) to immediately nominate a committee to define conditions of membership and to investigate whether these conditions were met in countries such as Chile and Rhodesia, and (d) to report on South Africa and on the activities of the above committee at the 1980 meeting of the General Assembly of the IASSW. The president pointed out action had already been taken on (a) and (b). Discussion at the executive meeting focused on (c) and it was recommended the board consider a committee competent to examine complaints and to provide a right of appeal.³⁰⁶ I was to become directly involved in trying to help the board address this membership issue which had clearly not yet been resolved.

304 Katherine Kendall, 'Report of the 26th Session of the U.N. Commission on Social Development, 20 February – 9 March, 1979', for the IASW board of directors meeting, 6–7 August, 1979, Vienna.

305 Minutes, Meeting of the IASSW Board of Directors, August 6–7, 1979, Vienna, Austria.

306 Minutes, Meeting of the Executive Committee

Chapter 13

AASWE Membership of the IASSW?

In March, 1980, Marguerite Mathieu sent rather belated congratulations to me and many other Australian colleagues for launching the Australian Association for Social Work Education (AASWE) and said it would probably be entitled to full membership in the IASSW, with representation on the board of directors. All Australian schools which were members of the association would automatically become members of IASSW.³⁰⁷ I discussed her letter with Professor Herb Bisno, the current AASWE president, who sent her a copy of the new association's constitution, so she could make a judgement on whether or not the association was eligible for full membership with representation on the board.

You will see from the constitution, that AASWE is not formally an association of schools, although the existence of schools is fully recognised in the association's governing council, and the association's objectives are identical with what we would wish for an association of schools. As Katherine may have told you, we did attempt to establish an association of schools, but were unsuccessful because a number of university vice-chancellors were opposed to component parts of universities having membership in an outside body. You will see that the eventual AASWE constitution had only an individual membership, not a school membership basis, and there lies the problem in terms of AASWE's formal connection with the IASSW. I think I speak for most of my colleagues when I say that we would wish Australian schools to have regular exchanges through the IASSW with schools in other regions.

I told her Ron Baker and I would be coming from the UNSW school to the Hong Kong international meetings. 'Incidentally, Ron very much appreciated the time he spent with you in Vienna'.³⁰⁸

307 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to John Lawrence, 11/3/80.

308 Letter, John Lawrence to Marguerite Mathieu, 9/4/80. I was actively involved in the founding of AASWE 1977–79, chairing (at UNSW) the meeting which finally approved its constitution, and its acting president 1978–79. I served as a council member 1978–82.

Chapter 14

IASSW Advisory Committee on Discrimination in Member Schools

At the board meeting in Hong Kong, 23 July, 1980, it was decided to appoint a group 'to determine whether, and if so how, to strengthen and implement procedures called for by the constitution to deal with discrimination in member schools'. The IASSW proceeded to appoint a small group from the board, representative of regions, who had shown interest in this matter and who would agree to work by correspondence in view of reporting to the next board meeting in the summer of 1981. At the suggestion of Heinrich Schiller, now president of IASSW, I was invited from the Asia and Pacific region.³⁰⁹ Other members of the committee were Dr A. Shawkey (chair) and Dr Vukani Nyirenda (Africa), Dr Eugen Pusic (Europe), Dr Arthur Katz (North America), and Harriet Jakobsson (Scandinavia).

In December, 1980, Marguerite Mathieu provided a statement to assist us in fulfilling our mandate. It covered the reason for establishing the committee, provisions already in the by-laws, previous action by the board of directors on the issue, present membership policy, and the committee's mandate. Since 1972, board action had concentrated on the South African situation. The South African schools, through the JUC (South Africa), had been asked to report on their progress towards meeting six specific conditions defined by the board in 1973, three such reports had been received, 1975, 1978, and 1980. Current standards for admission were not explicit in terms of our present concern; they only repeated the by-laws on the principle of non-discrimination.³¹⁰

I waited to hear how Dr Shawkey wished us to proceed, not realising we were expected to contact him with our views. When the secretariat eventually told us that this was the expectation, I wrote to him at some length because of the importance of the issue. These were my comments which I described as preliminary, expecting further interaction between the members of the committee:

309 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to R. J. Lawrence, 13/10/80.

310 Marguerite Mathieu to Members of the Committee to Study Ways and Means to Deal with Non-compliance with Membership Requirements on the Principle of Non-discrimination, December, 1980.

The written comments received from the Scandinavian schools had chosen to ignore, or were not fully aware, of the various specific actions taken by the IASSW board since 1971, in connection with South African schools. Although as far as I could see, no argued case had been made for changing the existing procedures, especially those relating to the South African schools, a case could be made for developing more general procedural rules or guidelines in these matters and incorporating them in 'rules and procedures' for the IASSW. The secretary general was clearly in favour of this development. Although we must avoid being choked by excessive formalism, it seemed especially important in an international organisation with changing representatives and obvious communication problems that members, office-bearers and others know in general terms what policies and procedures the IASSW pursued in implementing its by-laws. The development of 'rules and procedures' could well lead to some desirable revision of what was contained in the by-laws and what was better placed in the rules and procedures.

The board of directors rightly had the final approval of applications for full membership. Under article IV 4A of the by-laws, the board had established a membership committee which reported to the board through its chairman. The proposed 'rules and procedures' statement should cover the composition and functioning of the membership committee. By-law IV 4B stated '... educational institutions which seek to become full member are required to comply with the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and, specifically, with the principle of non-discrimination as a matter of policy in the conduct of their affairs'. As I understood the present situation, the only full member of the IASSW which was in an operational sense required to comply with this was the Joint University Committee for Social Work in South Africa. This member was expected to report periodically to the board, not the membership committee, its progress towards meeting six specific conditions which would indicate 'the principle of non-discrimination as a matter of policy in the conduct of (its) affairs'. Because earlier reporting was too general, the most recent report was more specific in terms of the situations of the member schools of the South African association of schools.

In order to make operational for all members and potential members, this part of the membership requirements, our committee might suggest the following procedures:

1. In the original application for membership, the applicant should be required to make a statement of compliance with 'the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights', seeing them as a common standard of achievement to be striven for, for all peoples and all nations, 'and, specifically, with the principle of non-discrimination as a matter of policy in the conduct of their affairs'. In addition, each applicant for membership should be required to specify any particular problems it has in meeting this criterion for membership.
2. When the member is a national association of schools, the initial statement – of compliance with the principles in the Declaration, and of any particular problems in adhering to them as standards to be striven for – should be

made not only by the association, but by each of its member schools, since they become full IASSW members through membership of their national association.

3. Where there are particular problems, for example, where the government of the country in which the member is located shows indifference to, or massive denial of the kinds of human rights listed in the Declaration, the Membership Committee may recommend membership but only on the condition that this is periodically reviewed, perhaps biennially, or more frequently if the situation demanded it. This review would be in the light of reports from the member to the Membership Committee on how it is coping with its particular problems, using agreed headings for its reporting. The Membership Committee would need to determine these headings in each case, taking into account the particular circumstances of the member.
4. Whether or not a member is required to make periodic reports to the Membership Committee to retain its membership, it seems reasonable that all members should periodically re-affirm their commitment to the principles of the Declaration and be asked to specify any particular current problems in meeting this criterion for membership. Perhaps this could be done every 3 years.
5. If a member is accused of non-compliance with the principles in the Declaration, it seems best that this should initially come before the Membership Committee. The accusation would need to come from at least one other IASSW member, who would have the responsibility to establish a prima facie case. If the Membership Committee considered a prima facie case had been established, the accused member would be given every opportunity to present its defence.

If the Membership Committee recommends to the Board, that a member be suspended or expelled, the member should be informed of the recommendation and its rationale and be given the right again to present their case at the relevant Board meeting.

It seemed to me best to extend the role of the membership committee in the directions suggested, rather than to establish a new committee dealing with just this aspect of membership, or to overload the board. Clearly to perform the functions I had mentioned, the membership committee would need to consist of widely respected persons who could cope with making sound professional judgements about the complicated, sensitive issues at stake.

One of the real problems was trying to get clarity on what precisely was meant by:

...Educational institutions and associations which seek to become Full Members are required to comply with the principles enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and, specifically, with the principle of non-discrimination as a matter of policy in the conduct of their affairs.

— when this was applied in the widely varying circumstances of schools and national associations throughout the world. I had already suggested an interpretation of this statement in terms of commitment to a common standard

of achievement to which we aspire, and this is the way the Declaration itself described the status of its principles. All societies and institutions of society in fact fell short of these norms – although some did so more obviously than others.

The principle of non-discrimination was referred to. Presumably this was intended to refer to Article 2 in the Declaration, although notice that the word ‘discrimination’ was not used in the article:

Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

In connection with the South African schools, the principle of non-discrimination was interpreted to mean non-discrimination on the basis of race and colour. The general wording of the by-law made it quite clear, however, that a school’s or a national association’s membership could legitimately be challenged on one or more of the other grounds mentioned. There was also the obvious difficulty that ‘positive discrimination’ was certainly not non-discrimination.

I finally commented that these were deep waters, conceptually and morally. Unless we handled these matters with good sense and good will, we could easily tear the international body apart and lose whatever external moral influence could be brought to bear in helping and giving support to social work educators often in extremely difficult political and economic circumstances.³¹¹

In May, the secretary-general distributed to the members of the committee material from three of us – notes she had taken in a personal interview with Dr Nyirenda and later shared with Dr Shawky, a letter from Dr Katz (executive director of CSWE in New York) which recommended specific procedures to add to the by-laws to deal with suspension or expulsion from the IASSW, and my own more comprehensive statement. On 22 June, Dr Shawky received a letter from Dr Pusic, which suggested the collection of specific data on the legal and the actual positions of the schools in South Africa in relation to the South African government. On 21 July Dr Shawky informed the secretary-general that he could not attend the board meeting at the end of July, but was glad Miss Jakobsson and Dr Katz would be there. He suggested the committee adopt Dr Pusic’s suggestions and start collecting information along the lines in his proposal, and then proceed along the lines suggested by Dr Katz.³¹² At the board meeting, the secretary-general requested an extension for the committee until the 1982 board meeting in Brighton, so that the committee could complete its work and come to a recommendation, which each member of the committee would have a chance to approve. The board approved an extension

311 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to A. Shawky, 31/3/81.

312 Letter, A. Shawky to Marguerite Mathieu, 21/7/81.

being granted to the committee until Brighton 'to prepare an integrated report'.
In January, 1982, I wrote to Dr Shawky:

I have read all the relevant materials relating to the work of our IASSW Committee and, as requested, am making some comments which might be of assistance to you in preparing a draft proposal for the Board.

We have been asked by the Board 'to determine whether, and if so, how, to strengthen and implement procedures called for by the constitution to deal with discrimination in member schools'.

1. Dr Katz, Dr Pusic, and I seem to agree on the need for a strengthening of procedures in the implementation of the constitution's by-law IVB. However:
 - I point out that no argued case was made to the Board for changing the existing procedures (in particular, those relating to the South African schools).
 - Clearly Dr Katz and I have in mind procedures for handling discrimination in any school or country, whereas Dr Pusic is only apparently talking about South Africa.
 - Dr Katz emphasises the opportunity for informal resolution.
 - The comment reported from Dr Nyirenda does not clearly support the need for strengthening procedures. It emphasises helping colleagues in difficult situations (a view, I think, shared by us all), argues against any sanctions, states that the South African situation is more clear-cut and therefore easier to deal with, and points out that the IASSW lacks power to be a 'watch-dog' on human rights.
2. While my suggestions perhaps take most seriously the idea that all member schools adhere to the aspirations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they can be seen as unrealistic, given the very limited staff and other resources of the IASSW. Dr Katz's recommendations are more modest in terms of involvement of resources and can be seen as potentially dealing with at least the most extreme and obvious discrimination situations.
3. The two sets of information suggested by Dr Pusic would appear to be necessary information for Dr Katz's proposed 'investigating committee of three' appointed by the President 'to gather facts and report conclusions' to the Board. It would seem to be necessary information to deal fairly with any member school accused of discrimination, not just a school in South Africa. If it has sufficient resources, the IASSW Secretariat could perhaps systematically and periodically collect reliable information on these broad matters from a number of countries known to have blatant violations of human rights. This general information would then expedite the work of an 'investigating committee' in the event of a formal complaint being made and acted upon in accordance with Dr Katz's proposed procedures. Such information would be helpful anyway if the IASSW is to be of assistance to member schools in particularly difficult moral and political circumstances.
4. The procedures proposed by Dr Katz would be better adopted as 'rules of procedures', rather than incorporated in the constitution. The

Secretary-General is obviously in favour generally of the IASSW developing 'rules of procedures', to be used in association with the constitution (see her Memorandum to our Committee, December, 1980).

I hope these comments are of some assistance to you in your integrating task.³¹³

At its meeting in Brighton in August, 1982, the board had to decide whether it needed to amend the by-laws or whether the present ones could accommodate the guidelines offered by the committee. I suggested: 1 What was needed was an affirmation on the application form of the requirements contained in the By-laws, Art. IV, Section 4, para. B. 2. We also needed something more effective than setting up a committee when a complaint came in. 3. All of us came from countries that practised discrimination of one form or another. We should not only be concerned with extreme cases. Vukani Nyirenda wondered if the school which was the subject of a complaint was the right target for our action. It was not the school which was at fault but the system within which it operated. We should be concerned to assist the school in dealing with the system. After discussion, the board decided that for the next two years, the president, in consultation with the executive committee, should be allowed to receive and consider any complaints coming under the relevant by-law. In doing so, the executive committee should take into consideration the guidelines proposed and the summary of the discussion at this meeting.³¹⁴

313 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to A. Shawky, 25/1/82.

314 Minutes, Meeting of the Board of Directors, IASSW, August 22, 1982, pp. 6-7.

Chapter 15

World Meetings 1980 – Hong Kong

In March, 1980, Ron Baker and I made a case to Professor Rex Vowels, UNSW acting vice-chancellor, for financial assistance to participate in meetings and world conferences in Hong Kong –

- 20th International Conference on Social Welfare, theme – ‘Social Development in Times of Economic Uncertainty’, July 16–22.
- Seminar on Social Work Research, sponsored by the IASSW, the ICSW, and the Board of Studies in Social Work, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, July 23.
- 20th International Congress of Schools of Social Work, sponsored by the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW), theme – ‘Conflicts in Contemporary Society: Issues for Social Work Education’, July 23–26.
- General Assembly of Schools of Social Work (biennial meeting of IASSW member schools).

For the 20th International Congress of Schools of Social Work, Professor Baker has been invited to prepare a paper and chair a 2-day discussion group on ‘Methods of Training for Conflict Situations: Innovative Teaching Methodologies’. In addition, he is a member of the Resources Development Committee of the IASSW, with responsibility for generating research projects of relevance to Australia and other countries in the South-East Asian Region, and identifying potential sources for them. This committee has world-wide representation. The biennial world conference of the IASSW provides an invaluable opportunity for the committee to discuss its work.

Our school is a member school of the IASSW and our attendance at the General Assembly of Schools will give us a rare opportunity to discuss with representatives from schools throughout the world, issues of common concern.

Professor Lawrence has been an active member of the Programme Committee for the 20th International Congress of Schools of Social Work, and in this capacity is expected by the IASSW to attend the Conference. He also needs to go to Hong Kong at this time in order to attend the meetings of the Board of Directors of the IASSW, being held on July 22 and 27. He has been an elected member of this

Board since 1974, and has made an active contribution by correspondence but because its meetings are usually held on the other side of the world has been only able to attend one previous Board meeting.

Apart from these various responsibilities connected with the IASSW and its Congress, we both would learn from, and make a contribution to the 20th ICSW and the Research Seminar. Only rarely are these international social welfare and social work conferences held in the South-East Asian region. Because of this, we believe that we in Australia should be making an especial effort to participate in them. Our attendance should not only be of benefit to us personally, but to the School, the University and more broadly to Australia's reputation in international social welfare and social work circles. ...

We will need to be away from Sydney from July 14 to July 27. The School's Second Session commences on July 21, but there is no difficulty in reorganising our teaching commitments for that week.

We estimated the cost for each of us to attend these conferences and meetings was \$1,143 – return air fare \$544; registration fees ICSW \$115, IASSW Congress \$72, Research seminar \$9, 13 nights of shared accommodation \$273, and of daily meals \$130.

In view of all the above, each of us would greatly appreciate a grant-in-aid from the University to attend these important conferences and meetings.³¹⁵

We were granted special overseas leave with pay and each received a grant-in-aid of \$300 from general University funds – on the understanding that if we received any substantial subsistence from any other source, the grant would need to be reviewed.³¹⁶

Ron Baker invited comment from colleagues in the school on the session he would be chairing at the IASSW Congress, and received a typically vigorous response from Martin Mowbray, arguing that left wing perspectives should be given serious attention in schools of social work. Often the class nature of society had been effectively denied in social work theory and practice. In the non-conservative literature there were various ideas for dealing with conflict, and the place of social work in conflict.³¹⁷

Hong Kong

Hong Kong Island became a British colony after the first Opium War (1839–42), with the Kowloon Peninsular being added in 1860, and the New Territories (under lease) in 1898. Hong Kong was under Japanese occupation 1941–5, but then the British resumed control. In 1997, it became the first Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, with a high degree of autonomy on all matters except foreign relations and military defence. Its highly developed free market capitalist service economy with low taxation could not be readily assimilated into the People's Republic. It was the

315 Letter, Ron Baker and R. J. Lawrence, to Rex Vowels, 18/3/80.

316 Letter, (Mrs) P. R. Robertson to R. J. Lawrence, 15/4/80.

317 Memo, Martin Mowbray to Ron Baker, 19/5/80.

third most important international financial centre, after London and New York City. It had one of the highest per capita incomes in the world, but also the highest income inequality among advanced economies. Over 90% of its population were ethnic Chinese, originating mainly from the neighbouring Canton province. In 1980, the population of 5 million lived and worked in ‘the world’s most vertical city’.

Flying in through the mountains past the incredibly high-rise city to its airport on the water’s edge of a deep natural harbour provided a dramatic introduction to Hong Kong. The vibrancy and stimulus of the place with its cultural mix of east and west, entertainments, and seemingly endless shops and shopping, was not my scene – perhaps a fun place to visit, but not for the likes of me to live if I could help it. ‘Rampant capitalism’ was a phrase which came to my mind, but we had the chance to learn at least something of its social service system. I was particularly impressed by the way it had handled the large numbers of refugees at different periods – from Vietnam, and earlier from mainland China.

Ron Baker and I shared a room in one of the recommended hotels, the Miramar. It was on the Kowloon Peninsula, roughly midway between the International Congress of Schools of Social Work conference centre at the Hong Kong Polytechnic (also in Kowloon) and the ICSW conference centre at City Hall, Edinburgh Place, on Hong Kong Island. Walking and using the excellent public transport system made it easy to get around in this very densely populated city, and to see some of the appalling living conditions as well as the material affluence on display.

15.1 20th International Conference on Social Welfare 16–22 July, 1980

According to the printed proceedings, 63 countries were represented at this social welfare conference. There were over 1,000 participants, but neither the total number or the numbers from each country were given in the proceedings. Some analysis of the level of participation from each country would have been helpful. A list of participants (as of 4 July, with additions to July 12), indicated USA 363, Brazil 60 (but very few from other Latin American countries), and 27 from Canada. About 90 came from European countries (France 33, UK 17, Netherlands 13, Germany 10, Sweden 10). Our Asian and Pacific region included 142 from the host Hong Kong, Taiwan 38, Japan 33, Philippines 31, Australia 32,³¹⁸ India 17, Indonesia 15, Thailand 15, and Singapore 13. Simultaneous interpretation into English, French and Spanish was provided in the main conference sessions and in some of the other meetings. Summaries were prepared for the general rapporteur from the French-, Spanish-, and Japanese-speaking discussion tables.

Under the conference theme, 'Social Development in Times of Economic Uncertainty', the program was designed to tackle three questions:

- Most industrialised countries have entered the 80's in a state of economic uncertainty – most less developed countries with little hope that their economies will improve. What is the nature and extent of these economic problems?
- Economic development and social development are mutually dependent. What impact have the world and national economic situations had on the most vulnerable members of society, the young, the old, the sick and the poor, for example? What effect have they had and are they having on national social policies and on international economic relationships?
- Given the current period of world economic uncertainty, what new strategies can ICSW and its affiliated bodies adopt to influence the direction of those systems that have an impact on social development?

Each of these was the topic at a plenary session in the concert hall at City Hall, with a main speaker followed by reactions from two discussants:

Topic 1

Speaker:

John F. Jones (chairman, Board of Studies in Social Work, Chinese University of Hong Kong), 'Hard Times and the Search for a Frugal Utopia'.

Discussants:

F. M. Phiri (executive member, Zambia Council for Social Development Zambia)

³¹⁸ 6 of us were social work educators – Ron Baker and John Lawrence (UNSW), Edna Chamberlain (University of Queensland), David Cox (University of Melbourne), Janet George (University of Sydney), and Frank Pavlin (University of WA). We all stayed on for the IASSW Congress, where we were joined by Rae Lindsay (University of WA) and Herb Bisno (La Trobe University).

E. T. Weaver (director, American Public Welfare Association, Washington, USA)

Topic 2

Speaker:

Andre Marco Montoro (senator, Brazil), 'Recent World Development and its Impact on the Poor in the Third World'.

Discussants:

N. Hinton (director, National Council for Voluntary Organisations, London, UK)

B. Prakash (professor, Tata Institute of Social Sciences Bombay, India)

Topic 3

Speaker:

William A. Dyson (executive director, The Vanier Institute of the Family, Ottawa, Canada), 'People are the Policy'.

Discussants:

D. Schaffer (Bamberg University, Federal Republic of Germany)

I. G. P. Kamayana (social affairs officer, Social Affairs Division, ESCAP)

In addition to the plenary addresses, a notable paper contributed by the recipient of the Rene Sand award, addressed topic 3 – Gradus Hendricks (director general for social development, Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Recreation, and Social Welfare, Netherlands), 'Getting Back to People: A Bid for a New Approach'. Hendricks had been a member of the ad hoc working group of independent persons requested to report on the social aspects of UN development:

The ad hoc group recognised that the social aspects of development should be viewed within the broad context of a unified approach to development and a new international economic order. At the same time, strong emphasis was placed on the promotion of a 'people-oriented development process' and on the idea of processes proceeding from the base upward...

The report of the group includes many practical recommendations for better coordination and cooperation among the main agencies of the UN responsible for social development policy. The report further urges that the work of the UN center in Vienna be more clearly defined and that it be given wider scope for field operations. In addition, the functioning of the Commission on Social Development should be improved for the third decade.

The ad hoc group also made recommendations for nongovernmental organisations – including, of course, the ICSW – which can contribute not only to the wide dissemination of ideas, but also to the implementations of resolutions and reports.³¹⁹

In four 2-hour discussion sessions, participants met at round tables to discuss the conference theme and sub-themes of the plenary sessions according to different areas of interest and need. Special attention was focused on the urban

319 Gradus Hendrick, 'Getting Back to People: A Bid for a New Approach', in *Social Development in Times of Economic Uncertainty*, Proceedings of the XXth International Conference on Social Welfare, Hong Kong, July 17–22, 1980, pp. 174–5.

and rural aspects of the issues under consideration. Emphasis was placed on the vulnerable groups and the least advantaged in various societies, as well as the emerging phenomenon of 'consumerism'. Each table was asked to consider three main questions in relation to its topic: What is the effect of economic uncertainty? What should be the objective guidelines and priorities for social development? What are the new strategies for action and what should ICSW and its membership do?

Each participant was allocated to one of a number of tables in each of 10 topics –

- The provision of housing within a liveable environment
- Work and employment opportunities for vulnerable groups – youth, women, handicapped
- Education of all people
- Health for all people
- Personal health care and care for special groups
- Personal social services for individuals, families and special groups
- Income security measures for the total population and for special sectors
- Integrative community services for special sectors – migrants, displaced persons, refugees ...
- The structure and organisation of the social welfare system
- Policy issues for social and economic development

Each of the 63 tables had an assigned discussion leader, and a helpful written introduction from the conference organisers suggesting aspects to be considered by the group, as well as some key initial questions in each of the topic areas. These table sessions were intended to be 'the single most important part of the Conference'. Frank Pavlin, John Dixon, and Edna Chamberlain were the three table leaders from Australia. All table discussion sessions were held at the Hilton Hotel, a 10-minute walk from the City Hall.

I was a member of the table 59J, led by Edna Chamberlain, one of the seven tables discussing 'Policy issues for social and economic development'. Our table of 17 participants consisted of people from Australia (2), Canada, Guam, Hong Kong (2), India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Nigeria, Sweden, USA (5), and United Nations in Vienna.³²⁰

Our initial discussion was well reported by Edna in these terms:

The first critical question addressed was the understanding of social development and its relationship with economic development. There was general agreement that development was a unified concept and that social, economic and political factors were linked, the crucial question being: What are relevant policies for developing human societies? Humanism is the central criterion for evaluating all development.

Within the cosmic framework provided by social development, social welfare is concerned with service systems specifically for disadvantaged groups. The

320 I already knew and had appreciated the work of two of them – Indian Dr Mukunda Rao from the UN social affairs office first, now in Vienna, and Dr Felice Perlmutter, who was an American social work professor at Temple University where she had developed one of the first programs in social work administration and was a strong advocate for social workers in management roles.

pragmatic view is that the social welfare sector has to present its case for human values in economic terms, that is, to show the contribution welfare programs can make to society as a whole in cost-benefit terms. This led to discussion about the nature of the welfare sector's task and its strength (power). It was argued that strategies for social development required multi-disciplinary involvements (economists, lawyers, health personnel, educators etc.) both for practical purposes and because the broad definition of social development necessitated such involvement.

One implication of this viewpoint is that the structure of ICSW should be reviewed in relation to the breadth of its representation or, at the very least, its linkages with other relevant international bodies concerned with development issues strengthened.

The two most pertinent policy issues touched upon relate to: (a) values and attitudes, and (b) resources.

- (a) Decisions by national governments are not necessarily made in relation to human values such as justice and equality. It is necessary to make clear who benefits. Choices have to be made between short-term (remedial) programs and long-term developmental ones. Moreover development requires measures which involve the people affected in improving their skills and assuming responsibility for their affairs.
- (b) In a situation of economic restriction or uncertainty the most general policy issue is how to maintain if not enhance the share of resources which goes to social development (as against for example, defence). While the first requisite is adequate resources, a second necessity is to use such resources as are available effectively. Selection of priorities depends on clear objectives. Again programs which move people towards self-dependence are indicated both for pragmatic reasons and because the development of human beings requires it.

These issues were raised in our subsequent discussion:

1. Where should emphasis be placed? Should it be on short-term, remedial measures or upon long-term planning for prevention and development?
 - (a) In developing answers and strategies, there is need to examine goals and values, and determine what kinds of programs will move us towards goals.
 - (b) There is much desirability for political debate to continue. The level of informed opinion about the impact of social legislation needs to be enhanced. While the current trend toward program evaluation in some countries is desirable, we do not wish to recommend that we want a new kind of power group, an elitist expertise, telling people what to do. The expert's role should be to propose alternatives and choices.
 - (c) Restraints in political process – annual budgets, change of governments.
2. How pragmatic should we be? In most countries economic development is given high priority and is deemed more important than other development. Is it not pragmatic to present our arguments for social development in economic terms? Should we play their game?
3. Human development in social terms and economic terms should proceed along parallel lines, not hierarchical lines. Move away from a residual view to

- one which emphasises interdependence.
4. Requirement for interdisciplinary approaches to development, based on a philosophy of collective humanism.
 5. In an interdisciplinary context, what is the special contribution of social welfare?
 - (a) Social welfare has unique knowledge of role and role performance of individual and groups in social structures.
 - (b) Social welfare personnel can make contribution to specific strategies because of knowledge of resources and how they can be networked to meet need.
 - (c) Social welfare personnel can contribute expertise to program design and implementation.
 6. In time of limited resources, how should social welfare adapt?
 - (a) At such times, there is strong tendency to turn inward and protect boundaries, rather than link with others to provide more integrated services. Therefore, there is need to remain open, constructive.
 - (b) Rethink the situation – could programs be designed or structured more efficiently and effectively?’
 - (c) Necessary for social welfare organisations to continue to reaffirm their values, and continue to make arguments for them.
 7. What should be the contribution to ICSW?
 - (a) A structural weakness of ICSW is its major concern with residual programs. Needs greater emphasis on prevention and development.
 - (b) Structural alterations in ICSW are required to link us, through coalitions, with other groups with similar interests. Need more interdisciplinary input, and coalitions that will provide access to power and influence.
 8. The major concern in development is the maximisation of human potential which requires
 - (a) developmental provisions
 - (b) participation
 - (c) resources development and utilisation

In addition to the discussion tables, participants could focus on specific subjects and issues related to the main theme by attending three special workshops, and two forums amongst the eight on offer. The workshop topics were: ‘Social Welfare in Hong Kong’, ‘Refugees in South East Asia’, and ‘Inter-Country Adoption’.³²¹ The forums, hosted by various international organisations, concentrated on: ‘The Role of Voluntary Agencies including National Councils in Influencing the Social Development in the Country’(ICSW host), ‘Services for the Disabled in Changing Economies’(Council of World Organisations

321 Each of these produced a paper in the conference proceedings. For the first workshop Harold Ho (senior lecturer in social work, the Chinese University of Hong Kong) provided an overview of social welfare development in Hong Kong. He was chairman of the unwieldy conference program committee of 35 people from around the world. All conference participants were given a book *Social Welfare in Hong Kong*, prepared by the HK organising committee for the conference, with eleven contributors and an editorial committee chaired by Nelson Chow. My friend Peter Hodge (professor and head, Department of Social Work, University of Hong Kong), whom I had got to know in various regional activities together, opened the book with an article on ‘Social Planning Models and Their Application’.

Interested in the Handicapped), 'Role of Red Cross in Social Development in 1980 – Red Cross Contribution to Community Welfare' (League of Red Cross Societies), 'Economic Security for the Elderly During Hard Times' (IFA),³²² 'Family Planning: A New Responsibility in Social Welfare' (International Planned Parenthood Federation), 'Consequences of Economic Uncertainty for Migrants and their Families' (International Social Service), and 'Women in Development' (YWCA).

My American social work colleague Jim Dumpson was an outstanding contributor to the conference. He prepared what ICSW president described as a 'remarkable document', a basic working document for the world conference. It provided a summarised overview of issues related to the conference theme, based on reports from the five regional rapporteurs appointed to synthesise country reports from their regions.³²³ Then as general rapporteur of the conference, with the assistance of a working party of five 'experts in the field of social development', he distilled a summary and review of the conference from the mass of material channelled to them. This was in four parts: 1. A brief restatement of the most significant findings in the overview of the world social situation as reported in the working document for the conference. 2. Perspectives and insights presented in the three plenary sessions and in the statement at the Rene Sand award ceremony. 3. A summary of the issues, findings and general recommendations of the table discussions. 4. A set of recommendations made as action strategies specifically for ICSW and its national committees.³²⁴

The overview of findings in the working document:

1. While economic and social development are mutually dependent, both industrialised and less developed countries are in the midst of economic stagnation. A careful choice and conscious trade-off among social welfare programs will need to be made. The question will arise and must be answered: What is desirable and what is affordable?
2. In all countries, those technologically developed and those less developed, a primary issue arises as to the availability and distribution of resources: Who gets what and how?
3. Social development in the context of individual, or organisational, and societal change must be viewed in relation to industrially developed and developing nations.
4. However social development is defined, whether in micro or macro terms, its goal and substance are the welfare of people, as determined by the people themselves, and the consequent creation or alteration of institutions so as to create and improve the capacity of people to meet human need

322 Charlotte Nusberg's opening paper at the forum was 'Economic Security for the Elderly During Hard Times in the Industrialised Countries'. It was a special pleasure to meet up again with her and Bill Kerrigan from the IFA, after getting to know them at the IFA meetings in Israel in 1978.

323 James R. Dumpson, 'Conference Working Document', in *Social Development in Times of Economic Uncertainty*, Proceedings of the XXth International Conference on Social Welfare, Hong Kong, July 18–22, 1980, Columbia University Press, New York, 1981, pp. 1–33.

324 James R. Dumpson, 'Summary and Review of the XXth International Conference on Social Welfare', in *Conference Proceedings*, pp. 182–97.

and to improve the quality of human relationships between people and their societal institutions.

5. Welfare and happiness cannot be measured by levels of income. Levels of social justice and equity are essential components in determining human well-being.
6. In a period of economic uncertainty such as is likely to characterise over half of the 1980s the challenge of improving the inherent capacity of people to realise their full potential and to alter societal institutions that block achievement of this goal may be all but overwhelming. That it be achieved, however, is crucial for those who are already at risk, who live near or at the poverty level in towns and villages in all areas of the world.

All three plenary session speakers, as well as the recipient of the Rene Sand award, did not see the current world economic difficulties as 'the critical variable in furthering social development'. Dire poverty, widespread underdevelopment, and economic inequalities remained – even in the 'good times'. William Dyson of Canada had 'placed the industrial culture of Western industrialised nations totally in question. He did not see either economic or political adjustment as the road to another and better development, so long as the belief and attitude structures remained unchanged. ... his view expanded on a theme also noted in the European report.' Gradus Hendriks of the Netherlands, winner of the Rene Sand Award, held a similar view. Accepting the need for a new international order, he placed the primary road to development squarely on a need for 'getting back to the people'.

Six ICSW-specific recommendations came from several groups keen to develop program and action strategies by the ICSW through its national committees. James Dumpson observed that these recommendations, not unlike those that concluded the reports of the table discussions, required clarification as to intent and means.

1. The ICSW should serve as a clearinghouse for information and social services for its national committees and through them to its total world membership.
2. The ICSW should seek to influence the development of social policy in countries in which the ICSW is represented by its national committees. In this effort, the ICSW should seek to have social welfare become one of the top priorities in each of the countries.
3. It is recommended that there be a systematic distribution of ICSW reports to international and intergovernmental bodies as well as a reverse provision of intergovernmental reports to ICSW organisations.
4. The ICSW should provide leadership in the development of a series of specialised standards for the care, support, and/or protection of the most vulnerable groups in our society – the elderly, the disabled, displaced persons, women and children, ethnic minorities, and those living in special economic or geographic circumstances.
5. The ICSW should develop both educational materials suitable for training policy-makers and materials to guide consumers in the use of a variety of community facilities as well as for participation in community planning.

6. The ICSW should facilitate the exchange of manpower and assist in providing a network of personnel equipped with the knowledge and skills for working at a variety of levels in social development, particularly in industrially developing and underdeveloped countries. A closer working relationship with the IASSW and the ICSW is clearly indicated.

Dumpson noted:

... no reference was made to the structural arrangements required in terms of the relation of the responsibility of ICSW headquarters in Vienna for the central coordination required in a unitary concept of the ICSW as was implied when each of these recommendations was submitted. Further, no reference was made to resource development and allocation and program evaluation, so essential for assuring the implementation and effectiveness of the recommendations.

At the end of his summary and review of the conference, James Dumpson returned to 'a priority subject for all of us in this conference', the 16-odd million refugees and displaced persons in the world, the most vulnerable people in the world's population:

No country, particularly those with material abundance, notwithstanding times of economic uncertainty, can justifiably renounce by word or action its economic and moral responsibility for the resettlement and placement of the world's refugees.

My social work colleague Werner Boehm (director, Center for International and Comparative Social Welfare, Rutgers University), for the second time was responsible for the report of the US national committee of ICSW for a biennial conference. He subsequently sent me an inscribed copy of his report for the Hong Kong social welfare conference, asking for my comments on it. In Hong Kong, Werner discussed with me his plans to visit Australia in 1981, a visit which led to me going to Rutgers for at least part of my sabbatical leave in 1983.³²⁵ Both Dan Saunders (University of Hawaii) and Terry Hokenstad (Case Western Reserve University) sounded me out during the Hong Kong meetings about spending some of my sabbatical leave in 1983 in their respective schools where they were deans, after I discontinued being head of school at UNSW at the end of 1982.

³²⁵ See Vol. 4, pp. 51–88.

15.2 IASSW Board of Directors

We met in the conference room, Hong Kong Polytechnic throughout the day of Tuesday, 22 July, 1980, and in the morning of Sunday, 27 July. It has already been noted that the board, on the recommendation of the executive, decided in Hong Kong to appoint a small corresponding group of us to advise it on the implementation of the non-discrimination criterion in the IASSW constitution. I happened to be sitting beside Herman Stein when the issue was being discussed yet again, and I can remember him quietly exploding to me with 'bloody liar' when Professor Rooney from South Africa was speaking. It obviously continued to be a highly contentious emotional issue. Herman was attending his last board meeting as the immediate past president of the association.

A postal ballot for six positions on the board was held prior to the meeting and the result announced at the general assembly. The nominating committee had proposed nine suitable candidates and the need for a ballot was welcomed. Dr Heinrich Schiller was elected the new president. He was president of the Protestant School of Social Work, Nuremburg, Germany, had been active in the ICSW, IFSW and the IASSW, and had taken a special interest in improving the financial situation of the IASSW. Dr Seno Cornely, was a new vice-president. He was president of the Latin American Association of Schools of Social Work and had been representative of this association on the board. The new members at large were Dudley Dissanake (director, Sri Lanka School of Social Work), Abram Doron (chairman, Israeli Association of Schools of Social Work, and Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Jerusalem), Harriet Jakobsson (Örebro University, Sweden; on leave with the UNHCR in Cambodia), and Eugen Pusic (Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb, Yugoslavia; former ICSW president).

'Social Work' and/or 'Social Development'?

Another personal memory from the board meeting was being involved in a discussion over lunch about the wisdom of changing the name of the association to incorporate 'social development' in its title, as Katherine Kendall had just raised informally at the board meeting.³²⁶ A small Inter-University Consortium on International Social Development (IUCISD) had been established in 1977, and had held its first international conference in Hong Kong in 1980, just prior to the main global social work and social welfare meetings. It seemed to threaten to divert to it people and schools who were much needed in the main-stream organisations. The original initiative, in the early 1970s, came from younger US social work educators in six mid-western universities, who felt they did not have sufficient influence inside the established international

³²⁶ It was not on the agenda and did not appear in the minutes.

social work and social welfare bodies.³²⁷

As my account of various social work and social welfare activities in the 1970s, has indicated, a social development framework was said to be important, not only for developing countries but also for any country. I thought, however, that it would be a mistake not to retain ‘social work’ as the description of the professional work we were engaged in. This was now the generally accepted term for what we were engaged in, internationally and in many countries of the world, thanks to the work of people like Katherine Kendall and Eileen Younghusband, and a multitude of others. We had a responsibility to make and keep the concept socially progressive and relevant to the times. I can recall Eileen Younghusband leaning across the table and warmly shaking my hand, saying ‘I couldn’t agree more’.

I saw the idea of ‘a school of social development’ as a pretentious, and rather muddled concept. If it described a professional social work school – or a professional school of any kind worthy of the name, what were the knowledge, values and skills, which characterised the profession in question, and what were its professional bodies responsible for the organisation and development of its practice? If, alternatively, ‘social development’ described a subject area of social science, the main task was to develop reliable knowledge about a society’s social policy and its administration, as had occurred in Britain under the outstanding leadership of Richard Titmuss. This produced knowledge and insight into how a society was organised to achieve its social purposes. This was my own main teaching area, and whatever its social reform and social work origins in Britain, I saw it as best developed autonomously as a subject in its own right, separate from professional disciplines or citizen groups who would use this knowledge for their own various ends. It was obviously not synonymous with social work practice. The terms ‘social policy’, ‘social welfare’ and ‘social development’ were often now being used interchangeably; each could be descriptive and/or prescriptive.

The Seminar on Social Work Research, 23 July

As in Jerusalem, a social work research seminar immediately preceded the IASSW Congress. The host was the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In view of the expressed interests of seminar participants, the discussion groups were: social service delivery and citizen participation; poverty and income inequality; planning research and evaluation; and social work education and training. It was a full day with individual papers followed by group discussions, group

327 In October 1983, Terry Hokenstad told me the social development consortium was a bunch of young Turks in the US who felt excluded and wanted some of the action in the international social welfare arena. The ICSW was very narrow and conservative. The US International Committee (of the ICSW) had only six members, but now had 25. Terry was chairman of the CSWE International Committee. Dan Saunders (elected president of IUCISD in 1981) and others, were suspicious of these developments. Herman Stein had done nothing to reach out; he only operated with people who accepted his frame of reference. Katherine Kendall was more open than others. See: Frank B. Raymond and Charles Cowger, ‘International Consortium for Social Development (ICSD), in Lynn Healy and Rosemary J. Link (eds), *Handbook of International Social Work: Human Rights, Development, and the Global Profession*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2012, pp. 292–6.

reports and open discussion. A list of participants registered by 26 June, showed Australia (5), Canada (3), Germany (2), Hong Kong (6), India (1), Indonesia (3), Israel (1), Philippines (1), Singapore (1), South Africa (1), Sweden (2), Switzerland (1), Thailand (1), Uganda (1), UK (2), and USA (7), with 6 student members.

15.3 20th International Congress of Schools of Social Work 23–26 July, 1980

The 181 participants came from 35 countries – Australia (8), Canada (11), Chile (1), Egypt (2), Finland (1), Greece (2), Germany (8), Guam (6), Hong Kong (46), India (7), Indonesia (4), Ireland (1), Israel (2), Japan (4), Korea (2), Malaysia (1), Netherlands (3), New Zealand (1), Nigeria (1), Norway (1), Pakistan (2), Papua-New Guinea (1), Philippines (6), Puerto Rico (1), Singapore (1), South Africa (2), Sweden (8), Switzerland (4), Thailand (1), Uganda (1), UK (8), USA (32), Zambia (1) and Zimbabwe (2), and from 7 international bodies.

The Congress was sponsored by the five schools of social work in Hong Kong, and was held at the Hong Kong Polytechnic, Hung Hom, Kowloon. Its school had originated in 1973 as the Institute for Social Work Training under the Hong Kong government Social Welfare Department. On moving to the Polytechnic in 1977, it became the School of Social Work. It currently offered a 2-year diploma course in social work and a 1-year certificate in child care. A degree course in social work was being planned to meet the expressed manpower needs of local, public and private agencies in Hong Kong.³²⁸

As already indicated, my Filipino colleague Esther Vilorio had had the unenviable responsibility of chairing the Congress Program Committee, in which I had been an active contributor. The congress theme was 'Conflicts in Contemporary Society: Issues in Social Work Education'. It was intended to address how well social work education prepared social workers to promote as well as deal with conflict in their professional interventions.

The Opening Plenary Address, Wednesday, 23 July

The opening plenary session, with the subject 'Social Conflicts and Contemporary Society: Perspectives for Social Work Education', was held in the concert hall, City Hall. (All other congress sessions were at the Hong Kong Polytechnic in Kowloon.) The plenary speaker, Mrs Nahau K. Rooney, concentrated on Papua-New Guinea, in a paper titled 'Changes and Conflicts in Contemporary Papua New Guinea Society – Perspective for Social Work Education'. A social work graduate of University of Papua-New Guinea,³²⁹ she was the minister for decentralisation in the National Parliament of Papua-New Guinea. An official reception in the exhibition hall at City Hall, followed this opening plenary session.

In her paper, Mrs Rooney first provided a brief description of the traditional village society of her people –

... a self-reliant finely balanced social system suddenly ... strained by the arrival of the Australian Colonialists in Papua and the Germans in New Guinea at the end of the last century.

After the first World War the Australians took over from the Germans and in

³²⁸ *Hong Kong Polytechnic School of Social Work 1979/80*, Handbook.

³²⁹ This was the course established by Dr Maev O'Collins, originally from Melbourne who had her doctorate from Columbia University in New York.

1946 following a short period as a colony of Japan and then America, the Australians formed a single administrative unit of Papua New Guinea.

In one sense we were blessed that the colonial period did not really affect our traditional village structure as much as it did in other countries. When we achieved our National Independence on 16th September, 1975, most of our people and even those few of us who are educated, still had close and meaningful connections with village life. At Independence we were not a dispossessed people faced with problems of personal and cultural identity.

Papua New Guinea currently had a population of nearly 4 million people, speaking more than 700 languages, and living on 'hundreds of islands and thousands of high rugged mountains'.

We are a nation of many cultures, with different clans, tribes and Provinces having their own ways of doing things – ... a nation with more than 80% of its people firmly attached to their traditional and ancestral land. ...

But to me and my fellow countrymen and women, Papua New Guinea is a life-time challenge and commitment, as we steadily grow from a collection of small isolated villages and hamlets into a modern nation in the world community.

We are ambitious. We want education and modern literacy. We want better health and we wish to enjoy the benefits of modern science and technology. We are in this way faced with the problem of establishing a national economy and at the same time building the required manpower resources needed to deliver the demanding goods and services as well as taking care not to alienate our people from their land and heritage. ... a 'conflicting demand'. ...

Somewhere there is a balance. It is the job and responsibility of all educated Papua New Guineans who have the advantage of the Western education and are still part of the traditional Papua New Guinea society today, to search and interpret the values and customs of our traditional societies so that they can be written in the modern form of communication.

It is important that they do not just transplant the Western institutions and ideas and accept them as they are without assessing their suitability and relevance. It is this balance that we must search for.

Mrs Rooney then gave a graphic account of her own experience of changes and conflict in Papua New Guinea since graduating 6 years ago with a 4-year social work degree at the university – her learning and encouragement from the village elders, communities' knowledge of their own needs, the impact on traditional communal and exchange values of labour recruiting and resettlement connected with large economic projects, and of people moving from rural areas to urban centres, the breakdown of the extended family system, people not having a say and being told what to do by outside officials and 'consultants'. What effect did these changes have on the various institutions and elements of the traditional societies and how was the society coping with these changes?

Papua New Guinea was a very democratic country:

We believe in the ideals that Government should be directly related to people's needs and aspirations and that through the elected representatives the ordinary people should have a direct say in policy formation and national and local

decision making. However, as in other countries these ideals are difficult to put into meaningful practice.

About one-fifth of the 109 parliamentarians had some tertiary education, but the majority had less than two years of secondary education. Their survival depended on what they could do for their local electorate, which inevitably was sometimes in conflict with the interest of the nation. Senior public servants, the principal policy advisors to the Government, were not accountable for their failure to produce results, and were often alienated from their origins by many years of education in a Western environment. The problem in Papua New Guinea was doubled because of the continual reliance on short-term foreigners for technical and expert advice at the middle management level, where many professions were located. The short-term nature of the elected members made it possible for the bureaucracy to continue to be in control. One of the major conflicts was open confrontation between a minister and a departmental head. The roles of each needed to be understood.

Language communication was another major situation of difficulty and conflict. Although Tok Pisin and Motu were encouraged, there was no policy on the national language. English was used as the official language and was the language of instruction for the 50% of school-age children who attended school. The majority of elected members in the parliament could not comprehend or read the massive reports and documents presented to parliament – yet were expected to make sound and responsible decisions. Policy decisions interpreted by provincial representatives or field officers were no longer comprehensible at the village level.

The system of 20 provincial governments (administrative units and part of the national government) had improved communication between the people and government, despite the criticisms of being over-governed, and the expense, but national leaders and provincial leaders needed understanding and cooperation.

Throughout all levels of Government communication between people and an understanding of why public servants, politicians at all levels and village people act the way they do, are essential ingredients in a well-balanced society.

Knowing the political system and the administrative structure was the key to effective implementation. Social workers in particular had the benefit of a training which made them aware of the human problems faced by those they worked with. To be most effective they must strive to understand the system they worked in. 'It is only by knowing the system and the personalities can effective action be accelerated through to the villages'. Mrs Rooney warned against indecision – 'More than half of our social problems are caused by being indecisive and being fearful of the consequences of our decisions'.

Finally, the speaker observed that social work education must aim to create a well-balanced citizen who will be going out to work in an environment full of conflicts and contradictions.

We cannot afford to be specialised and become narrow in our outlook. Too much emphasis in the past has been on the needs and problems of the community and

less time is devoted to the understanding of the role of the Departments, organisations, individuals and profession that claim to work for the people. ...

A Papuan New Guinean social worker must be everything – He must be able to give legal or business advice and at the same time help resolve a family or community problem, and most of all he must be an educator. He must be able to interpret the community needs and write it in such a way that it is acceptable by the language of the system.

... having education in developing countries is a privilege – and therefore it is the responsibility of those privileged few to share the benefits and to further reach those who have not got the opportunity.

The Second Plenary Session, Discussion Groups

The second plenary session was chaired by Ho Kam Fai (senior lecturer in social work, the Chinese University of Hong Kong), a member of the Hong Kong Legislative Council. The subject ‘Social Conflicts and Social Work Education: Strategies for Intervention’ was considered by a panel of members from India, London (formerly Northern Island), Zambia, and Venezuela. For the rest of the day and during the morning of the following day, participants explored 11 subject areas, in small groups with designated leaders:

- Social conflicts in relation to minorities – leader: Dan Sanders (USA)
- Social conflicts in relation to sex discrimination
- Social conflicts in relation to racial discrimination – leader: Peter Hodge (Hong Kong)
- Social conflicts in relation to authoritarian rule – leader: P. D. Kulkarni (India)
- Social conflicts in relation to poverty – leader: Abdelmonem Shawkey (Egypt)
- Social conflicts in relation to refugees – leader: Harriet Jakobsson (Sweden)
- Value conflicts and their implications for social work education in the 80s – leader: Herb Bisno (Australia)
- Tasks for social work education: problems of change: challenges to curriculum planning – Friedrich W. Siebel (Federal Republic of Germany)
- Methods of Training for Conflict Situations: innovative teaching methodologies – leader: Ron Baker (Australia)
- Linking education and practice perspectives in the preparation of practitioners for conflict management – leader: Vera Mehta (India)
- Research in social conflicts and implications for social work education – Angelina C. Almanzor (ESCAP, Bangkok)

I chose the group led by Herb Bisno, because I was particularly interested in the topic anyway, but also because I knew Herb shared my special interest in value analysis and had done a lot of work in the area. We were a rather large group of 29, with at least some cultural diversity – USA (7), Australia (3), Switzerland – French speaking (1), Hong Kong (6), Guam (1), Uganda (1), Korea (1), Germany (2), Japan (1), Ireland (1), Zambia (1), Sweden (1), United Kingdom (1), Canada (1), and Philippines (1). Herb Bisno’s systematic discussion guide was of great assistance. Briefly, it was in five parts:

1. A prospective inventory of value conflicts confronting social workers in the 80s.
2. Characteristics, types and sources of values; and types of value conflict – from differing belief systems, from conflicting interests/needs/desires, from differing experiences and membership/reference groups, from different priorities, from means/ends conceptions.
3. Some Key Issues – cross-cultural similarities and differences; social indicators and values; social policy and value diversity; the profession, the organisation and the society – values in conflict?; functions of social workers in helping relationships in regard to values; deviance, values and social work practice; value conflicts in inter-occupational and team relationships; selected value dichotomies.
4. Value conflicts in social work: stimulation and resolution of conflict – alternative modes of coping with conflict.
5. The implications of value conflicts for social work education in the 80s – curriculum content and organisation, modes of instruction, student admissions, and emigré professionals.

ARASWE

Business meetings of the various regional associations were held in the evening of Thursday, 24 July. 33 of us attended the fifth general body meeting of ARASWE – Australia (5), Hong Kong (5), India (6), Japan (4), Korea (1), Papua New Guinea (1), Philippines ((5), Sri Lanka (1), Thailand (1), USA (1), a couple of 'friends of ARASWE' (David Drucker and Dan Sanders), and Robin Huws Jones (IASSW president). Professor Esther Vioria (University of the Philippines) was now the president, having served as secretary for five years with Dr Armaity Desai as president. Dr Nelson Chow (the Chinese University of Hong Kong) was now secretary, and professor Peter Hodge (University of Hong Kong) was now treasurer and the organisation would now be located in Hong Kong. Dr David Cox (University of Melbourne) had replaced Louise Arnold as an Australian on the executive board. The meeting admitted AASWE as a voting member on the executive board, for the constitution allowed for teachers from member schools to form a group and elect a representative. Dan Sanders urged schools in the Pacific to be included as ARASWE members.³³⁰

Friday afternoon was devoted to five concurrent regional meetings – Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe, Latin America, and North America. Each meeting was asked to consider the implications of the congress theme for its region, assisted by a series of questions suggested by the organisers. Did social work have a major involvement in various areas of actual or potential conflict – conflicts between cultural groups, socio-economic groups, age groups, occupational groups, primary and secondary groups, geographical areas, different levels of government, government and non-government instrumentalities? What was the nature of the involvement? What were the main determinants? Was the

³³⁰ Minutes, Fifth General Body Meeting, ARASWE. Hong Kong Polytechnic, 24 July, 1980.

professional education provided relevant? Should social work roles in the conflict area be of a different nature in your country? What would be the implications for the educational programs of the schools of social work? It was, of course, highly ambitious, but people's thinking was being challenged and hopefully opened up by beginning to think systematically about these questions.

The Third Plenary Session, Saturday 26 July

In his valedictory address to the final plenary session, Robin Huws Jones (IASSW president, 1976–80) acknowledged the exceptional work of his presidential predecessors – Rene Sand, Jan de Jongh, Eileen Youngusband and Herman Stein, and the devoted work of the changing board and staff. He had known them all, and had worked closely with them, except for Rene Sand. In addition to the 'normal' stresses of an international body, the IASSW in 1976 faced its coming Golden Jubilee, the change of secretary-general, the anxious search for headquarters, and 'a gravely altered financial situation'. As semi-retired from full-time work, Robin Huws Jones had been able to tackle what was needed from the IASSW president at this juncture.³³¹

He had begun in 'what we now call social work' about 1930 and had become a part-time teacher in the department of social science at Liverpool University in 1937. Although the 30s were a decade of stark depression, looking back over those 50 years, he could not recall a time that 'seemed more discouraging for social work and social work education, nationally and internationally, than today'. Despite the obvious growth and development of social work and social work education over the years, it felt as if 'we are limping along, standing still or almost going backwards'. Although this was partly illusory,

We must recognise that there is, on the threshold of the 80s, a new and threatening climate with the severe and still worsening economic recession, a keener awareness of the world's shortages of essential commodities coupled with the demand that we must grow with the population explosions that are inevitable for several decades at least; there has been a decline in the more liberal attitudes that go along with social work, and above all there are the clouds that hang menacingly over international relations.

There is real justification for discouragement and some, including colleagues and

331 Robin Huws Jones was born in a north Welsh village in 1909. He lived in Liverpool, left school at 15, worked at a YMCA centre near Liverpool University and studied for a London University external degree in economics and sociology (graduated 1934), obtaining a master's degree from Liverpool University (1937), lectured in its Social Science Department until 1939, and was extra-mural tutor for Oxford University, based in Lincoln, until 1947. He served as director of social sciences courses at University College, Swansea, including a UN course for people from developing countries headed for senior university or government positions, 1948–61; was first principal, National Institute for Social Work Training (NISWT), 1961–72, a staff college to train the trainers of local social service staff, recommended by the ministry of health working party chaired by Eileen Youngusband, (Huws Jones was vice-chairman); and finally, was associate director and then consultant, to the Joseph Rowntree Memorial Trust, 1972–78. According to Peter Barclay, he was one of the most active members of the 1968 Seebomh Committee which gave birth to the new local social services departments in 1971. As principal of the NISWT, he was 'at the height of his influence, a smiling, quietly-spoken manipulator, who energy, charm and persuasiveness it was hard to resist'. Peter Barclay, 'Obituary: Robin Huws Jones', *The Guardian*, Monday 9 July, 2001.

those who claimed to be our supporters, and who rarely criticised in the buoyant days, have recently attacked social work and social work education, making no allowance for the youth of the profession.

There was a danger in not acknowledging what social work had achieved. 'If social work did not exist, we would have to invent it – instantly'.

Social work aims to help with human needs that are not, or are not wholly, covered by the other helping professions, such as medicine, law, religion, politics, or by good neighbours.

Ideally ... social work and social work educators aim to discover how to help systematically, imaginatively and effectively.

A truly generic, realistically limited social work would be seen to include 'the classic methods *and* new methods and also, without any doubt about it, social administration, social planning and research'.

Robin Huws Jones referred to a number of problems which his successors would have to continue to grapple with:

- How to support social work colleagues working in countries with totalitarian or quasi-totalitarian regimes? 'Social work should not tolerate the denial of human rights to some or all the people'.
- The danger when any profession allowed itself to become the agent of one political party. 'We have to take the political dimension into account, but social work and social work education should not become a political tool'.
- The criticism that 'social work and social work educators go in for fashions in a big way; at one time case work, or the dynamics of small groups, or may be community, and today perhaps behaviour modification, Gestalt theory or social action'. 'If there are professions that are not touched by enthusiasms for new theories, I suspect they are moribund'. Students should be encouraged to welcome new fashions but also to subject them to critical scrutiny because they are fashionable – asking what evidence there is to support the claims of new dogmas.
- The almost opposite criticism that social work educators have failed to give a lead to the profession in recognising new problems, and have been indifferent or hostile to new approaches. 'We are all conservative in this sense, and none more than those who were once pioneers or revolutionaries, and think they still are'. Examples where social work education had been 'laggard or at least patchy' included 'refugees, migrant workers, family limitation in relation to family welfare, the social implications of the increasing survival of handicapped people, the recurrent world calamities' and the very old especially in western countries.
- The need for more educational resources going into continuing education in its various forms, if the profession is to be alert to new problems and new methods.
- The place of prevention in social work and education for social work. 'Everyone talks about it but no-one does anything about it'. ... 'in the history of all the helping professions relief comes first, then attention is paid to ways of helping people recover, and only later does prevention

receive concentrated attention'. Research in social work was beginning to increase our understanding of individuals and groups particularly at risk, the especially vulnerable, but 'even when we can predict reliably we may still have to learn how to prevent, and there is the side effect that prediction may sometimes be self-fulfilling'.

- Sharp value conflicts amongst colleagues, some considering that social work and education should concentrate on changing social circumstances, altering the environment or changing the economic or political system, others that it should concentrate on helping people under stress to cope better with the aid of appropriate additional resources. 'The real argument should be about emphasis and not about whether the profession should be exclusively concerned with one or the other'. Also, 'social agencies cannot seriously undertake preventive work, with all the extra work and the risks that this must involve, unless they have (additional) resources'. 'We need measured evidence to test our current theories and our personal hunches about prevention.'
- Research should become an integral part of future social work just the same as the growth of the scientific spirit in medicine had led to a new evidence-based order in medicine. It was especially needed in connection with the study of effectiveness, now almost a growth industry. Professor William Reid of Chicago had recently concluded a paper examining studies of social work effectiveness, by saying: 'the weight of recent evidence should give pause to our detractors, uplift our spirits, and above all provide added justification for our existence!' Research findings had to be utilised, not ignored.
- The IASSW itself will also be an invariable theme in future congresses.

The Association as it exists today is the slow creation of women and men in many continents who, for more than 50 years, have given time, effort and hard thought, and made material sacrifices, to create a vehicle for social work educators to educate one another and, hopefully and with due humility, to help those countries that are starting education in social work, or seeking new direction.

Would it be possible to maintain a small but independent full-time secretariat equipped to meet the increasing expectations of the membership? At present schools contributed only one-fifth of the very modest budget of the association. The arguments for active geographical regional bodies were self-evident and overwhelming, and the achievements of the Asian Region in particular were encouraging, but somehow IASSW had to find a way of promoting regionalism so that it strengthens rather than weakens the central international body. Every international body had special problems of communication and participation.

It is not easy for the members to meet one another with continuity; it is hard to deal with business by correspondence; people cannot get to know one another when meetings are infrequent and when there are language barriers. The remarkable thing is that in spite of these impediments, the Association has grown steadily and healthily.

In conclusion, Robin Huws Jones made a plea for help in keeping schools in active membership, for encouraging other schools to apply for membership, and for persuading faculty in one's own school to become individual associates. Why should schools and individuals give their support?

The IASSW is needed because it stimulates and shares new ideas; it encourages standards that are both high and flexible; it provides a coherence about social work education that commands attention in international bodies and also in national bodies. ... the existence of an international body like this can especially help the weaker and the needier and if that argument does not compel our support, then ought we to be in social work?

World Meeting 1980 – Hong Kong



Ron Baker – Hong Kong Harbour



Boats on Harbour and huge apartment blocks



Plane soon after take-off from Hong Kong Airport



Older, colonial building – square in Hong Kong



Spectacular view from mountain – Hong Kong



*Robin Huws Jones, IASSW
President (1976–80)*

Chapter 16

IASSW – Revised Fees, Pressing Issues

Revised IASSW Membership Dues

At the Hong Kong meetings, the board and the General Assembly finally adopted a revised membership dues scale with an overwhelming majority. It was long overdue. (The last revision was in 1972.). The social work school at UNSW was happy to pay at the highest rate under the new scale – \$250. This was obviously a very modest contribution from an affluent country to keep our world body functioning. I thought we, and particularly the schools in the USA should have been paying much more. However, IASSW treasurer, Terry Hokenstad, feared a drop-off of USA members if it went higher. I recognised that all schools of social work were, perhaps inevitably, constantly under financial pressure, because there seemed to be so much more that might be done with more financial resources. But for schools in countries like the USA and Australia, the revised due was still at the petty cash level of their budgets – suggesting tokenism rather than serious commitment to international social work.

Pressing Issues

In notifying our school of the due increase, Marguerite Mathieu invited our comments on an enclosed statement of issues which the IASSW recognised as especially pressing. 'With necessary resources, new action or research projects could be undertaken.'

1. Comparative Studies of Social Work Education.
2. The identification of growing points, new forms of social work practice and the relation of these new forms of practice to social work education.
3. Education and Training for Social Work and the Social Services in rural areas.
4. Ways of relating the contribution of Social Workers and Para-professional Workers to both Organised and Spontaneous Good Neighbourliness in the Community.
5. Social Work Developments and Training for Social Work in East European countries.
6. Social Work Education for work with communities suffering from long-term

- unemployment, from concentrations of unemployment and among young people and, from the problems of migrants and 'guest workers'.
7. Recent research findings relevant to social work education and training, how they can be identified and made known, considered for replication if this seems necessary, and utilised in practice.
 8. A review of experiments in community work in selected countries and their implications for social work education.
 9. The social effects of rapid changes in population structure and their impact on social work education and practice.
 10. The need for continued planned development of regional seminars.
 11. Study of experience of schools in teaching 'integrated methods of social work practice'.
 12. Action Project: An International Faculty Roster (IFR)³³²

My response:

All of the 12 items obviously have merit, but which ones should be pursued and developed into projects by the IASSW will depend on the expressed interest and commitment by member and non-member schools in different parts of the world, and the capacity of the IASSW to respond effectively.

The first topic, comparative studies of social work education, seems to be especially important. Many of the other topics can be seen as more specialised sub-sets of this first topic.

The IASSW would be performing a very useful service for many different purposes, if say every 4 years it produced a basic reference book which contained a succinct, analytical account of the system of social work education in each country where the IASSW has member schools. This could be seen as a logical development of the IASSW *World Guide to Social Work Education* published in 1974.

A general editor appointed by the IASSW could invite a distinguished social work educator from each country to write the relevant article for the book – within strict word limits, and using headings and guide lines suggested by the editor. The book could also contain data on international action for social work education. Depending on the quality of the data, the book would also contain a section or sections on trends and issues in social work education in different parts of the world, and for different types of countries.

The earlier international surveys on social work education have been invaluable in helping to break down the isolation and parochialism of social work education in many countries. What I have in mind this time round, however, is more systematic work on a regular 4-year cycle involving a selected author from each country but one who would, of course, consult with colleagues in producing the country article, and one who can realistically work to a deadline. The role of the general editor would be crucial to the whole enterprise.

This is obviously an ambitious project in its scope, but I see it as feasible and well worth serious consideration. The sponsorship of this periodically revised basic reference would be a very public service provided by the IASSW to governments, to others involved in social welfare provision, to educators generally, and to member

332 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to IASSW Member, 20/10/80.

schools of the IASSW, throughout the world. Early editions may be uneven in quality, but even so they would still help to replace our existing ignorance, myths and impressions of social work education in our own and other countries, with more substance. More careful comparative perspectives would certainly increase understanding of what are seen as local issues in social work education.

One of the difficult practical matters which the project would have to cope with would, of course, be the language problem. Assuming that the main publication would be prepared, at least initially, in English, and the general editor is English-speaking, the general editor would need to have translation facilities communicating with the country article authors who do not speak English and for translating their articles into English.

A further practical matter would be deciding on relevant publishing and distribution arrangements for the book. No doubt the IASSW has some relevant past experience to help in such decisions.

The general editor would obviously need the assistance of the IASSW Office to identify a suitable country author for each country, but generally the project should be self-contained and should not require heavy involvement of the IASSW Office.³³³

Marguerite Mathieu thanked me for 'the carefully thought out suggestion for a basic reference book on social work education. We are considering how it could be incorporated in a revised edition of the World guide. I shall be writing again about this.'³³⁴

In November 1981, Dr Vijaya Rao (project director and assistant director-general, IASSW), sent me 'the good news' of a project to produce a revised edition of the *World Guide to Social Work Education*. 'In view of your very helpful response to the IASSW List of Issues, we think you might be particularly glad to receive this news.'³³⁵ You will note that there will be some new features to include essays on Regional Trends and Issues in Social Work Education'.³³⁶ An attached summary of the project indicated that a grant had been provided for the revision by the Lois and Samuel Silberman Fund of New York. The new edition would carry entries for 69 countries, and 25 national and regional associations. Requirements and procedures for the determination of the equivalence of social work qualifications in selected countries would now be included.

The problem of assessing comparability of social work credentials earned in different countries has engaged the attention of the United Nations and its regional bodies, the Council of Europe and the European Economic Community, schools of social work with foreign student enrolments, associations of schools of social work, membership organisations of social workers, and agencies employing social workers. While the IASSW as an international membership organisation can assure that the graduates of a member school have taken advantage of the best social work education available in their country, it is not an accrediting body. The determination of equivalence must thus be made in each country, in relation to national

333 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Marguerite Mathieu, 13/11/80.

334 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to R. J. Lawrence, 8/1/81.

335 In fact, I already knew of the project from the minutes of the board meeting in Athens in July, 1981. Katherine Kendall had prepared the documents and secured the funding.

336 Letter, Vijaya Rao to R. J. Lawrence, 27/11/81, with attachment.

standards. However, the unguided use of any one national yardstick is completely unsatisfactory in measuring the educational achievement of a social worker trained in another country. The *World Guide* provides the information necessary to identify differences in national educational systems and in the patterns and content of social work education within those systems.

‘Continual updating of information, now envisaged as part of the revision project, will encourage study of changes over a period of time in individual schools and countries as well as current similarities and differences in social work education among countries’.

The project would be directed by the Dr Vijaya Rao, under the general oversight of the Dr Marguerite Mathieu (secretary-general), and with Dr Katherine Kendall (former secretary-general) as chief consultant. Collection and organisation of data was aimed to be completed in Vienna by early 1983, with publication in early 1984.

I was certainly pleased to hear about the revision, but was at some loss to know how to respond to a question in the same letter about the Australian situation. The project planned to continue to use the same criteria to select specific schools for inclusion. All schools had to be members of the IASSW. The oldest and the newest school would be included in countries with a large number of schools or where there was significant variation in the national pattern. National associations of schools would be involved in the selection process. Dr Rao had already contacted the school at the University of Melbourne as the oldest Australian school in the previous edition. A school (not named) established in 1965 was recently admitted and would be the newest school. Would these two schools represent the variation in the national pattern?

I wrote that it was unclear to me which Australian school was being referred to as the ‘newest’ school which might be included in the guide. The IASSW directory of member schools (Spring 1981) had two schools (including my own at UNSW) as having been established in 1965, and another in 1966. I added:

Perhaps it might be helpful to mention briefly the Australian situation as I know it. There are 12 schools of social work that are currently accredited for membership of the Australian Association of Social Workers, and whose staff can become members of the Australian Association for Social Work Education. 9 are at the Universities of Queensland, James Cook, New South Wales, Sydney, Melbourne, Monash, La Trobe, Flinders, and Western Australia. 3 are at colleges of advanced education – the Preston Institute of Technology, the South Australian Institute of Technology, and the Western Australian Institute of Technology.³³⁷ The Tasmanian College of Advanced Education has recently been not re-accredited but is seeking a further accreditation review.

All accredited programs involved 4 years of full-time tertiary study, or their equivalent, leading to a degree in social work. The main variation is perhaps between those programs which we call 2+2, that is, 2 years mainly in social and

³³⁷ This was, in fact, the unnamed school in Dr Rao’s letter, and was chosen as the second Australian school for inclusion in the Guide. It had been established as a three and a quarter year program in 1967 and redesigned as a 4-year program in 1971.

behavioural science subjects and then 2 years in primarily social work subjects; and 4-year integrated programs. All the schools are not automatically eligible for membership of the IASSW because AASWE is not strictly a national association of schools.

Of those schools listed as IASSW members in the Spring 1981 Directory, the schools at the Universities of Flinders, Western Australia, Melbourne, and Sydney, have 2+2 programs, and the schools at the universities of Queensland and New South Wales have integrated 4-year programs.³³⁸

338 Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Vijaya Rao, 9/12/81.

Equivalency of Qualifications Across National Borders

Whenever people professionally qualified in one country wish to work professionally in another, the complex issue of equivalence of qualifications cannot be avoided if there was any concern for the maintenance of professional standards. The IASSW had side-stepped the issue by recognising the national standard in each country. It was obviously not an accrediting body for professional practice, but it was clearly aimed at developing better professional education and practice in social work in all its member countries, and hopefully in other countries not yet within its membership.

At the IASSW board meeting in Athens, in July 1981, the issue was raised by a report on social work training in the European community. It was decided to set up a committee to collect information on the systems and procedures developed in some countries to recognise 'foreign-trained' social workers, and to plan and organise a session at the Brighton Congress for the benefit of people interested. I agreed to be a member of this committee. The countries known to have established procedures were Australia, Canada, Scandinavia, the United Kingdom, and the USA.

For the Brighton Congress session, the secretary-general asked me for full information on how this was dealt with in Australia – specifically:

- Who or which body is responsible for the recognition of foreign-earned degrees?
- How is equivalence established:
 - what is required from the applicant?
 - what form does the examination of the credentials take?
 - how is the operation financed?
- Are the schools of social work involved in the assessment, and if so, how and to what extent?

Please list some of the problems which have been met in the attempt to give recognition to foreign-trained social workers.³³⁹

In a follow-up letter, Marguerite Mathieu reported that Miss Madeleine Malherbe, recently retired from the Central Council on Education and Training for Social Work in London, had agreed to act as coordinator of our working group. She had already studied the issue, and had a number of additional questions which she thought should be considered. The meeting in Brighton would be a work session for those who had done some advanced thinking, mainly members of the working group plus hopefully some representatives of IFSW. It would be scheduled concurrently with other special interest groups.³⁴⁰

In December, I wrote:

I expect to be able to send you in about mid-January the information you have requested on the recognition in Australia of foreign social work qualifications. I will be on recreation leave from December 14 to January 12.

I am going to try to get to Brighton, although it is a long and personally costly distance to travel, particularly for such a brief period and bearing in mind that I anticipate going to the United States on a year's study leave ... in mid-December 1982.

I have been in a real quandary whether or not to accept nomination as IASSW Vice-President at the election in mid-1982, mainly because of the practical difficulties if I were to be elected. The IASSW News (Autumn 1981) mentions that several names have been nominated for each vacant position, so the likelihood of being elected would appear to be slim. All the same I obviously do not want my name to go forward if I am not in a position to undertake the responsibilities involved. After discussion with colleagues here and my family, especially Trish my wife, I have decided to agree to the nomination and somehow I will just have to get to the Board meetings in the ensuing 4 years, if I did happen to be elected.

I very much regretted not being able to get to the Athens IASSW meeting, but it was a crucial time in the School when we were choosing a successor for Ron Baker who had decided to return to England permanently.

Dick Splane reports that you are doing splendidly in the job. I am sure some very positive feedback cannot go amiss in your pressured and difficult job.³⁴¹

On 25 January, 1982, I sent to Marguerite Mathieu the requested document, 'The Assessment of Overseas Qualifications in Australia', prepared by my colleague Mrs Margaret Lewis, in consultation with Mrs Elspeth Browne another colleague in my school. As experienced expert panelists in the assessment procedures, both were particularly well placed to be informed about these matters. The document had been fully discussed with me and I saw it as an accurate description of the situation, with the key issues, as I understood them, highlighted. The AASW had received the same fuller set of questions from the IFSW, and had passed these on to Elspeth Browne, so I anticipated the document was also likely to represent the Australian AASW response

339 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to John Lawrence, 28/10/81.

340 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to John Lawrence, 3/12/81.

341 Letter, John Lawrence to Marguerite Mathieu, 8/12/81.

in preparation for our Brighton discussions.³⁴² Marguerite Mathieu thought the very careful treatment of this issue contained in the Australian document should be of considerable help to Miss Malherbe in the preparation of the agenda for the Brighton conference.³⁴³

THE ASSESSMENT OF OVERSEAS SOCIAL WORK QUALIFICATIONS IN AUSTRALIA

The Context of Assessment of Overseas Qualifications

In the last twenty years or more, the AASW has provided the only national accreditation of social work courses in Australia. There is no statutory organisation which undertakes this task. From time to time the criteria used by the AASW for accreditation of Australian courses are updated in the light of developments in social work knowledge and changes in the Australian social welfare context. More recently the updating of the criteria and procedures for accreditation of courses was undertaken as a cooperative effort between the AASW and the Heads of Schools of Social Work in Australia.

The criteria used for the accreditation of Australian social work courses form the basis for the assessment of overseas qualifications. This assessment is focussed on establishing eligibility for membership of the AASW. It is not formally set up as an accreditation of overseas courses. The focus is on the particular education program undertaken by the individual applicant. This may be in the form of a single comprehensive qualification which itself meets all the requirements, or it may be a combination of more than one course which, when viewed as a whole, is judged to be an appropriate program.

The AASW has a major role in the assessment of overseas qualifications because the assessment is formulated in terms of eligibility for membership of the AASW. As the emphasis is on eligibility rather than actual membership it also provides an assessment which is used by government and non-government employers of social workers throughout Australia.

Agreement has been reached with State and Federal Public Service Boards in Australia that the AASW criteria are acceptable for the assessment of overseas qualifications of their potential employees. Public Service organisations are the main employers of social workers in Australia.

Agreement has also been reached with the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs that the criteria set by the AASW should be used in the assessment of qualifications of persons applying for migration to Australia on the grounds of listed occupations.

The Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications (COPQ), is set up under the auspice of the Australian Government. In conjunction with the AASW it is involved in assessments for the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and the Public Service Boards. These are based on AASW criteria, and close links have been established between the two bodies. COPQ's role in assessment of overseas

342 Letter, John Lawrence to Marguerite Mathieu, 25/1/82.

343 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to John Lawrence, 11/2/82.

social work qualifications commenced in July 1980. Prior to this the AASW was the only body involved.

Overseas qualifications are assessed against the criteria operating in Australia at the time when the qualification was completed if in fact it does not meet current standards. Current criteria for assessment of overseas social work qualifications are set out in Appendix 1.³⁴⁴ These were developed in 1980.

The Process of Assessment of Overseas Qualifications

The applicant is required to provide documentary evidence of the qualification/s obtained, together with course descriptions and subject descriptions, including the period of time over which each subject was studied. The duration of supervised field education, its agency location, and the qualifications of the supervisor are required.

Examination of the credentials is undertaken on an individual basis for each applicant, with guidelines for assessment provided by the AASW to the Registrar of the COPQ Social Welfare Expert Panel. Those which are more complex may be referred to expert assessors who over the years have built up considerable knowledge about social work educational programs in specific countries. Most specialised assessment is done by three expert assessors who are accountable to the Federal Secretary of the AASW. This includes one who, incidentally, is a member of the COPQ Social Welfare Expert Panel. Two of these assessors are in fact on the academic staff of a School of Social Work, although their assessment work is in no way formally associated with that or any other School of Social Work.

Notification of recognition/non-recognition is made by a formal letter. In the event of the qualification not being accepted the reasons are noted in the letter.

Recognition applies only to the qualifications held by an individual, and does not extend to a program. At the same time, however, a careful check is made on precedent decisions. Many applications examined in Australia reflect a combination of two or more separate educational programs, e.g. a degree in the basic social sciences followed by a degree or diploma in social work. It is considered that a recognition of overseas educational programs per se would decrease flexibility of the assessment outcomes, and would require considerable effort in updating regularly because of the fairly frequent changes which occur in educational programs.

Fees

Assessment activities have been found over the years to involve considerable time and energy of the AASW, and after the major expansion of migration of skilled workers in the 1960's (with heavy demands on assessment of social work qualifications) it was decided to charge an assessment fee with a view to 'breaking even' in the process. Currently that fee is set at \$50 for each AASW assessment. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide an assessment fee, although in cases of hardship this can be waived.

Relationship between Schools of Social Work and the Process of Assessment

As already mentioned, the Heads of Schools of Social Work in Australia were actively involved in determining the current eligibility criteria for AASW membership. The

³⁴⁴ These detailed criteria to be met based on the current Australian standards required for eligibility for membership of the AASW, together with possible action in the event of a very minor shortfall, or a shortfall 'not gross'.

Schools are not usually formally involved in assessing overseas qualifications, but they provide an important and essential resource for those persons whose qualification is not acceptable but where it is judged that the shortfall can be made good by a special educational program. This is undertaken with a relevant Australian School of Social Work where usually the applicant is enrolled as a miscellaneous student. A successful outcome of this educational program then establishes the candidate's eligibility for membership of the AASW, but does not provide any additional professional qualification from the Australian School of Social Work.

The chairperson of the Social Welfare Expert Panel of COPQ is a Head of a School of Social Work, but again this does not formally associate COPQ with that or any other School of Social Work. While AASW, COPQ, and the Schools of Social Work retain their autonomy, there is considerable informal liaison and intercommunication because of the diverse roles of some personnel.

Reciprocity

Since 1974 when Australia accepted four year qualifications as a minimum qualification, and with a minimum of two year's study of social work theory and methods, reciprocal arrangements with the U.S. and U.K. could not be maintained. It was found, in fact, that from about this time in Australia there was a much higher proportion of assessments deemed ineligible for membership. Presumably this reflects the differences which were emerging between qualifications in Australian and many other countries.

Registration of the title 'social worker'

Although it is possible at present for persons with overseas social work qualifications which do not constitute eligibility for membership of the AASW to gain employment in Australia as a social worker these are the exception rather than the rule. Moves have commenced in some States in Australia for registration of the title 'social worker', and this is likely to impose further limitations on those with unacceptable qualifications.

Employers' acceptance of assessment

By and large qualifications which establish eligibility for membership of the AASW are seen by most employers as desirable and by many as essential. Some employers refer to qualifications which are equivalent to those provided by Australian Schools of Social Work. This usually represents an attempt on the part of the employer not to appear to be dominated by a professional association. However, on closer analysis these same organisations accept the AASW's role in the accreditation of Australian courses and its usefulness in standard setting. Occasionally such organisations seek the opinion of their local school of social work about the equivalence of a particular qualification to their own educational program. To this extent Schools of Social Work may be involved in assessment, but often the matter is referred informally to an expert assessor anyhow. If a person without a qualification which meets AASW criteria is employed in a social work position this does not aid job mobility and may limit promotion to positions where an accredited qualification is mandatory.

Acceptance of assessment by other countries

We have no knowledge of countries outside Australia accepting an AASW recognition of an overseas qualification in lieu of their own assessment. On the other hand there

is no specific statement about the recognition of the overseas qualification being valid only in Australia. Perhaps, however, this is implicit in the term of acceptance used – ‘eligibility for membership of the AASW’.

Equivalence vs. Comparability

No specific policy or discussion had emerged in Australia with regard to the term ‘equivalence’ or the term ‘comparability’.

Issues surrounding assessment of overseas social work qualifications

The problems encountered in dealing with overseas social work qualifications are large and complex. Listed below are some of the more major issues which relate to it –

- A large proportion of courses from other countries do not provide educational programs which meet Australian requirements.
- Australian requirements have been set with the specific nature of social work practice in mind. These include:
 - fairly autonomous and often isolated practice experiences on or soon after graduation;
 - limited opportunities for quality supervision or consultation after graduation; the emergence of a two-tier welfare personnel structure with the sub-professional component being provided now by persons educated in tertiary educational institutions in the equivalent of two-year non-graduate diploma courses in welfare work (these persons are called welfare workers, or welfare officers);
 - limited opportunities for and commitment to post-basic education in social work; a broad range of practice roles accepted by social workers and employers in Australia as relevant and the associated breadth and depth of educational background to equip persons for this wide range of roles;
 - for some years social work education has enjoyed status in Universities and other tertiary institutions as professional education in its own right, and not subordinated to other disciplines such as psychology, sociology, or social administration. Within this positive educational climate it was possible to achieve a four-year degree level qualification as a minimum standard, especially when it was demonstrated that the range of content and the necessary conceptual level at which the content was taught necessitated degree-level courses.
- When the focus of attention is on the educational qualification there is often dispute that this does not necessarily correlate highly with the practice competence especially after some years of good practice experience. This is a point put constantly in the wake of a negative assessment. It is put not only by the applicant but often by his/her colleagues in Australia who make judgements about comparable performance in practice despite the difference in qualifications. To meet this point the AASW developed policy regarding tribunal assessment by examination of current practice competence. In practice this policy is fraught with standardisation and other problems. The policy was finally abandoned in 1981 after a short and interrupted life, when Public Service Boards challenged that it was their right as employers to make judgements about practice competence. What they wanted from the professional association was guidance with regard to the interpretation of

the complexities and uncertainties of education programs. They claimed that they would have to abandon using AASW eligibility as a guideline for their employment decisions if the AASW was using criteria other than educational. While it needs to be seen that this issue is not completely closed, the stage of development of social work in Australia is at a point where the AASW can have greatest and most appropriate influence in the setting of practice standards in Australia if a helpful and trusting relationship is built up with the main employers. For the sake of this goal, assessment on other than educational grounds has been abandoned for the time being.

- The 'run of the mill' practitioner appears not to be able to understand the details or complexity of AASW assessment policy, and often reacts to negative individual assessments as if these individuals were being treated unnecessarily harshly (whereas in fact there is an inclination on the part of all who are formally involved in assessment, towards some leniency when the bulk of requirements have been met).
- Bearing in mind that, desirably, there is a high level of cultural specificity in social work courses in any particular country, the culturally specific content of social work practice in Australia cannot be expected in an overseas qualification particularly if it comes from a country rather different culturally e.g. the Middle East. Little progress has been made in Australia in coming to grips with this problem in a fair and constructive way. It is likely in practice that quantitative factors about a qualification, when satisfactory, can counter balance these cultural issues. It is likely that we shall have to move in the future to having certain educational and cultural orientation programs made as a prerequisite for accepting some overseas qualifications.
- Although for some applicants who are not immediately successful it is possible to pursue a supplementary educational program if the short-falls are not gross, this is only possible to pursue in those cities where Schools of Social Work exist. This excludes many who live outside the metropolitan cities, e.g. it excludes those living in Canberra if required to make-up in areas other than supervised fieldwork, because the nearest school of social work is 150 miles away.
- Those persons undertaking a supplementary educational program are invariably using scarce educational resources in competition with students in our own courses. This is particularly difficult where supervised field education placements are needed, as the supply of good placements invariably is lower than the demand, yet this is one area where the field teacher needs to be able to evaluate against a frame of reference of equivalence of performance of Australian students.
- Through COPQ many other professions use objective tests and /or clinical examination in Australia, rather than attempting to assess basic educational qualifications. To date the development of objective tests for social work has been seen as daunting.³⁴⁵

345 Margaret Lewis, in consultation with Elspeth Browne, 'The Assessment of Overseas Social Work Qualifications in Australia', January 1982. (The names of the author and consultant were not on the document.)

I was particularly pleased that it was two members of my school who were responsible for producing this very helpful statement. Like me, both had a firm long-term commitment to the profession and understood the importance of the role of the professional association in its development. As described, we had developed a system of professional accreditation in Australia, not run by the employers or by government or by the educators, but with the prime responsibility continuing to rest with the one organisation responsible for the maintenance and development of the profession – the professional association. It made sense to me conceptually, provided the major interested parties accepted it and were willing to make it work, including of course the association itself.

By 20 July, 1982, Marguerite Mathieu informed us that the compilation of the information received unfortunately would not be available until 23 August. It was not an open session. The purpose was to compare and analyse the experience of the selected countries, to identify the issues arising from this experience, and, if needed, to suggest how the assessment of foreign degrees could be conducted in a more satisfactory manner. She also sent a list of participants for the special session on equivalence, which would be a day-long meeting on 25 August. Seven countries would be represented – Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Israel, UK and USA. The consultant and director of the IASSW World Guide project would also attend. Five of the countries would have a participant from IFSW, additional to their IASSW participant. It looked a promising group of people, which included Dennis Kimberley (Canada), Gunvor Brettschneider (Finland), Priscilla Young (UK), and Arthur Katz and Mary Ann Quaranta (USA). I was listed for Australia, along with Pam Roberts, a very experienced Australian social worker, whom I knew well. Pam, originally from the UK, had been active in the AASW for many years. She was now director of welfare services at the Benevolent Society of New South Wales, a position I had worked to get established. At Brighton, in fact, Pam Roberts was left to make the Australian contribution at the special session on equivalence, because I was attending the important first meeting of the program committee for the 1984 Congress, an unfortunate clash of scheduling.

At the third session of the IASSW board, on 28 August, we received a recommendation from the participants in the special session on equivalence that a joint working party of IASSW and IFSW be established to consider further the issues and to prepare a discussion report for the 1984 conferences. At the board, A. Gindy recommended the inclusion, if needed in stages, of other countries, in particular third world countries. I suggested a genuine working group, small in membership, possibly three from IASSW and three from IFSW, who could have contact persons in each country, to collect and analyse materials on the countries' experience. K. Kendall hoped we could pursue the analysis of material received, and of that to be collected, to come up with guidelines. A. Doron thought IASSW should limit itself to a description of the programs offered leaving it to a country interested to decide whether a qualification earned outside its boundaries was comparable to its own. The board decided the presidents of IASSW and IFSW should jointly establish a small work group to report in 1984 to a meeting of representatives of countries wishing to establish equivalency determination procedures.

Chapter 18

Mistaken Nomination For IASSW Vice-Presidency

My term as one of the 8 elected members at large on the IASSW board was due to end in Brighton in 1982. In 1980, I had been one of two people proposed by the nominating committee for a vice-president vacancy and agreed to stand. The other person, Dr Seno Cornely (president, Latin America Association of Schools of Social Work), was elected. In October 1981, I received a letter from the nominating committee again asking if I would accept nomination as vice-president. After considerable thought I accepted, but it was a mistake by the nominating committee, and I should have checked the constitutional position. Having already served 8 consecutive years on the board I, in fact, was not eligible to stand again for election. Marguerite Mathieu was very embarrassed and apologised. The acceptance letter had been sent to me by mistake. She wrote:

I had taken great care in consulting with Katherine and Heinrich (Schiller, the president) to see if we could not 'twist' the Constitution in some way to let your name go on the slate. We have all grown to appreciate your participation as a Board member and we do not relish the thought of not having you continue to serve the Association in this capacity, even though we know that we can still count on your unflinching support.

Heinrich hoped that I would accept nomination for the 1984 election. Meantime, I would shortly be invited to serve on the program committee for the 1984 Congress, which could hold its first meeting in Brighton, at the time of the 1982 Congress. My name was among the first to be listed by Marguerite and Heinrich.³⁴⁶ I told Marguerite that I fully understood the mistake, and that I should myself have checked the constitutional position. 'In fact, I am quite relieved not to have to even consider trying to meet the responsibilities of a Vice-President's position.'³⁴⁷

346 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to John Lawrence, 27/1/82.

347 Letter, John Lawrence to Marguerite Mathieu, 19/3/82.

Chapter 19

World Meetings 1982 – Brighton

On the plane to the UK, Stuart Rees from the University of Sydney, sat beside me, but for much of the flight I was checking through the transcripts of my interviews with officers of the Department of Youth and Community Services (YACS), in connection with the Montcalm Inquiry, and these were of course strictly confidential. Ron and Karin Baker met me at Heathrow at 8.15am on Saturday, 14 August, to take me to their home in Guilford where I stayed for a few days before the first meeting in Brighton. They were enjoying having a steady stream of Australian visitors.

19.1 Inter-University Consortium for International Social Development

The second international conference of this emerging organisation³⁴⁸ was held 19–21 August, in Brighton, deliberately just prior to the three long-established international meetings of the IASSW, the IFSW, and the ICSW, to facilitate people also attending these if they wished. I did not respond to a general call in October 1981 for papers for the Consortium, but decided to attend since I would be going to the IASSW and ICSW meetings, and wanted to find out first-hand whether the organisation was going to be a welcome addition to the international meetings or an unfortunate distraction from them. According to Frank Paiva, the initiator of the Symposium in mid-west USA, the purpose was to discover and refine knowledge required for international social development, to clarify the role of the human service professions in the development process, to develop educational programs and curriculum content to reflect these, and to ensure these were reflected in university country assistance programs.

The theme for the 1982 Brighton Consortium was ‘Emergence of Social Development Practice in a Turbulent World’. This seemed to me a clear shift from clarifying the role of the various ‘human service’ professions (always a highly ambiguous concept), to a concentration on something called ‘social development practice’ (as yet a nebulous concept). Was this to be a new

348 See pp. 252–3.

international occupation of social developers organised on professional lines, with their own identifiable body of knowledge, values and skills, and if so, how were they going to relate to other established professionals working at an international level, who saw themselves as integral members of their own professions operating internationally? IUCISD was obviously a social work initiative drawing considerably on social work knowledge, values and insights. Was this to be international social work, but under another name so it could draw in people with a variety of other occupational backgrounds? Within the social work profession, working at an international level had not been given much priority, either practically or in the development of practice theory, although many social workers had worked at an international level. Certainly, there was plenty of room for international social development initiatives, but could and should it be in the form of some new kind of professional practice or was 'practice' being used loosely just to equate with 'action'?

I generally shared the social concerns of the participants and was pleased I attended the Consortium, but frankly thought many of the basic organisational and structural issues could not be realistically addressed at a global level by such a body. I did not see it as a genuine global alternative to either the ICSW or the IASSW as some of its enthusiasts seemed to aspire to. Its concerns were obviously not novel in either body and would have been strengthened by the encouragement and inclusion of such people as an integral part of these bodies. Dan Saunders (Hawaii), president of the Consortium from 1981, was an active member of the IASSW.

I can recall spending time with Jim Midgley in my room between Consortium sessions having a beginning discussion about these kinds of issues. From the University of Cape Town in South Africa, he had a BSocS (1965), an MSocSc (1967), and a PhD (1971), with an MSc (1970) from LSE. He had settled in Britain and was teaching social policy at LSE. He was essentially a social policy scholar, who had developed a keen interest in international social welfare and international social work in the developing world. His vigorous book *Professional Imperialism: Social Work in the Third World*, Heinemann, 1981, had just been published. It was to be followed by a series of books focused mainly on social development in the third world.

The next and last time I saw him was in 1997 at the time of our daughter Ruth's PhD graduation in the School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley. He was then the Harry and Riva Specht professor of public social services and dean of the School, a very prestigious appointment. A vivid memory remains with me of him leading with great gusto the academic procession in his flowing red doctoral robes, almost charging down the aisle of the graduation hall to the loud accompaniment of Elgar's 'Land of Hope and Glory'. I wondered if it was a deliberate bit of irony that would have been lost on most of the locals!

At the IASSW 1982 board meeting in Brighton, the president Heinrich Schiller mentioned he had had a meeting with the board of the IUCISD during his visit in New York and had concluded the Consortium was pursuing different aims than those of IASSW. Since the relations between the consortium and the IASSW had previously been questioned, he wished to have the

board's views. Should we try to integrate the Consortium in IASSW? He added that the Consortium seemed to be covering more than social work *per se*. The minutes recorded this response from the board:

Dr Niyirenda does not see the need for two separate organisations. The Consortium is interested in a special approach to social work. Miss Gindy recalled that the U.N. system has raised the issue of the relationship of social welfare to social development on many occasions. It considers social development as the bigger umbrella which brings in other fields including social work. In 1968, the Consortium helped the U.N. to develop a conceptual framework for social development. It is interesting that American schools through the Consortium are now developing an interest in social development. It used to be and still is a question raised by the schools in the developing world: are we schools of social work, or of social development or of social administration? Mukunda Rao recalled that the dichotomy between social work and social welfare has been going on for a long time. He recognises the efforts of the Consortium in the field of social development, but he sees it more as an ad hoc group than an international organisation. J. Lawrence sees it as the initiative of a small group of American schools. The meetings do not place a special emphasis on Third World interests and the number of Third World participants is small. The Consortium could be considered as a special interest group, but it would be a mistake to view it as an international group. The question remains: what does IASSW do to accommodate such groups? Care has to be taken so that we do not recognise too many. R. Huws Jones wonders if these interest groups mean disaffection from IASSW. If so, should we look at the reasons for the disaffection. T. Hokenstad sees the Consortium as a small group of schools in the U.S.A. where some faculty members have developed a special interest in relation to social development, and this is a desirable thing. He does not see it as disaffection. What the Consortium wants is a relationship on subject matters. R. Splane sees the Consortium's International Forums as fulfilling the need of professors to present and publish their papers.

In conclusion, it was agreed that the president, treasurer and secretary-general who have an appointment with the Consortium's chairman and secretary would stress the importance of working together and avoiding initiatives which might be confusing to schools as they might lead to seeing the Consortium as competing with the IASSW.³⁴⁹

In December 1982, I received an invitation which I declined, to be a member of the international program planning committee for the Consortium's third biennial conference with the theme, 'Social Development: Further Conceptualizations' – in Montreal in August 1984. In May 1983, the chairman of the program committee (Richard Estes) invited me to be 'the feature speaker' for a plenary session with the general topic 'Toward a Strategy for World Social Development: International Economic and Political Considerations' – to be followed by four workshops on aspects of the topic. In June 1983, I was listed on a worldwide panel of 29 'expert social development commentators' who were requested to contribute to identifying 'the changing conceptual

349 Minutes, Meeting of the Board of Directors, IASSW, August 22, 1982, pp.2–3.

dimensions of social development' in a two-stage project arising from the Brighton conference and in preparation for the Montreal conference. It was hoped to identify areas of common agreement as well as differences. I was on a sabbatical year in 1983, and decided not to have these continuing involvements with the Consortium. I thought it unlikely that I would be able to get to Montreal in 1984 anyway after having spent 1983 away.³⁵⁰

350 The organisation is now called International Consortium for Social Development. Its 19th biennial international symposium was in Singapore, 2015.

19.2 21st International Congress of Schools of Social Work, 23–27 August, 1982

The University of Sussex, founded in 1962, was the first of a new wave of universities in the UK in the 1960s. It was located on the South Downs, East Sussex, easily reached by rail or bus from Brighton. We could relax on Brighton pebbly 'beach' and pier if we wished, in congress and conference breaks. Brighton was a regency holiday town on the south coast of England, 50 minutes by train from Victoria Station in London. I have photos of riding the double-storied Brighton buses with congress/conference colleagues from Melbourne – David Cox, Lionel Sharpe and Elizabeth Ozanne. Our accommodation was in halls of residence on the campus, which seemed well-planned and conducive to university work. Asa Briggs, an outstanding British historian whom I had met at the ANU, was a founding pro-chancellor of the university 1961–67, and its vice-chancellor 1967–76.³⁵¹ He had recruited Norman MacKenzie to teach sociology at the University in 1962. I hoped I might see Norman again but being the summer break, he was away. The list of Congress participants showed 417 people from 54 countries from around the world; almost all of us were living in student accommodation on the campus. The largest contingents came from USA (85), UK (56), Norway (34), Sweden (33), Germany (19), Canada (17), and South Africa (16). 10 of us came from Australia – David Cox, Jim Crawley, Ben Gelin, Michael Horsburgh, June Huntington, John Lawrence, Elizabeth Ozanne, Stuart Rees, Lionel Sharpe, and Norm Smith.

The theme of the 21st IASSW congress, TRENDS IN SOCIAL WELFARE, THE STATUTORY, VOLUNTARY AND INFORMAL RESPONSE, CHALLENGE TO EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PRACTICE, was said to be based on three assumptions – that traditional social welfare services were increasingly criticised; that duplication and overlapping, along with important gaps, existed in services provided by the statutory and voluntary agencies; and that informal groups, such as citizen's groups and self-help groups, were increasingly setting up innovative programs to fill the gaps.³⁵² The Congress had two important innovations – some joint activities with the IFSW, and a call for individual papers sent to schools, associations and individuals affiliated with the IASSW. Simultaneous interpretation into the three languages of the congress, English, French and Spanish, was provided for all plenary sessions.

Some degree of integration with the international meetings of IASSW and the IFSW seemed an obvious desirable development. The congress program stated, 'Through this attempt we hope to draw attention to the importance of collaboration between educators and practitioners and to promote further collaborative efforts for the consideration of their common professional task'. In December 1981, the IASSW president, treasurer and secretary-general had met in Geneva with the IFSW president and secretary-general to discuss joint meetings in Brighton and the possibility of on-going joint activities. The resultant joint occasions at the Congress were:

³⁵¹ I recalled that as an impressive historian of urbanisation in Britain, he had provided a lecture sponsored by the History School at the ANU to stimulate urban studies in Australia.

³⁵² *Programme, XXI International Congress of Schools of Social Work, 23–27 August 1982, Brighton, England.*

- The opening session in the Gardner Centre Theatre, in the evening of Monday, 23 August, where we were welcomed by Chauncey Alexander (IFSW president) and Heinrich Schiller (IASSW president); greeted by Lord Trefgarne (parliamentary under-secretary of state at the Department of Health and Social Security) and Professor McGovan (pro-vice-chancellor [arts and social studies] University of Sussex); and heard a tribute to Dame Eileen Younghusband by Janie Thomas (IFSW). A roll call of nations concluded the opening.
- The British government reception afterwards in the university Refectory, hosted by Lord Trefgarne.
- The plenary session and subsequent table discussions on the subject 'Trends in social welfare within the context of overall development: challenge to social work' – in the Dome Conference Hall, Brighton, on the Tuesday morning. Aida Gindy (now UNICEF director for Europe) was the plenary speaker.
- The reception by the Brighton Borough Council in the Brighton Corn Exchange – at 8.30pm on Tuesday.
- The Wednesday all-day program, 'Practice on the Spot' – field visits of observation to institutions, projects and innovations; or presentations at the University on projects largely outside the radius of the visits. Each field visit had a leader, with assistance of an interpreter in some cases.
- The ethnic evening with an auction sale to raise funds to help colleagues in developing countries to come to international meetings – at 8pm on Wednesday. (Each organisation received half the proceeds.)

For the rest of the time, the ICSSW and the IFSW symposium had separate programs. As an ICSSW registrant I could choose on Tuesday afternoon either to attend a panel on 'Social work traditions and professional solidarity' with a couple of speakers and 7 respondents', or two 90-minute sessions at which individual papers were presented. It was a welcome embarrassment of riches, for I was interested in the subject-matter of so many of the options. In the first half of the afternoon, 14 individual (including joint) papers were on offer; a further 12 in the second half of the afternoon. My final choice was influenced by where I would be working in 1983 – in the USA, first at Rutgers University in New Jersey, then at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. Miriam Dinerman and two of her colleagues at Rutgers presented a paper, 'The export of education for social welfare: the art of borrowing'. I was impressed by Miriam, who was to become one of our friends at Rutgers. We shared an interest in professional standards and national patterns of social work education. My choice in the second half of the afternoon, from 12 individual paper options, was Merle (Terry) Hokenstad and Marvin Rosenberg, from Case Western Reserve University, making a presentation on 'Social work education in Great Britain and the United States: a comparative study'.

As a member of the IASSW Program Planning Committee for the 1984 Congress in Canada, I spent most of Wednesday in the committee discussing the theme and format. At a joint meeting with an IFSW committee in the morning, we reached agreement on a common theme – 'Survival and Development: Choices and Responsibilities – Challenges to Social Work'.

Discussion in the afternoon concentrated on what needed to be included in the call for papers – an explanatory statement on the significance of the theme, a clear statement of what was expected of authors, criteria for the selection of papers, deadlines for abstracts and final texts, and a permission to publish form.³⁵³

Concurrent sessions of workshops, individual papers, panels and joint sessions ran throughout Thursday. In the morning, I attended a workshop led by Marjorie Cantor (Fordham University), and Virginia Little (University of Connecticut). The topic, ‘Linking formal agencies and informal support networks’, was recently being addressed especially in services for ageing and disabled people. The two presenters were studying the uses and limits of ‘natural’ supports in the USA, and were encouraging comparative study. Informal mechanisms (family, neighbourhood and work groups, friendships) play an important part in attainment of human well-being in a society, but have remained a relatively neglected social policy subject.³⁵⁴ Most social policy research focused on formal organisations of one kind or another (government, non-government, and increasingly for-profit) and relations between them in the so-called developed countries. Amongst the multiple choices at the time of this morning workshop was one led by my former colleague at UNSW Ron Baker, ‘Is there a future for integrated practice? Obstacles to its development in practice and education’.

In the afternoon, I heard Werner Boehm (Rutgers) speak on ‘Differential deployment of social welfare personnel with differing levels of training – co-operation between formal and continuing education and staff development’. Then I chose Daniel Sanders (University of Hawaii), ‘New developments in international refugee work: a challenge to social work education’. The day ended with a before-dinner reception by the UK Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work, in the university Refectory. In the evening were the meetings of the regional associations of social work educators in South America, Asia and the Pacific, Africa, Europe and North America.

On Friday, 27 August, in the final morning of the Congress in the Gardner Centre Theatre, Arthur Katz (executive director, CSWE, New York) provided reflections on the Congress. In the afternoon before the biennial meeting of the General Assembly of the IASSW, Robin Huws Jones provided an eloquent tribute to the life and work of Dame Eileen Younghusband, whose life had ended in 1981 at the age of 79 in a car crash in the USA.

353 Marguerite Mathieu, ‘Notes on the meeting of the 1984 Programme Committee, University of Sussex, Brighton, August 25, 1982’.

354 I became aware when I was at the University of Michigan in 1967, of the work of Eugene Litwak on extended kin relations in a democratic industrial society. His 1963 work was in the brief bibliography provided for the workshop, but all other items dated from 1976.

19.3 My Final Board Meetings

Eight years as an elected member of the IASSW board ended with our meetings in Brighton. We had three sessions – Sunday, 22 August, 10am to 5pm; Monday, 23 August, 9am to 5pm; and Saturday, 28 August, 2pm to 5.30pm; plus a joint meeting with the IFSW executive board, 28 August, 9am to 12noon. With 6 officer-bearers,³⁵⁵ 5 elected members,³⁵⁶ 15 representatives of national and regional associations, 2 representatives of international organisations, and 2 staff, at most of the sessions, this board meeting was particularly well attended. As usual, there was a very full agenda, which now included the joint meeting with the IFSW executive board.³⁵⁷

How the August 1982 board meetings dealt with procedures to deal with discrimination in member schools and associations, and questions about IASSW's relationship with IUCISD are matters that have already been covered. Other matters of note at the meeting included:

- The president had been unable to visit Latin America because of an unexpected cut in the budget he had been receiving from his government for his duties as president of the IASSW. Seno Cornely had been very active with member schools in the region, but had been unable to attend board meetings. Funds which had been promised to help him from the German Foundation had not been obtained.
- The president had met with the Austrian authorities in Vienna to pursue recognition of the association as a non-profit making association.
- The president reported on his Geneva meeting with the IFSW. The IFSW president, Chauncey Alexander, would like more cooperation with ICSW, including representation at board meetings. Our president said he viewed the relationships with ICSW differently. He also believed we must first evaluate the results of our first attempt at collaboration with IFSW before going further in this direction.
 - J. Lawrence expressed the opinion that the ICSW is a different organisation which needs to establish relationships with a variety of occupational fields. He does not think that IASSW should be planning for more programmatic cooperation with ICSW.
- Income from fees had more than doubled since 1981. Although 28 schools had withdrawn (primarily because of the fee increase and some with severe budget cuts) an active recruitment campaign had resulted in 11 new schools, 1 national association and one regional association. I raised the issue of a regular revision of the dues scale. The last revision came too long after inflation had already greatly diminished the returns from membership dues. Automatic indexing to cover inflation should be considered. My motion that this be considered further by the executive committee for a firm recommendation to the next board meeting was unanimously accepted.

355 Schiller (president), Huws Jones (past president), Kendall (honorary president), Nyirenda (vice-president), Hokenstad (treasurer), and Simon (assistant treasurer).

356 Lawrence, Doron, Jakobsson, Papaflessa, and Splane.

357 Grace Vaughan, the incoming IFSW president, was an Australian.

- Member schools wished to find information from around the world in the Newsletter, but the secretary-general reported difficulty in obtaining news items for publication.
- The secretary-general pointed to the limitations of the staff, both numerical and qualitative, which limited the time she could devote to substantive matters such as the development of new projects.
- A tri-partite committee composed of representatives from LSE, NISW, and IASSW, would manage the Eileen Younghusband memorial fund, with the administration centred in LSE. A world-wide appeal for contributions was underway. The fund would provide scholarships primarily for Third World students to study at LSE and the National Institute for Social Work, a scheme which had been initiated to celebrate Dame Eileen's 80th birthday.
- The revision of the world guide on social work education had been delayed because as yet only 57 schools out of 82 had sent in their material, 15 national associations out of 19, and 2 out of 5 regional associations. It was planned that participating schools would send a revised statement every two years to provide a periodically revised data bank.
- A comparative study of social work education in hopefully nine European countries had been launched, with some funding from the national bank of Austria.
- In the board discussion in preparation for the joint meeting with IFSW board, I suggested that in a discussion of specific means of future cooperation, we should not lose sight of the distinctive goals of the two organisations. Cooperation should be discussed in terms of links to establish. R. Splane quoted as an example, the coordinated planning done in Canada in preparation for 1984. R. Huws Jones recommended that attention be paid to preserving focus on IASSW's goals. Educational content should not be too diluted.
- A report from a joint work group, chaired by Terry Hokenstad, recommended that the three organisations who sponsored *International Social Work* (IASSW, ICSW, and IFSW) should reaffirm their commitment to the journal, contingent upon acceptance of major changes in its organisation and operation – place it with an established publisher; locate the editor-in-chief (selected by the three sponsors) in the same country as the publisher; establish a small editorial committee of four (editor-in-chief, and one from each of the sponsors) to implement editorial policy; establish a larger board, with representation from all geographic regions and official languages covered by the sponsors; and promote the journal and increase subscriptions. IASSW board members reiterated their support of the journal. At the board's joint meeting with the IFSW, Dick Splane reported the ICSW executive committee accepted the Hokenstad report. The original work group was asked to implement its recommendations, and Terry Hokenstad agreed to continue as its chairman.
- The chairman of the 1982 Congress program committee thought the call for papers should be repeated, but a better geographic distribution of papers was needed. The board agreed and urged very clearly formulated criteria for selection of papers. The selective publication of congress papers was an issue that needed to be addressed.

- J. Simmonds the chairman of local arrangements for the 1982 Congress queried the association's policy of relying for financial support of the host country's government. For Brighton, fortunately a substantial grant of £15,000 had been provided by the Rowntree Trust. Self-financing should be considered. The board, however, did not expect an international conference could ever become self-financing, and must continue to seek host country's financing. J. Simmonds also suggested consideration of the policy of IFSW of appointing one committee in the host country to be responsible for both program design and local arrangements, but the board preferred to maintain the policy of an international committee to ensure an input from all regions.
- Richard Nann (University of British Columbia), chairman of the 1984 program committee, reported that 12 members from the five regions had agreed to serve. 10 of us attended the committee meeting during the Congress week and part of our meeting was held jointly with the IFSW program committee. Dick Splane reported on the organisational arrangements for the three 1984 international conferences to be held in Canada. Originally the conferences were to be held at the new Vancouver Trade and Convention Centre, but when its construction was delayed the Province of Quebec and the City of Montreal reaffirmed their earlier invitation for the conferences to be held in Montreal. The IASSW Congress and the IFSW Symposium would now be held at McGill University in downtown Montreal, and the ICSW in the new Montreal Convention Centre. Dick Splane had been elected chairman of an inter-organisational committee, with a federal charter name of International Conferences of Social Development. This would benefit joint approaches to both federal and provincial governments. He foresaw the basic program format for the conferences would be similar to that of Brighton. There would be three events for three organisations with some joint activities. The board discussed various ways to increase larger delegations from Third World and east European countries. The executive committee was instructed to decide on the most efficient plan to create a solidarity fund.
- There was consensus that the Research Seminar should become an integral part of the congress. Board members interested in research had been unable to attend the research seminars connected with the last three congresses because it had clashed with the board meetings.
- Marguerite Mathieu, the secretary-general, was retiring at the end of 1984. All the IASSW officers would again constitute the search committee for a new secretary-general to take up duty by October 1984 if possible. Katherine Kendall was, of course, a very hard act to follow, but Marguerite had done well in firmly establishing the Vienna office and ensuring that the organisation did not lose too much momentum in the very difficult world circumstances during her term of office.

At the last session of the board, on Saturday afternoon, 28 August, Heinrich Schiller thanked three of us who were completing their elected terms of office. (Dora Papaflessa and Esther Vilorio were the other two.)

Joint Meeting with IFSW

Our joint meeting on the morning of 28 August, with 11 attending from the IFSW executive and 21 from the IASSW, was particularly constructive. We discussed the Brighton Conference, the journal *International Social Work*, the equivalence of qualifications, and further IFSW/IASSW cooperation.

Grace Vaughan

As the newly-elected president of IFSW, fellow Australian Grace Vaughan was centrally involved in this joint meeting. Grace was Western Australian branch president (1974–6), and national president (1976–82) of ASSW. She had served as vice-president (Asia) (1980–82). Grace was born in Sydney in 1922. Her father's long period of unemployment during the depression was a formative influence on her future career and politics. Leaving school at 14, Grace went to a business college on a scholarship and worked as a clerk-typist until 1940. Between 1942, when she married, and 1962, when she returned to formal education (a part-time diploma of sociology at UNSW), she worked as an assistant industrial officer (1942–45), then cared for her three children for nine years, worked as a mail delivery contractor (1954–60), a community liaison officer with a radio station (1960–62), and as the administrator of the North Sydney Community Service centre coordinating the work of a large number of volunteers (1964–68). In Perth, she worked for the Child Welfare Department as a family welfare officer (1969–71) and the Department of Community Welfare as a social worker (1972–73), and was seconded to the Australian Social Welfare Commission as a consultant (1973–74). At the University of Western Australia she completed a BA (1971), MSocWk (1973), was on the Board of Studies in Social Work (and Social Administration) (1976–83), and was a member of the Senate (1975–83). She was an ALP elected member of the Legislative Council in the WA State Parliament (1974–80), losing her seat due to a redistribution.³⁵⁸ Grace was an activist in whatever she was involved in. Her political involvement and acumen was rare amongst social workers. Her unexpected death in January 1984 was a shock and significant loss to social work and social welfare, not only in Australia but internationally. She was deeply committed to Australia's participation in Asia and to ensuring women's full participation in society, and provided a role model for all who professed a concern for social justice.

My Board Membership

As has been indicated, I took my membership of the IASSW Board seriously. I saw it as a privilege to have this opportunity to operate internationally, despite all the difficulties and frustrations. Being responsible for a social work educational program in my own country, and believing firmly in the significant contribution that professional social work could make to the social good,

358 Vaughan, Grace Sydney (1922–1984), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Vol. 18, Melbourne University Press, 2012.

development of an international organisation of schools of social work should have been for me a central interest – and it was. I was fully and sometimes painfully aware that as an English-speaking white male in a developed western country, I was not strategically well placed to make the needed contribution as I saw it. However, I was certain that genuine morally-based professionalism was capable of not being bound by stereotypes but by explicit values, evidence, and individual judgement. Fortunately many of my social work colleagues from a variety of cultures seemed to share this way of looking at people and their collective existence.

In September, I received a joint letter from Marguerite Mathieu and Heinrich Schiller. Although they recognised the need for rotation of board members, they regretted that my term of office had come to an end. In addition to the general appreciation extended to all retiring members, they wrote, 'May we be allowed to add our own personal note of gratefulness for all you have done to assist us in the Board meetings as well as in various committees'.³⁵⁹

In February 1983, the search committee under the chairmanship of Dick Splane, IASSW vice-president, sent out a summary statement on the main functions of IASSW, and the qualities and duties expected of the its secretary-general. I was in the USA on sabbatical leave, no longer a head of school or a board member, but remained concerned and interested in its future. Future activities suggested for IASSW included:

- a stronger emphasis on research into social work education and dissemination of its findings
- an inquiry into the comparability of professional social work qualifications and the establishment of procedures to handle questions related to this matter
- increased attention to the production and use of all types of teaching aids and materials, and
- the development of special projects in a wide variety of educational areas

As before, the wide variety of qualities hoped for in a secretary-general were to be used as guiding principles to assist the search committee.

³⁵⁹ Letter, Marguerite Mathieu and Heinrich Schiller to Professor John Lawrence, 21/9/82.

19.4 21st International Conference on Social Welfare

The ICSW biennial report for 1980/81 indicated changes were under way in relation to its functions, activities and membership.³⁶⁰ The changes stressed it should contribute to social development throughout the world, achieve greater involvement of government agencies and the possibility of changing its name to ‘International Council for Social Development’ was considered. ICSW was represented in 73 countries in the five continents of the world. Its members were national committees or national councils and 24 international organisations. Its network needed to be strengthened and widened. In Brighton 1982, various constitutional changes were affirmed to bring the constitution up to date. ICSW’s name was retained, but with the addition, ‘A World Organization Promoting Social Development’.

The Brighton world conference was attended by about 1500 people from 68 countries. Its theme – ACTION FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS – THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT AND VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS – indicated a focus on *both* government and voluntary social welfare structures. However, the preparatory world report, the papers and discussions concentrated primarily on what traditionally was called ‘the voluntary sector’ in social welfare, and government in relation to this sector. Professor Leaper (chairman of the International Program Committee) seemed to be thinking more broadly, when he said,

We must re-examine the different patterns of responsibility and of partnership in action which can make social progress possible at all levels of society. These patterns vary considerably with the traditions, political systems and the economic situation in the countries represented in the ICSW ... Clearly, most social progress is made when there is respect and co-operation between formal governmental structures and systems of mutual aid and association, at whatever level and on whatever scale these associations work. ... How can we ensure that social solidarity and the duties of citizenship are given their full weight while releasing and encouraging other initiatives for self-help and mutual aid? Which examples of partnership have demonstrably helped people to improve their standard of life without affecting adversely that of their fellow human beings?³⁶¹

David Scott

Australian David Scott (vice-president of ICSW for the Asia and Pacific Region, and world rapporteur) prepared the *World Report* for the 21st Conference.³⁶² From both ACOSS and earlier ICSW activities, I knew David well. He had had 30 years of work in voluntary organisations – with the Brotherhood of St Laurence in Melbourne (eventually as executive director, until stepping

360 International Council on Social Welfare, *Biennial Report* 1980/81.

361 Robert Leaper statement of why you should be at the conference, *Programme, 21st International Conference on Social Welfare*, p. 5.

362 International Council on Social Welfare, ‘Action for Social Progress – The Responsibilities of Government and Voluntary Organisations’, *World Report for 21st International Conference on Social Welfare*, Brighton, UK, 1982.

down in 1980), with Community Aid Abroad (founder and director from 1962), president of the Australian Council for Overseas Aid, president of ACOSS (from 1982), and formerly vice-president of the Australian government's Advisory Council on Social Security. His book, *Don't Mourn for me – Organise: the social and political uses of voluntary organisations* (George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1981), was a pioneering Australian social policy contribution on the voluntary sector.³⁶³ In 1982, he had just founded and was publisher of *Australian Society*, a new magazine on social issues, partly inspired by the British *New Society*, which I had appreciated for many years. Born in 1925 the only child of a soldier settler, David had attended Melbourne Grammar partly on scholarship, but had left school early. He joined the Australian Navy in 1942 and served in the Pacific as a member of the gun crew of the destroyer HMAS Arunta. (Our friend Johnny Thwaites served on the same ship.) In 1984, he became chairman of the Land Conservation Council of Victoria and later the first commissioner for the environment in Victoria.³⁶⁴ In November 2005, Trish and I went to a Sydney launch of his book *Last Flight Out of Dili: Memoirs of an Accidental Activist in the Triumph of East Timor*, Pluto Press, by Nobel Laureate, Jose Ramos-Horta. David first went to East Timor in November 1975, just a few days before the Indonesian invasion and had been forced to leave. His book documented and challenged Australia's role in East Timor, and gave an account of his own involvement over the years with Ramos-Horta and other key East Timor players. David's was a life devoted to human well-being. He was a strong supporter of professional social workers, with whom he shared common basic values, and he developed his own knowledge and skills in working with many of them.

With a questionnaire as guidance, 32 national committees and three international organisations in membership of ICSW provided material for the 1982 *World Report* for Brighton. In his introduction to the report, David Scott cautioned that it dealt with only the ICSW world and then only with a part of that world. Countries representing almost half of the world's population were not linked to ICSW. 'Hopefully, as ICSW membership increases, we will be able to benefit from dialogue with people concerned with human well-being in countries with a wider variety of political systems.' The report had an Anglocentric bias due to his own language limitations, and lack of ICSW resources to help preparation of members' reports. The report was not a definitive statement about the voluntary sector. It raised critical questions for discussion – about the existence of a voluntary sector; its functions; a government's relations with

363 In its preface, he was grateful for large numbers of people in voluntary organisations, government, and universities here and overseas, who had helped him to understand social welfare in its social and political context. For this book, he gave special thanks to Herb Bisno, Martin Rein, Peter Hollingworth and especially Hugh Stretton for rigorous criticism and constructive suggestions. Scott briefly referred to the five sectors of welfare administration in a society – family, neighbourhood, commerce, government, and voluntary or people's organisations. His book concentrated on the fifth. The purpose was to encourage a more critical and appreciative attitude to people's organisations and their social and political significance. He acknowledged that issues such as organisation and management theory and practice were only treated superficially, yet were important. Many people in service organisations and self-help groups had not had the opportunity for training or reflection about the nature of organisation.

364 Richard Tanter, 'David Scott, 1925–2012' – obituary on the internet.

voluntary organisations; organisation, accountability, and participation in the sector; and its future:

- *Reports from many ICSW members invoke (the) principles of freedom of association, subsidiarity³⁶⁵ and pluralism as the principles underlying the existence of the voluntary sector, but are these principles that give legitimacy and purpose to voluntary organisations upheld more in principle and rhetoric, than in practice?*
- *Are the voluntary organisations in the form they exist appropriate and, if not, how can they be adapted to contemporary needs?*
- *How is the size and nature of the voluntary sector identified in a country?³⁶⁶*
- *How do organisations decide whether they should be experimenting? Should they innovate at the expense of conventional services? How can experiments be funded?*
- *What is the scope of services provided by the voluntary sector? Is the service-provider function the main or only function? Is it filling service gaps or inadequacies?*
- *To what extent should, or could, there be choice of service available to people? How can decisions be made about what kinds of services should offer a choice of auspice, for example, child care, family planning, sheltered workshops, housing, drug dependency? What criteria could be used to decide how resources should be allocated between administered departments, more conventional voluntary organisations, and self-help groups that want to provide services? What difference does it make if a service is provided by a government or a voluntary agency?*
- *Is the advocacy role of voluntary organisations, supposed to be one of their most important functions, a pretence or a reality? How important is advocacy? How can public opinion be influenced? What are the appropriate strategies and techniques in particular countries and circumstances? How could ICSW national committees, ICSW regional offices and headquarters help member organisations to be more effective on behalf of and alongside people who suffer most through poverty, inequality, disability and racial or sex discrimination in their own countries?*
- *Is it best to support the self-help groups to campaign for their rights? Is it appropriate to form coalitions of organisations that might campaign more effectively? What is the role of information, communication and the media in preventing or encouraging reform?*
- *What were the value guardian and value promotion responsibilities of voluntary organisations? In what ways could their importance be better appreciated by voluntary organisations?*
- *How does government see the role of voluntary organisations, and how do the government and voluntary sectors relate to one another?*

365 'Larger and higher organisation should not arrogate to itself functions which can be performed by smaller and lower bodies'.

366 Australian had an estimated 30,000 voluntary organisations. A university research project (at the Social Welfare Research Centre, UNSW), in association with ACOSS, was rectifying the dismal lack of information on the voluntary sector in Australia.

- *How can smaller, newer or less popular organisations working in areas of greater need receive more funding, instead of a disproportionate amount going to better resourced organisations working in better-off areas?*
- *How valuable was participation in consultative bodies?*
- *Should there be a charter that establishes the place of voluntary organisations?*
- *How can government be assured that services will be efficient and effective and sympathetic? Do we really understand the tensions between autonomy and the increasing expectation that voluntary organisations using public monies must be accountable for what they do? What method of funding helps to achieve the best balance?*
- *Fundamental questions to be asked when a voluntary organisation was formed and regularly during its existence, were 'what is its purpose?', and 'what are the values or views about participation, accountability, efficiency, effectiveness and relevancy?' 'How can it build in provisions to ensure responsiveness to changing needs?'*

The final chapter on the future in the *World Report* observed that in most countries the situation of poor, vulnerable, disadvantaged people was worsening despite economic growth. In industrial states, a slow-down in economic growth had led to a cutback in social expenditure, yet unemployment increased. In these circumstances what was the future for voluntary organisations? Some industrial countries indicated a new interest in voluntary organisations, for both positive and negative reasons – a greater realisation of their social welfare potential, and governments lacking resources off-loading their social responsibilities onto non-government organisations. P. D. Kulkarni, consultant for the *World Report* for the Asian and Pacific region, pointed out that in developing countries the capacity of the community to mobilise resources to meet needs adequately did not exist, although voluntary organisations had proliferated in many developing countries in recent years.

- *What should voluntary organisations do? Concentrate all efforts on providing services to meet need wherever they can? Use all their resources to campaign for greater government responsibility and social justice? Try to provide services and also influence public opinion and government? If so, how much weight should be given to each function and what are the most effective and appropriate means of influencing?*

Can they rely on government funds and be independent and critical? Whatever decisions are taken, voluntary organisations need to attract people who support them, not only with money, but perhaps more importantly want to support their policies for minor and major reforms.

Whether more people will become involved will depend on the voluntary organisations being able to present themselves as having clear policies about their function and about government responsibilities; acknowledging the importance of maximising participation by users; having flexible structures that can make use of the skills and enthusiasms of all kinds of people, particularly the young, who may see voluntary organisations as relics of the days of charity attempting to meet large-scale need, noblesse oblige, and assumptions that the fault that created

dependency lies inevitably with the person in need and not with society and its prejudices and unequal arrangements for distributing resources and opportunities.

As well as providing services, voluntary organisations can be the kind of mediating and representative structures that are desperately needed everywhere to give people more authority, responsibility and influence.³⁶⁷

Except for the closing session held in the Dome, the plenary sessions of the Conference were held in the Brighton Centre, the largest conference and exhibition centre in southern England. It was located on King's Road on the seafront just a 10-minute walk to the Station. Opened in 1977, it was regularly used for conferences of the British political parties and other bodies of national importance. The building was functional but not very attractive. On the first floor, was an exhibition of display stands by organisations engaged in action to improve the conditions under which people lived, organised by the National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 'the major resource and development agency for the voluntary sector in England'.

Simultaneous interpretation in English, French and Spanish was provided. Inevitably conference organisation was again complex, given the scope of the conference theme and the number and variety of participants to be engaged in the discussions. Each participant was asked to provide on a registration form a first, second and third preference for a discussion group, and every attempt was made to assign people to their first preference if practicable. There were 9 sectors, each meeting in a particular room – world distribution of resources, migrants and refugees, employment, personal social services, income maintenance, education, health, housing, and rural development. Each sector comprised a number of monolingual groups. Each discussion group focused on its area of interest at local, state or provincial, national, continental or international level. Each had as its theme the theme of the conference, considering it in relation to the *World Report* and the content of plenary sessions. Altogether a participant had 45 first options, each with linguistic options! Table leaders reported to their sector coordinators, who in turn discussed their findings within three (monolingual) commissions – commission A: international; commission B: national; and commission C: local. Each commission considered the conference theme at its particular level, meeting on Thursday, 2 September, and Friday, 3 September – after the plenary and discussion group meetings on the previous three days. The commissions consisted of the chairmen, speakers and sector coordinators, regional representatives, and representatives of the IASSW and the IFSW. While the design was comprehensive, it was clearly ambitious, given the time available and the variability in the participants' backgrounds, experience and capacities. Everyone was given the opportunity to be involved in areas in which they had expertise, knowledge, interest, or just curiosity.

In the ten plenary sessions, papers were presented but copies were not available to participants. The first four were introductory plenaries on general topics followed by group discussions –

367 International Council on Social Welfare, *World Report for 21st International Conference on Social Welfare*, Brighton, UK, 1982.

- Do non-government bodies have a role in the North-South dialogue?
- National governments and voluntary organisations – conflict or partnership?
- Social development. The contribution of community groups and local authorities.
- Why should inter-governmental organisations take voluntary bodies seriously?

Throughout the conference, participants received periodic ‘Conference Bulletins’. Bulletin No. 4 (2/9/82) reported there was some agreement that while table discussions had been helpful, there was room for improvement in the organisation of the discussion. Table leaders should have had guidelines on how to proceed.

Some participants felt that the table discussions should have focused more on the political aspects of their work. They found they had become bogged down in discussing people’s motivations for volunteering in the first place. It seemed that when table participants had varying levels of knowledge, the debate was pulled down to the lowest common denominator. An irony that emerged was that those countries who had a history of colonialism were those who understood the concept of volunteerism.

The remaining six plenaries were specialist focused on these topics –

- The European Community NGOs and the Third World
- Refugees and voluntary organisations. An Asian experience.
- Employment and voluntary organisations. The UK experience.
- The role of voluntary organisations in rural development – Latin American experiences.
- The situation of children today and in the future. UNICEF and NGOs in partnership.
- What did NGOs contribute to the International Year of Disabled People?³⁶⁸

On Friday, 3 September, were three sequential one-hour forums, organised by other organisations:

- Conclusions of the IASSW congress and IFSW symposium³⁶⁹
- The public and voluntary sectors: partners or adversaries in serving the ageing? (organised by International Federation on Ageing and Age Concern England)³⁷⁰
- Private organisations – contributions to health services (organised by International Federation of Multiple Sclerosis Societies)

³⁶⁸ This had a panel of speakers and was chaired by Norman Acton, secretary-general, of Rehabilitation International. I appreciated briefly catching up with him.

³⁶⁹ Speakers: Marguerite Matthieu (IASSW), Terry Bamford (UK).

³⁷⁰ The speakers included William Kerrigan, currently secretary-general, UN World Assembly on Ageing. The forum was jointly chaired by David Hobman (Age Concern England), and Charlotte Nusberg (senior program specialist, IFA). Age Concern invited me to an ‘informal reception’ to meet Bill Kerrington at the Old Ship Hotel, Marine Parade, Brighton, 5.30–7pm, and afterwards for dinner in the Gresham room at the Hotel, on Thursday, 2 September – a very friendly, warm occasion. I particularly appreciated seeing Bill, David, and Charlotte again. I admired their work.

In the closing plenary session, chaired by Maude Akanya (president of the Nigeria Council of Social Service) on Saturday morning, 4 September, each of the three commission chairmen reported on how the conference topic had been seen at their particular organisational level – international: Nigel Martin (Canada); national: Edith Motta (Brazil); and local: Kaj Westergaard (Denmark). My notes recorded a few points from each commission: At the international level – the importance of advocacy by the voluntary sector; the need for more effective coordination among the NGOs; ICSW should urge for a new conference of ministers responsible for social welfare to review since 1968 and plan for the next 15 years – segmented sections for the old, youth, children were separated from social planning; the need for NGOs to adopt a global perspective, e.g. re unemployment, increasing problem of migration. ICSW influence could be immense because of its political freedom. At the national level – NGOs should not have priorities imposed on them by the government; the state should achieve an equitable apportionment of resources. At the local level – a reaffirmation of action for social progress through government/non-government cooperation; perception of government had changed to encouraging participation of non-governmental bodies for service and research; machinery of cooperation was needed at all levels; service providers had to be accountable; and voluntary agencies needed to be more sensitive to changing community needs. The commission reports were followed by an over-view by the world rapporteur David Scott. He emphasised that it had not been an issues conference, but one about structures and organisational relationships.

I can recall chatting on the train to London with Michael Horsburgh (University of Sydney), who had stayed with friends during the Congress and Conference, and Frances Hishon. During the Congress, Frances and Ann Lavan, Irish social work educators,³⁷¹ had talked to me about the difficulties of practising social work in a society dominated by the Catholic Church and its priesthood.

³⁷¹ Ann Lavan (lecturer, Department of Social Science, University College, Dublin) was honorary secretary, European Regional Group of IASSW.

World Meetings 1982 - Brighton, UK



Baker family & friends - English pub, end of long walk through countryside near Guilford - day of my arrival in UK



Sussex University, Brighton



June Huntington (former UNSW colleague) - IASSW Congress



Wyatt Jones, David Jones and Dick English - Brighton conferences



David Cox, R.J.L, and two NZ delegates (Ken Daniels and ?)



Gunvor Brettschneider (Finland) and Harriet Jacobssen (Sweden) - colleagues and friends from IASSW board



Heinrich Schiller (Germany), IASSW President (1980-88) (His school wished to nominate me as his successor in the presidency)



Sight-seeing in Brighton with Melbourne colleagues David Cox, Lionel Sharpe and Elizabeth Ozanne



With Irish colleagues Ann Lavan and Frances Hishon



The Royal Pavilion - Brighton

Chapter 20

A Challenging Assignment

The volume on living and working overseas has already described how, in August 1983 when I was in Cleveland, I received the extraordinary invitation to deliver the first Dame Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture to a joint session of the IASSW Congress and IFSW Symposium in Montreal 1984.³⁷² Earlier, in June 1983, when I was urgently asked to cable suggestions for the Younghusband memorial lecturer, I had replied: 'Suggest Kendall on social worker as international practitioner ...' On 8 September 1983, Dick Nann (co-chairman, 1984 Congress Planning Committee), reported to the committee that Dr Katherine Kendall would give a background to the lecture:

The lecture itself will be given by Professor John Lawrence of Australia drawing upon his rich and diverse international experiences. This will be a joint session with IFSW. The selection of Dr Kendall and Professor Lawrence for the Memorial Lecture is the outcome of extensive discussions I have had with numerous persons including, among others, members of the IASSW Board.³⁷³

As a member of the Planning Committee of the Montreal IASSW Congress, I was generally aware of what was being planned but never anticipated I would have the responsibility for the memorial lecture. The sabbatical year had helped to clarify and shape my future writing program in two major areas – the ethics of professions, and a comprehensive framework for the analysis of social welfare. In my report to council at the end of the sabbatical, I said my immediate research and writing must be focused on this particular task (the memorial lecture), but this would clearly be building on my teaching and research interests of 1983. (These, of course, for me were not new-found interests.) The 'Global Currents' lecture series at the Case Western Reserve had been particularly relevant to the task.³⁷⁴

Richard Nann's letter of 15 September congratulated me on my selection 'to lead off what should become a very important series of lectures'. The lecture was scheduled for Wednesday, August 1, 9–10.15 am, at a joint plenary attended by delegates from both IASSW and IFSW. Since it was an inaugural memorial lecture, Katherine Kendall would speak for about 15–20 minutes reviewing the

372 See Vol. 4, p. 120.

373 Richard C. Nann to IASSW 1984 Congress Programme Committee, 8/9/83.

374 See Vol. 4, pp. 125–6.

background to the lecture series. (Katherine and Dame Eileen had been very close colleagues and friends for many years, and the fact she would be doing this before I spoke was a significant factor in my acceptance of the assignment. As indicated, I had thought Katherine would have been ideal for the whole assignment.) There would be no questions from the floor, because table discussions were scheduled immediately following the lecture, 10.30am to noon. Some general guidelines had been developed by the board for the memorial lecture, but I should not feel bound by them. Because it was a joint session the lecture should embrace in scope both social work education and practice. I should proceed on the assumption that I would not be out of pocket in taking on this task.³⁷⁵

In October, 1983, Heinrich Schiller wrote as president of IASSW, 'With great joy and relief I received a message from Dick Nann that you have accepted the task of delivering our first Memorial Lecture in Montreal'.³⁷⁶ In January 1984, I received from the organising committee of the IFSW a copy of the preliminary program for the Symposium with details of the format and content, with the hope that my lecture would take their overall concerns into account.³⁷⁷ On 4 May, as requested by Dick Nann, I provided a resume of myself, and also the title of the Younghusband memorial lecture for inclusion in the final printed program.³⁷⁸ On 6 June, I sent a copy of the lecture and suggested that copies be made for congress members to receive as they leave for the discussion groups, and also for the interpreters. It was typed single-spaced and could be copied on both sides of the paper to make it easier to handle in bulk.³⁷⁹

In March, 1984, in response to a request from Marguerite Mathieu, I estimated my expenses would total US\$2,545.³⁸⁰ I hoped to obtain US\$285 from UNSW, so I would need at least US\$2,260, in order to attend the IASSW Congress and the prior international seminar in New York. I indicated that I would, in fact be purchasing an around-the-world air fare, to enable me to visit our new and first granddaughter and her parents in Oxford in the UK from 8th to 21 July.

Because I had spent 1983 in North America on sabbatical leave, I had thought that our family finances could not stand another overseas trip so soon. I am very much looking forward to seeing you and other friends and colleagues in the fairly near future, and I am, of course, especially pleased now to have the opportunity to see the most recent member of our family.³⁸¹

Marguerite wrote that IASSW would supplement the amount received from the Trust Fund (for the lecture) and would provide the US\$2,260.³⁸²

375 Letter, Richard (Dick) Nann to John Lawrence, 15/9/83,

376 Letter, Heinrich Schiller to John Lawrence, 10/10/83.

377 Letter, Ben Chud to John Lawrence, 20/1/84. In reply, I sent my warmest regards to two of his UBC colleagues, Dick Splane and Dick Nann. Clearly faculty at the School of Social Work at UBC were playing central roles in the organising of the 1984 meetings in Montreal.

378 Letter, John Lawrence to Richard C. Nann, 4/5/84.

379 Letter, John Lawrence to Richard C. Nann, 6/6/84.

380 This covered: Apex air fare – Sydney, New York, Montreal US\$1,872; International Seminar – accommodation and living expenses US\$245; IASSW Congress – registration, accommodation and living expenses US\$428.

381 Letter, John Lawrence to Marguerite Mathieu, 21/3/84.

382 Letter, Marguerite Mathieu to John Lawrence, 25/4/84.

Chapter 21

First Visit to Ireland, 4–8 July, 1984³⁸³

In April 1984, Frances Hishon, who headed the social work course in the Department of Social Theory and Institutions at the University College in Cork (UCC), repeated her invitation (made at the Brighton Congress) to visit Cork. She wrote at considerable length to see if I was planning an Irish visit on my way to Canada. It would be a delight to show me as much of Ireland as I wished to and had time to see, and for me to talk with her colleagues. She was supremely confident that my Montreal paper would be challenging and stimulating, and would deal fairly extensively with values – and virtues! Cork was a mass of contradictions – maybe characteristic of all provincial cities. Generally it was immensely traditional – in its values, its practices and its expectations of its citizens. But it attracted some astonishingly different, innovative, imaginative people (not many!) and tolerated them surprisingly well. Frances mentioned that last week Kay Carmichael and David Donnison had stayed overnight on their way to Kerry where David had a cottage in ‘a most lovely place’. Her riverbank cottage had been two flats so she could offer me a ‘suite’ if I came.³⁸⁴ I decided to accept the enthusiastic, generous invitation. I could go to Ireland first, before my promised stay with David, Ruth and Naomi in Oxford, 8–21 July. I suggested a couple of possible topics for a formal presentation – or we could leave it open-ended, because there was so much that we could talk about. I left the choice to them.³⁸⁵ Frances and her colleagues at UCC sent out invitations to a mixed group of college people, local social workers, and Cork social services administrators to come and meet me at 11am on Friday, 6 July, hear me deliver a paper, and talk with me informally over a glass of sherry.³⁸⁶ She thought my suggested topic, ‘Social Welfare in Our Time’, might best meet the needs of this rather diverse group.³⁸⁷

I flew from Sydney by Qantas at 3.15pm on Tuesday, 3 July. At Heathrow

383 In my archives is a brief diary which I kept for 4–28 July.

384 Letter, Frances Hishon to John Lawrence, 10/4/84.

385 Letter, John Lawrence to Frances Hishon, 4/5/84.

386 Letter, Frances Hishon to John Lawrence, 2/6/84.

387 I had given a presentation on this topic at Rutgers in 1983.

Airport in London, I caught a British Airlines flight arriving at Cork Airport at 1pm on Wednesday, 4 July. Frances welcomed me in her battered car newly polished for the occasion, and took me to a smoked salmon lunch with strawberries. Her cottage was at Inniscarra on the north side of river Lee, about 15 km west from Cork City. I slept for an hour, and we went for a walk with Sam (her dog) on the other side of River Lee in the Ballincollig Regional Park. The next day, we visited medieval Blarney Castle where I 'kissed the Blarney stone'; Anglers' Rest pub; Fota House and garden (now owned by UCC) on a small island in the very large Cork Harbour; and the wharf at Cobh, a town on the Great Island of Cork harbour from which all emigrants from south Ireland left for overseas (St Coleman's Cathedral dominated the town). In the evening, we talked and had dinner with John Maguire (professor of social theory and institutions at UCC).

About 40 people came to my presentation on Friday morning on conceptions of social welfare. It was generously received. (My diary recorded 'much enthusiasm'.) John Maguire joined us for lunch with Maev Saunders and Paddy Murphy. Maev had been at the ANU for three years to 1980, doing a thesis on Patrick White. Afterwards, we walked around in central Cork, viewing a bookshop, an 'English' market, a new shopping arcade, a Franciscan church in a slum area, St Finbarr's Cathedral, and the buildings of UCC. Cork, with about 140,000 people, was Ireland's second largest city. Back at Frances's cottage, I mowed the lawn and talked with Walter Lorenz who was going to Hong Kong on sabbatical, teaching social work and concepts of welfare. Saturday, 7 July, was spent on a memorable drive and commentary from Frances in west Cork County – Macroom, a market town whose population had been decimated in the 1840s by famine and emigration; Gougane barra 16th century monastery, forest park and lake; the Keimaneigh Pass through a precipitous ravine in the Cahal Mountains; and the town of Bantry and Bantry Bay, a deep-water gulf extending for 30kms to the west. Much of the area was wild, remote and beautiful. I was devastated I had lost the use of my camera. It slid off my shoulder and hit the road when I was getting out of the car at UCC the day before.

I greatly appreciated the hospitality and lively professional discussions I had had particularly with Frances Hishon during my Cork visit. I was now, however, looking forward to seeing our eldest son David, his wife Ruth, and of course Naomi, whom I had not yet seen, and to spending a bit of time in Oxford again.

Visit to Ireland



Wharf, Cobh, Cork Harbour - where emigrants (including some my antecedents) departed for Australia; St Coleman's Cathedral



Prof. John Maguire and Frances Hishon - University College, Cork

Family Matters - Oxford



Naomi (first grandchild), R.J.L., David and Ruth R. - Oxford



Visit from the Sonleys (Geoff, Isabel and Garth)



Magdalen College



Magdalen College



Archbishop of York's Palace, River Ouse



Looking after Naomi, Palace rose garden (her parents talking with Archbishop's secretary about David's future)



Naomi and her grandfather



Trinity College, Bristol

Chapter 22

Oxford – Family Matters 8–21 July, 1984

It was a joy to meet all of the family at Heathrow at 3.10pm on Sunday, 8 July. They were in a borrowed car. We drove to their flat in 3A Polstead Road in North Oxford after a brief drive around the town, and returned the car to Graham and Janet Tomlin. After dinner, we chatted until almost midnight about many things including their thoughts about their future. They were not settled in Oxford. Because David was a diploma and not a degree student, and was married and living away from Wycliffe, they encountered attitudes which they found hard to reconcile with their notions of Christianity. Also David questioned the relevance of much of what he was learning for the ministry.

On Monday, 9 July, Naomi woke at 5.30am, but I managed to get back to sleep until 8.30am. Late morning, we walked into town. I checked at a camera shop in the High and another in the Turl to see if I could get my first, very reliable 1954 camera fixed. (Its lens was first-rate.) The latter shop was willing to sent it away for 6 weeks! I decided to buy a new one, and with David's help selected a Pentax ME Super, which proved to be an excellent choice, which I was to use until eventually I transferred to a digital camera in 2006. After lunch in a courtyard restaurant in the Turl, Ruth returned home (she had someone coming at 3.30pm), while the rest of us walked to Christchurch meadow, past Merton College to Magdalen, through Magdalen (my room with access to the open-air pulpit had been split into offices), along Longwall, Holywell, the Parks, and back home. At 5pm, the Tomlins came around for a drink and chat before dinner. After dinner, we chatted about David and Ruth's future plans.

The next day, Ruth's two sisters, Rebecca and Joanna, came from London to spend the day. Late morning, David and I went for a walk to Port Meadow and the river. He was having serious doctrinal and other doubts about a future in the ministry, and obviously was welcoming the opportunity to talk at length. I was thankful to be there at this time. In the afternoon, we had a game of squash at council courts, about $\frac{3}{4}$ mile from their home, and David had a swim. In the evening while David and Ruth went to a fellowship group at St Aldate's, I babysat and wrote to Trish. On Wednesday, 11 July, we talked in the morning and in the afternoon, David and I took Naomi to Port Meadow.

At 5pm, we had high tea with Canadian Brian Crook, and a couple of other fellow students at Wycliffe Hall.

At 7.15pm, I walked to 25 Beechcroft Road and visited David and Sylvia Worswick. Earlier in the day, I had seen David riding his bike near Wycliffe Hall. I knew it was him when he did not hear me when I called out to him. (He had a hearing aid when he was my economics tutor at Magdalen.) Remarkably they lived exactly opposite where Trish and I had had digs in 24 Beechcroft Road. We had a great talk catching up on the past 30 years. I left at 9.15pm because David had to prepare for a conference the next day. He retired from his job as director of a National Economic Research Institute in London two years earlier and returned to Oxford to live. He was sharing an office in Magdalen, writing papers, giving lectures etc, and enjoying life. David Stout had worked with him in London, had gone to a chair of economics at Leicester University where he had not found the students as bright as those he was accustomed to in Oxford, and then went to a highly paid job as an economic advisor for Unilever, and was happy. Margaret Tite was still living at the Old Pound House. Peter and Phil did not seem to be very settled.

In the morning of Thursday, 12 July, David organised for us to drive in a hire car on Monday to see Simon Wright in York. In the afternoon, we bought a circular walker for Naomi, visited Julian Hardwick's room at Christchurch but he was not there, looked at Christchurch Cathedral, and took various photos on the way home. Naomi fed herself for the first time – a welcome development. On Friday, David, Naomi and I went to the Natural History Museum and the General Pitt Rivers Museum (archeological and ethnographic). Late afternoon, we looked at Rhodes House and had afternoon tea with the current warden's wife, Mrs Fletcher. I had met Robin Fletcher at a UNSW luncheon for him when he was the warden-elect in 1979, and Trish had spent a day with Mrs Fletcher, June Davies, and Beth McCaskill, at that time. Mrs Fletcher was very welcoming.

On Saturday, 14 July, Doug Lee drove us all to a pleasant village, Swinbrook, about 15 miles out of Oxford, where we had a picnic lunch, looked at the local church (Nancy Mitford was buried in the churchyard), and a bargain sale in the church hall. Doug, a school friend of David's was studying and tutoring in ancient history at Cambridge. His family owned a well-known pharmacy in Gordon shopping centre in Sydney. Later in the afternoon, Doug drove us to Woodstock to see the grounds of Blenheim Palace. At 5.45pm, Geoff, Isabel and Garth Sonley came to Polstead Road from their home in Beaconsfield. After Geoff and I had a good game of squash, we all went to dinner at the Old Parsonage Hotel. Afterwards we drove in Geoff's turbo SAAB to the river beside the Trout Inn and walked along the river to the Godstow Lock. Coffee at David and Ruth's finished a fun evening. The Sonleys were our next-door neighbours at Balgowlah Heights when we first came to Sydney to live. They had had a meal with other neighbours, John and Deidre Adams, just the week before.

Sunday, 15 July, started with an excellent game of squash with Doug Lee. At 3pm, he drove me to Margaret Tite's home, but unfortunately she was not at home. We visited Magdalen cricket ground, looked at photos of teams in the pavilion, walked around Addison's Walk in Magdalen and the Fellows' Garden

besides the Cherwell. In the evening John Feltham drove me to his home at Woodstock for dinner with his wife Elizabeth, his son Mark (just finished first year of maths at Cambridge), and Patricia Karas (originally from Melbourne, now teaching in communication studies at a polytechnic). John, a law don at Magdalen, was still deeply politically conservative and now strongly approved of Margaret Thatcher's policies despite their social consequences!

David and I collected a hire car (a VW Polo) at Kennings on Monday, and we all drove to York and back – a total of 385 miles. From 2pm to 5pm, David and Ruth discussed their current situation with Simon Wright, the Archbishop's chaplain, and director of ordinands (David's theological studies at Wycliffe Hall in Oxford were being sponsored by the York Diocese.) I took care of Naomi in the rose garden of the Archbishop's Palace on the river. Periodically throughout the afternoon, our photos were taken by tourists on boats coming to view the palace, sometimes when I was changing nappies! David and Ruth had a good talk and it was decided to visit Bristol on Thursday to see if Trinity College there might be a suitable place for possible relocation.

On Tuesday, 17 July, I went to tea at 4pm at Bill and Gillian Williams' home at 94 Lonsdale road. Bill had retired as warden of Rhodes House in 1980. We had a thoroughly enjoyable talk until after 6pm, when I walked back home. Bill came some of the way with me and urged us to get in touch when we were next in Oxford. The next day, I played squash with one of David's fellow students, Paul Smith, getting to the courts on David's bike, my first ride for many years.

Again in a hire car from Kennings, we arrived in Bristol on Thursday at 11.45am. I looked after Naomi in the grounds of Trinity College, while David and Ruth had a series of interviews with Dr George Carey³⁸⁸ and other staff members to investigate the possibility of David transferring to Trinity College. David considered the course was much more appropriate than Wycliffe's for his particular needs, and the general friendliness of the place impressed them both. An administrator would help them find suitable accommodation. Although it would be an upheaval they decided they should tell Simon Wright and Geoffrey Shaw (principal at Wycliffe Hall) that they wanted to move. We left Bristol after a brief look at the city centre and arrived home at about 6pm. In the evening, David had a long talk with Simon Wright. He would see the Archbishop the next day and get his approval for the move. Since George Carey and he were in favour of it, there should not be too much difficulty. David was, however, apprehensive about Geoffrey Shaw's reaction. On Friday, after hearing from Simon Wright the Archbishop approved his transfer to Trinity college in Bristol, David and Ruth talked with Wycliffe's deputy-principal (at the suggestion of the principal because he was on leave). Again I minded Naomi, in the grounds of Wycliffe. Afterwards we walked downtown where I opened an account at Blackwell's, Oxford's first-rate bookshop. After a fine farewell dinner cooked by Ruth, I talked with her parents (Pat and Cyril Rosamond) by phone. They were arriving the next day.

³⁸⁸ George Carey, born 1935 in the East End of London, was principal of Trinity College, Bristol, 1982–87. He was an unassuming, very impressive man, who subsequently was Archbishop of Canterbury, 1991–2002.

Chapter 23

IASSW/Hunter College International Seminar – New York 21–27 July, 1984

In March, 1984, I was invited to participate in an international seminar in New York, immediately prior to meetings of the IASSW Board of Directors and the International Congress of Schools of Social Work in Montreal. It was the final international event associated with the Moses Distinguished Visiting Professorship for 1983–84 at Hunter College School of Social Work in New York. The co-directors were Charlies Guzzetta (professor of social work at Hunter) and Katherine Kendall (the first Moses professor at Hunter). Its purpose and theme:

To involve selected educational leaders from various countries in all geographical regions in a critical review and assessment of the functional and dysfunctional aspects of current and recent influences on social work and social work education with a view to developing a deeper understanding of national and regional differences together with a sense of international solidarity.

Each participant was required to prepare in advance a critique of the influences in his/her country or region in the past decade. Examples of influences were given – conscientisation; ecology; demographic problems – ageing, population pressures; ethnic and cultural pluralism; human and civil rights – sexism, racism, gender preference, etc; ideologies – political and economic; indigenisation; migration – refugees, guest workers, illegal aliens, etc: minorities; nationalism; peace and disarmament; reconceptualisation of social work; technological change and unemployment. Briefly, how had the selected influences affected the provision of services in a country or region? How were the influences expressed or dealt with in the objectives, curriculum content, field experience, and research in social work education in a country or region? How could the IASSW, cooperating with regional and national bodies, facilitate a better flow upward and outward on national and regional developments and, at all levels, a deeper concern for international developments? What was the role, if any, of national, regional, and subregional associations and the IASSW

in helping their members meet the challenge of affirming and enhancing the international unity of social work as a professional discipline while protecting the diversity related to local, national, and regional concerns? Questions drawn from the papers would be discussed in plenary sessions each morning of the seminar. Katherine attached a note to my invitation: 'You are absolved from the sin of not preparing a paper. How is the E.Y. lecture progressing? It will be great to have you with us again'. (In fact, my colleague Edna Chamberlain provided a paper on the Australian situation, anyway.) By special arrangement with Hunter College, a student dormitory of 40 single rooms would be available at \$10 a night. The dormitory was described as pleasant and modern. It was an excellent location from which to explore New York City.³⁸⁹

In May came the good news that successful third world candidates for Canadian study grants to the Montreal conferences included a number of our colleagues who were members of the IASSW board of directors, or related to its work. This would enable them to attend the seminar in New York. The deadline for submitting the required paper had had to be extended to mid-June at the latest.³⁹⁰

I took a taxi to the bus station in Oxford and caught the 8am bus to very crowded Heathrow Airport on Saturday, 21 July. Flying to New York by TWA (7 hours) – 12 noon to 2.30pm, I sat beside Joe Fong, a Malayan GP, now working in Whyalla, South Australia. He was visiting his sister who was doing a doctorate in social work at Bryn Mawr, and would be with the Australian Olympic team in Los Angeles as one of their medical advisers. JFK Airport was chaotic. We eventually caught a bus at 4.30pm to Central Station where I took a taxi to Hunter College Brookdale Center, East 25th Street and First Avenue. When I found out from Chuck Guzzetta that the seminar opening had had to be delayed until Monday, I was furious because I could have stayed for Naomi's christening on 22 July.

Our accommodation was a disgrace. Chuck and Katherine were very upset about it. It was rundown and dirty, and lights, sinks, toilets, showers, etc did not work too well. They had had to hire bed sheets and pillow cases, but there were no pillows! Chuck and I had a meal at a nearby cheap Italian restaurant on 23rd Street, and I enjoyed catching up on his news.

I spent the unexpected free day on Sunday 22 July with Edna Chamberlain and Chris Breeding (an American social worker who had taught in Edna's school in Queensland). After lunch in a pleasant café in Madison Avenue, we went to the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, Andrew Carnegie's home, and the locality of the New York School of Social Work from after the Second World War until the early 1970s. We finished up in the bookshop at the Metropolitan Museum, but too late to see anything else. After chatting on the steps and looking at the passing parade, we returned to the Brookdale Center. I had an evening meal with Abram Doron from Israel.

389 Letter, Charles Guzzetta and Katherine Kendall to John Lawrence, 7/3/84.

390 Letter, Katherine Kendall to John Lawrence, 7/5/84.

The Participants

The international seminar consisted of 52 selected social work educational leaders connected with the IASSW board. They came from 30 countries – Austria (1), Australia (2), Brazil (2), Canada (2), Columbia (1), Denmark (1), Dominican Republic (1), Egypt (1), England (1), Ethiopia (1), Germany (2), Greece (1), Guyana, Hungary (2), India (5), Indonesia (1), Israel (1), Korea (2), Nicaragua (1), Papua New Guinea (1), Peru (2), Philippines (4), Singapore (1), South Africa (2), Sri Lanka (1), Sweden (3), Tanzania (1), Thailand (1), and USA (5). Our plenary discussions and buzz sessions were held in the north lounge, Brookdale Center.

The Opening Session

A World View of Social Work Education

After the seminar orientation at Brookdale Center by Chuck Guzzetta and Katherine Kendall, we went up town to the Hunter College School of Social Work, East 79th Street for lunch and the opening plenary session, chaired by Harold Lewis, dean of the school. In the opening paper, 'Social Work Education 1984: Accent on Change', Katherine Kendall, contrasted the 1980s with the late 1960s when the first *World Guide to Social Work Education* had been compiled. The latter was a time of considerable turmoil in social work education:

Students were demonstrating: faculty members were lining up for and against radical change: schools of social work were becoming democratised, with deans and directors deposed from their seats of power; indigenisation and reconceptualization of social work education were the rallying cries throughout the Third World; foreign curriculum models were denounced and renounced; proponents of 'macro' and defenders of 'micro' in the curriculum were engaged in close to mortal combat. It was an exhilarating and exhausting period in a world of hope and confusion.

In 1984 of Orwellian fame, it was definitely not a period of exhilaration. New and different challenges were emerging, vastly more threatening to the stability of social work education than the fiery words of the sixties. In a review of the second edition of the *World Guide*, 1984, she presented specific examples, from Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Europe, of programs which represented a departure in structure or content from traditional patterns of social work education.

In conclusion, she observed:

Social work as a profession has never been free of problems, but in today's militaristic world, the humanitarian concerns we represent are frequently contested and too often produce lip service rather than social service.

This seminar will underline the ways in which our educational objectives and social programs are shaped by external forces and special interests. While remaining responsive to the needs and demands of our respective societies, we must also

consider whether there is any constellation of values, knowledge, and methods of work that is characteristic of social work as an international profession.

... I look forward to an exciting week with an accent on change and a cheer for continuity.³⁹¹

Social Work Education in USA

The second plenary paper, by Arthur Katz (executive director, CSWE, New York) described the characteristics of and contemporary influences on social work education in the United States – the country with the most extensive and in places, most developed, system of social work education. For a society of 235 million people, in 1983/84 there were 89 master's and 354 baccalaureate degree programs accredited by CSWE. 56 programs were 'joint' programs, offering both the master and baccalaureate. There were also 51 social work doctoral programs, almost all in institutions which also offered the MSW. The 446 schools and programs related to the population centres in the nation, with at least one undergraduate program in each of the 50 states. Graduate programs existed in 39 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. 57% of schools and programs were located in public colleges or universities sponsored by state governments. 56% of the 'joint' programs were in institutions with at least 20,000 students enrolled. Most baccalaureate programs were in colleges with less than 5,000 students.

About 90% of baccalaureate programs had fewer than 10 faculty members, and no baccalaureate program had more than 19 members. The mean number of faculty members in baccalaureate programs was 4.8 as compared to 33 for graduate joint programs. 1100 faculty members were in the 33 'graduate only' programs, 1800 in the 'joint' programs, and 1100 in the baccalaureate programs. About 25% of all faculty members were of ethnic minority background, i.e. Asian-American, Black, Chicano, Native American, or Puerto Rican. 55% of faculty who taught on the graduate or joint program level had doctoral degrees. Only 33% of baccalaureate program faculty had a doctorate.

Student numbers, part-time and full-time, and graduates in all categories were provided. The growth in the percentage of women enrolled and receiving degrees at every level of social work education had continued to rise, now exceeding 80% of the total. 93% of all master's students had a practice concentration, with over two-thirds combining this with a field of practice or a social problem focus. 52% concentrated on direct practice, 13% on generalist practice. The most prominent field of practice or social problem concentrations were mental health, health, family services, child welfare and ageing – in that order. The admission requirements, duration and content of the courses of study at the graduate level were sketched. Many of these programs were pressured to engage in a proliferation of course offerings. Fragmentation of a unified curriculum was a danger in attempts to accommodate fads, fashions, and highly specialised interests. However, there was relatively little system-wide change from the

391 Katherine A. Kendall, Moses Professor of Social Work, 'Social Work Education 1984: Accent on Change', International Seminar, Hunter College, July 1984.

traditional program of a decade or more ago. Efforts to establish different and distinct models for BSW and MSW programs had not been successful.

In the USA, social work was highly organised on a national and state level, under the leadership of NASW, with CSWE responsible for the standards of the educational system. Professional leadership could come from each. Needs and issues identified by practice through the national professional association, as well as the national practice agencies, were important influences on the educational system for social work.

Katz briefly sketched external and internal factors which had high influence on professional practice and, in turn, the educational system in the USA. External were social institutional factors (political, economic and social philosophy) which impacted on the society's social welfare programs, including the higher education system in which all accredited social work schools and programs were lodged. Since 1980, the administration of President Ronald Regan had been temporarily successful in its attempt to change the social welfare institution of the United States. It was committed to these political principles:

- A social ethos of rugged individualism.
- Least government as the best.
- The smallest unit of government as best.
- The voluntary sector as the highly preferred system for social service delivery and funding.
- The public sector as the system of last resort for social service delivery and funding.
- Local government as the preferred level for public social service delivery and funding.
- The Federal government as a temporary supplier of limited funds to states via revenue sharing.
- The major shift in national priorities from domestic social programs to military, industrial programs.
- A taxation policy which radically changes current income distribution patterns providing more to already high income receivers and making reductions (food stamps, etc.) to low income receivers.

This political administration came into power with a well defined and well organised ideology of social Darwinism and rugged individualism. To the extent that 'worthy' people are to be helped at all, such help, according to this view, should come from informal sources such as friends, neighbours, relatives and other volunteers in the community. Organised social welfare with an institutionalised profession is therefore perceived as unnecessary, luxurious, and an evil force which destroys the capacity for people to help themselves and each other. Fortunately, the social welfare system in this nation is a strongly institutionalised one. Despite the significant inroads made during the past three years in weakening this system, it had remained essentially intact. However, the profession of social work, the leading discipline within the human services of this country, has been forced to make changes as a result of this political ideology now implemented in legislation and in administrative regulations.

The impact of the economic system had also been important. High levels of unemployment and inflation had led to social discomfort and social problems, and reduced government spending for domestic programs. The problem of the huge budget deficit was complicated by high political priority for vast defence and military expenditures. A severe cutback in federal stipends and tuition assistance to students had particularly affected low income and minority students. The traditional 'guns versus butter' economic dilemma was further compounded in the United States by a clear and overwhelming distaste by the current administration for support for any programs that may be construed as part of a 'welfare state'.

There had been a significant shift during the past five years from a well-defined altruistic orientation on the part of many citizens to one of primary self-interest involving a high motivation for meeting immediate personal material needs. This obviously had implication for recruitment of students to social work education.

Arthur Katz concluded by mentioning various internal factors influencing social work education in the USA. A majority of students in graduate degrees were moving towards direct practice on the micro level, as opposed to community organisation, social planning, social policy development, administration and management. This was accompanied by a high interest in private practice as opposed to organised agency service, public or voluntary. The trend towards specialisation in practice had contributed to these developments, and emphasis in many programs on curriculum content to support clinical practice. For the first time a high level of unemployment combined with lower salary levels was evident.

The development of new career opportunities for women and minorities in other professional and business areas may have contributed heavily in the decline in applications for social work programs. At the same time, fewer men were now represented in the student population. The higher educational sector had been under severe economic pressures – loss of funding, high inflation, soaring costs, increased tuition fees, cutbacks in financial aid to students affecting recruitment from low and middle income students, drop in social work student applications, reduced staff mobility, reduced tenure positions.

Other influencing factors were: research-oriented faculty beginning to replace professional practice-focused faculty coming to teaching via strong practice expertise gained through significant direct service experience; and changes in the organisation of social work education programs – a tremendous expansion in part-time and off-campus programs, new work-study programs. Finally, there was the development and adoption by CSWE of a new curriculum policy statement to guide accreditation standards. Several critical concepts for social work education had been identified:

- The establishment of a common professional foundation of knowledge and skills in order to provide social services in systems of various types and sizes.
- A liberal arts perspective base for professional education to enrich the understanding of the person-environment context of social work.
- A generic focus for the baccalaureate level program (the professional foundation).

- A specialty or 'concentration' focus at the master's or advanced level.
- Research content in the professional foundation level to prepare students for systematic evaluation of their own practice.³⁹²

The opening session was followed by a reception at the lavish apartment of Henry Sachs, a wealthy philanthropist, who was visiting Sydney early in 1985. I returned to Katherine Kendall's apartment with her. After a meal, she read her introduction to the Eileen Younghusband Lecture and asked me to read my EY lecture to her, but kept on falling asleep!

Tuesday morning opened with a plenary session discussion, chaired by Charles Guzzetta, on similarities and differences in social work education in Asia, Africa and South America. At the coffee break, I talked with Frank Turner, the second Moses professor at Hunter for the year 1984/85. Our discussion group had people from Columbia, Hungary, Sweden,³⁹³ Korea, Germany, South Africa, India and Australia. The South African, Brian McKendrick, was a liberal head of the social work school at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. He was a very welcome replacement of Professor Van Royen on the IASSW board. We had the benefit of a background paper for group discussions and recommendations prepared by Charles Guzzetta, based on a review of the two dozen papers prepared for the seminar.

I had lunch with Phyllida Parsloe, professor of social work at Bristol University. She had very generously offered the use of her home to David and Ruth while they were looking for accommodation in Bristol. I wrote the details to them late that night. Phyllida and I spent the afternoon at the Metropolitan Museum. Back at Brookdale Center, we joined up with Heinrich Schiller and Abram Doron, for a meal in the Times Square area, followed by a bus ride to the end of Central Park. We walked through the park to a free open-air concert by the New York Philharmonic, attended by 250,000 people according to the *New York Times*! We could not hear very well, but the event was a real happening for New Yorkers.

The plenary session discussion on Wednesday morning, chaired by Edna Chamberlain, focused on social work education in western countries. Our subsequent discussion group spent considerable time on social work possibilities and difficulties in Hungary. In the afternoon, after a guided tour of the United Nations, we met in one of the UN committee rooms for a presentation by various UNICEF officials on UNICEF's contribution to social work education. My diary recorded 'A boring session – too much backslapping and little audience participation'. A reception followed – at Hunter College, sponsored by the New York deans of schools of social work, represented by Joe Vigilante and Harold Lewis. Afterwards, I went with Chuck Guzzetta, Hans-Jochen Brauns, Abraham Doron and Heinrich Schiller, to a band concert in Damrosch Park just behind the Lincoln Centre, and had a pizza at an Italian restaurant.

The subject of the plenary session the next morning was 'Nationalism,

392 Arthur J. Katz, 'Selected Characteristics of and Contemporary Influences on Social Work Education in the United States', International Seminar, Hunter College, July 1984.

393 Harriet Jacobsen, who was establishing a social work school at Beirut in the Lebanon.

Regionalism, and Internationalism: Competitors or Partners? Former IASSW president Herman Stein was in the chair, and the three 'resource' people were Aida Gindy (UNICEF, UN), Marguerite Mathieu (IASSW), and Katherine Kendall (IASSW). After our discussion group, I had lunch with Harriet and we discussed her Beirut assignment. In the afternoon, I went with Edna Chamberlain on an organised visit to Columbia School of Social Work. We were the only seminar participants there, but we had a good talk with the dean of admissions and the dean of field work, and visited the main campus and the school's library.

On the final day, Friday 27 July, our discussion group met before morning tea, and I helped with the wording of recommendations from our group to the IASSW. The final plenary on seminar outcomes, was chaired by Heinrich Schiller, current IASSW president. At lunch I talked with Hegyesi Gabor from Budapest, Hungary, about various issues and problems in social work education. Early evening, I talked with Vera Mehta. She had just submitted her PhD to a German university on indigenisation and social work education. Later in the evening, I had a meal and talked with Brian McKendrick about the South African situation.

Seminar Outcomes

Seminar participants were subsequently sent a list of the names and addresses of those in the seminar to keep in touch with each other; a summary of the influences on social work education considered at the seminar; and recommendations to the IASSW board debated and voted on by all of the participants, together with twelve other recommendations submitted in writing after the final session. Copies of this material were distributed to the board at its meeting in Montreal. Although it had not been practicable for all the specially prepared papers to be printed and made available at the time of the seminar, a selected sample would be published within the next year.³⁹⁴ Chuck Guzzetta added this note to my letter:

John – it seems, now that you've left the States for Australia that, from our perspective, you're *away* from home – Come back home!

Chuck

394 Letter, Charles Guzzetta to Colleague and Friend, 19/9/84.

IASSW/Hunter International Seminar
- *Summary of Influences on Social Work Education*

I. Characteristics: political and economic

Industrial countries

- Entrenched power
- Status quo is protected
- Social welfare budget cuts
- Expenditures for nuclear weapons
- Political aggression and expansionism

- Sanctuary for political refugees

Third world countries

- Newly independent
- Political instability and upheavals
- Political oppression and terrorism
- Human rights violations frequent
- Economic dependence on major world powers
- Virtual absence of social security

II. Characteristics: social

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- High rate of literacy- Less dense population: problems of assimilating refugees- Aging population- Mix of ethnic groups; racism- Widespread alienation; anomie- Gender discrimination | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- High rate of illiteracy- Overpopulation- Low status of women- Young population (high infant & maternal mortality; short life expectancy)- Highly stratified; strong class differences |
|--|---|

III. Influences on social welfare

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Poor in urban ghettos; wealthy in suburbs- Recession gradually increasing unemployment- Highly industrialised with great social costs- Favourable balance of trade (free trade zones in third world)- Exploitation of weaker nations- Poverty in a few marginal groups- High standard of living; material affluence- Less socio-economic contrast- Strongly industrialised urban sector- Growing family breakdown
- Welfare a way of life | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Pervasive poverty- Low per capita income- Highly polarised unequal incomes- Large rural sector- Extensive migration to urban areas- Massive unemployment- Heavy dependence on foreign aid and foreign economies
- Wide technological variation from simple to highly sophisticated- Economy strongly influenced by industrial- Population heterogeneous (language, Religion etc) |
|---|---|

IASSW/Hunter International Seminar
 – *Summary of Influences on Social Work Education*

IV. Social work education similarities and contrasts

Industrial nations

- Gradually moving away from single method specialisation
- Principal method: micro-level, clinical, therapeutic
- Major employer: state welfare system
- Insights and methods developed from behavioural science and systems theory
- Focus developing on:
 - a. micro level
 - b. macro strategies
- Relatively less emphasis on political intervention
- Three main training levels:
 - a. university
 - b. academy
 - c. technical
- Lack of literature exchange; mainly native language and national focus
- Generally traditional agencies for field work
- Innovative, demonstrative practice
- Educators from qualified training institutions
- Teachers come from practice; generally involved in the field
- Resistance to technology that widens gap from third world

Third world nations

- Diversity between integrated methods and traditional models
- Principal method: macro-level, preventive, developmental
- Social action program primarily sponsored by private and church organisations
- Emerging conceptual frameworks:
 - a. reconceptualization
 - b. reconstructing
 - c. conscientisation
- Sometimes removed from practice
- Focus on:
 - a. people empowerment
 - b. structural change
 - c. institution building
 - d. capacity building
- Work with political systems; social and economic institutions
- Wide variation in training level; indigenous aides to doctoral
- High dependence on western literature: efforts to develop indigenous literature
- Unstructured, floating field work placements
- Generally conforms to established modes of practice
- Educators drawn from allied social science disciplines
- Favour integrating technology into training and practice

IASSW/Hunter International Seminar, 1984
- Seminar Recommendations to the Board

1. Social work education programs should be encouraged to develop new and more precise ways of defining stages of development or industrialisation in describing countries or regions.
2. The profession should develop its own knowledge regarding social problems and intervention methods.
3. IASSW should emphasise interdependence of our 'shrinking global village'.
4. Third world should be more involved in international seminar and congress program planning.
5. Travel funding for third world participants at international congresses should be institutionalised.
6. IASSW should expand incentives for encouragement of social work education in countries not now necessarily members.
7. IASSW should emphasise human rights as the central concern of social work and should support social work educators in this pursuit, both individually or as programs of national organisations.
8. Congress themes should be more specific.
9. IASSW should provide more regional and subregional seminars and congresses.
10. IASSW should facilitate continuous exchange of documentation, literature, faculty, students and others on projects and activities.
11. IASSW should sponsor seminars for all regions both before and after congresses.
12. IASSW should encourage and support greater activity (workshops, seminars, conferences, projects, consultations, publications, etc.) at the national, subregional, regional and international/interregional levels.
13. IASSW should make its publications (e.g., books, reports, etc.) available in all regions, and whenever possible, at least in the three official IASSW languages.
14. IASSW should delegate an experienced social work educator to devise guidelines for consideration at the next Board meeting for a system of international consultation on the creation or revision of programs, including the roles of international bodies (including the IASSW), the Secretary-General, and the consultants, whether paid or not.

Nothing like this seminar had previously been available for IASSW board members. Apart from board meetings and board committees, they usually had little working interactions with each other around substantive issues for social work education. Most were in senior positions heavily engaged in their own countries, with little time available for this kind of peer discussion internationally. It was very significant that Katherine Kendall chose this as her final contribution as Moses professor at Hunter College. Her focus was on the functioning of the IASSW, the organisation to which she had devoted so much of her professional life.

International Seminar – New York 1984



At breakfast



Katherine Kendall addressing Seminar

*Younghusband Memorial Lecture –
Montreal*



RJL

Chapter 24

World Congress 1984 – Montreal

After the New York seminar came the IASSW Congress and board meetings in Montreal. I flew by Eastern Airlines from La Guardia Airport, New York, to Dorval Airport, Montreal, on Saturday afternoon, 28 July. The city was on the Island of Montreal at the confluence of the St Lawrence and Ottawa Rivers in south-western Quebec. It was named after Mount Royal, the triple-peaked hill in the heart of the city. The city population was over a million. It was the second largest primarily French-speaking city in the world, after Paris. Just over half the population also spoke English. In the summer of 1967, I had visited Montreal with my young family to see the remarkable Expo 67. Some of the buildings on a couple of the small islands were still operating as exhibition centres, and the memorable Habitat apartments were still in use.

The Montreal Convention Centre had been opened in May 1983, and all the meetings were held at this 'state of the art' centre. It was located downtown Montreal within reasonable walking distance from the hotels and university residences where most of the delegates were staying. I stayed in one of the university residences at the very reasonable rate of \$10 a night. IASSW board and committee meetings before and after the Congress were held at the Meridien (headquarters hotel), but I was no longer involved. Accommodation there was \$68 a night!

Registrations

The numbers and geographic pattern of registrations up to 27 July showed that Australia had 5 people at the Congress, 9 at the Symposium, and 12 at the Conference. The over-all pattern of registrations was 468 (Congress), 507 (Symposium), and 1,020 (Conference), with a regional breakdown of AFRICA – 44, 66, 120; NORTH AMERICA – 230, 263, 428; SOUTH AMERICA – 28, 25, 71; ASIA – 84, 88, 242; and EUROPE – 82, 65, 159. The North

American figures consisted of Canada – 140,208,267; and USA – 90,55,161.³⁹⁵ The registrations for the congress came from 67 countries. A notable feature at all three meetings was the larger number than usual of participants from developing countries. Some eighty of them were part of a carefully planned Canadian study project, jointly sponsored by the Canadian member associations of the three international organisations assisted by contributions matched by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

³⁹⁵ Conferences Countdown, 27 July, 1984. These were not the final numbers because many last-minute registrations were received, especially from Canada and the USA. I was delighted to see Howard Goldstein from Cleveland was amongst these. Howard told me he and his wife had decided to come and hear what I had to say!

24.1 22nd International Congress of the Schools of Social Work, 31 July-4 August, 1984

In April 1983, the 'Call for Papers, Workshop Proposals and Other Presentations' for the 1984 Congress included a brief development of the theme: 'Survival and Development: Choices and Responsibilities: Challenges for Social Work'.

Significant threats to human survival are clearly present and identifiable today in every nation in the world. Hunger, disease, and violence are absolute threats to physical survival in both developing and developed societies. Even the most affluent nations constantly expose citizens to threats of physical extinction through conventional and nuclear war, crime and violence, neglect and abuse, and social and economic injustice due to discrimination based on ideology, religion, race and sex.

Where physical survival is not the issue, violation of human rights in many societies results in the loss of opportunities to pursue life in a manner calculated to promote personal dignity.

Social work and social development hold human values paramount and place the maintenance of life and improvement of the quality of life as ultimate goals. The very future of the world as a social entity may depend upon the opportunity for all people to develop fully in physical, intellectual, emotional and spiritual dimensions. In 1984 this becomes a matter not only of social justice but of practical necessity for survival.

Ten issues were proposed for consideration:

1. Is the value system currently supporting social work education knowledge and skills clearly identifiable? Is there a universal (international) value system which underlies social work practice and education?
2. What new or different roles for social workers will be needed, and how can social work education best prepare people for these new or different roles?
3. What kind of individual should we seek to recruit as students to carry out new roles and functions?
4. Are there new areas of knowledge content necessary for future social work education?
5. Are new or different skills needed to be taught in the future?
6. Are new or different educational techniques necessary to maximise the educational process?
7. Should social work education programs prepare for immediate service needs of the social welfare system or focus on the changes for the near future?
8. What kind of faculty can best deliver these changing educational programs?
9. How can social work education programs best utilise community and practice resources?
10. What current research exists which bears on these issues, and what are the findings and conclusions?

All entries were to be reviewed by the program committee on the basis of these criteria: quality of content, innovativeness, clarity and organisation, relevance to the Congress theme, and relatedness to practice areas: e.g. youth, aged, unemployment. Proposals could include individual papers, research reports,

workshops, films or videos, small panels. A special invitation was extended to researchers. The format of abstracts to be submitted was prescribed. A selected number of Congress presentations would be included in the Congress proceedings. Presenters were expected to pay their own travel expenses, per diem costs and Congress registration fees.³⁹⁶

The theme of the follow-on 22nd International Conference on Social Welfare, was 'Social Welfare in a World in Crisis – Perceptions and Responsibilities'. It addressed similar societal concerns as a matter of urgency. ICSW invited participants 'to learn about the nature and breadth of the crisis, to debate elements of solution, to devise means of action, to share in the urgency of affirming the conditions which guide the reconstruction of our World'. Although I could not stay on for the ICSW Conference, the way I tackled the Younghusband Lecture was, in fact, relevant to all three conferences.

In a remarkable, if rather intimidating, 34-page consolidated document, 'Programmes, International Conferences on Social Development', all the necessary information was clearly set out for the parallel Congress and the Symposium, and the subsequent Conference. I was singularly unimpressed, however, when I found that the title of the Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture appeared in the program as 'Survival and Development Under What Conditions?' – an irritating, forgettable non-title!! My carefully chosen title after considerable work and thought – 'Survival and Development – Our Urgent Need for a Reflective Universal Morality' – was essential to the argument of my lecture. I also found out that copies of the lecture would not be available to participants at the conclusion of the lecture, as I had suggested. I was given some multiple copies but they soon went as people came and requested them at the conclusion of the lecture. I remember giving almost my last one to Robin Huws Jones!

The Congress shared its three plenary sessions with the IFSW. At the opening session, in the evening of Tuesday, 31 July, particular recognition was given to the support received from the three levels of government, and especially from officials and ministers of the Province of Quebec and the Government of Canada. (I recognised in this achievement the importance of Dick Splane, overall chairman for the planning of the three social development conferences, as they were called.)

Dr Helen Caldicott, a fellow Australian now operating on the world stage, provided an emotional, stirring opening address.³⁹⁷ 'A world authority on the gravity of nuclear proliferation', she commended an IFSW resolution:

That the International Federation of Social Workers supports world-wide nuclear disarmament and commitment to peace and calls for immediate cessation of the production testing and deployment of nuclear weapons and for the commencement of the destruction of all nuclear weapons wherever they exist and that the members of this Federation investigate and inform themselves and others how

396 'Call for Papers, Workshop Proposals and Other Presentations', 22nd International Congress of Schools of Social Work, July 31-August 4, 1984', 11/4/83.

397 The full text of her address was published in 1986 in the proceedings of the 8th International Symposium, International Federation of Social Workers, 1984.

much money now budgeted for nuclear weapons could be diverted to increase all allocations towards social development and social services and towards the creation of employment opportunities for youth.

A reception hosted by the Government of Canada, followed the opening address and lasted until 11.30pm.

Helen Caldicott, born in Melbourne into the talented Broinowski family, was medically qualified at the University of Adelaide in 1961 and was known to my brother Jim. She had joined the staff of the Children's Medical Center in Boston in 1977 and had taught paediatrics at the Harvard Medical School. In 1980, following the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, she had left her medical career to become a full-time activist against the use of nuclear power, nuclear weapons, their proliferation, war and military action in general. In the United States, she had received the humanist of the year award in 1982 by the American Humanist Association, she was founding president 1978–83 of Physicians for Social Responsibility, and worked abroad to establish similar national groups. In 1985, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the umbrella organisation International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.³⁹⁸

Each day in Montreal, we received copies of *Agora*, the daily journal of the international conferences of social development. The issue for Tuesday, 31 July, contained an article on Dr Helen Caldicott, and two 'in memoriam' entries by Janie Thomas on Peter Hodge and Grace Vaughan. Details of the remarkable life of Eileen Younghusband were also provided, including her major works: *Report on the Employment and Training of Social Workers* (1974), *Social Work in Britain* (1951), *Third International Survey of Training for Social Work* (1959), the Younghusband Committee report (1959), *Training for Social Work in Hong Kong* (1960), and her two-volume *Social Work in Britain 1950–75* (1978). Kathleen Jones (York University) was writing a biography. From 1950, she held important positions in IASSW, was president 1961–68, and honorary president until her death in 1982.

398 Internet article on Helen Caldicott.

24.2 Younghusband Memorial Lecture

The joint plenary session on Tuesday morning began with these memorable words about Eileen Younghusband from Katherine Kendall (honorary president, IASSW):

Eileen Younghusband – Role Model

The Younghusband memorial lecture series has been created because, in Dame Eileen, we have a role model *par excellence* – ‘a most rare and admirable social worker’, committed to human and social betterment, attuned to both education and practice, and effective not only at home but anywhere in the world. While we would all be hard put to match her vision, intellect, wisdom and wit, we can try to develop in ourselves, in our students, and with our practitioner colleagues what we can of those special qualities which made her the great woman we honour through this memorial lecture.

She herself noted, as characteristic of those who triumph, ‘an identification with something greater than themselves’. Let us make the precept number one and combine it, as did Eileen, with a vision of what social work is capable of becoming – a force that expresses the best in justice, compassion, and competence.

Eileen Younghusband was insatiably curious. She listened intently, wanting to know and understand everything she could about people, places, ideas. That is precept number two. Let us listen and learn from each other, from our differences as well as our similarities. Let us develop inquiring minds and keep them honed to a cutting edge through perpetual curiosity.

Dame Eileen, as a product of the British upper class, was in many ways quintessentially English, but she was also a tried and true internationalist. She rejected all barriers of race, colour, creed, social class, meeting everyone with straightforward and simple sincerity. She can teach us, as precept number three, how to stand firmly on our own identity and yet reach out in international solidarity to colleagues in every corner of the world. We can learn from her to welcome all that social work holds in common with professional goals, knowledge and values while recognising what is and should be unique to particular times and circumstances.

She had a genius for friendship, a quality which I translate into precept number four: Cultivate the art of relationship which lies at the heart of social work. It was said of Eileen: ‘... she would care for each and every one of us individually, and listen to our problems as if there were no other important problems in the world ...’ Whether in the juvenile court faced with a wayward child or on a prestigious committee bristling with highly placed officials or at Buckingham Palace dining with royalty or at home talking with her housekeeper, she was always herself, warm, sensitive, and caring. As someone has said of her, the relationship was always that of equals, working for a common cause. No matter what the future may demand of this profession, I hope we shall never forget that what we, as social workers, have to offer is our special knowledge and ourselves, translating the professional use of that knowledge into ethical practice.

Eileen made and recorded social work history in Britain, and brought her rich store of social policy, social work education and practice to bear on history in the making throughout the developing world. As a final precept, then, let us emulate

her respect for facts, patiently gathered, accurately recorded and interpreted in landmark reports so that those who come after us will know, as Eileen once suggested, what we have achieved or failed to achieve, and can build on our achievements or rectify our mistakes.

At the beginning of this very special lecture series, it is good to know that we are all part of an endless chain. Eileen Younghusband was a link so strong that we shall forever remain in her debt for the breadth of her vision, the clarity of her ideas, and the wondrous way in which she was able to translate dreams into reality. She had left social work and social work education a splendid legacy. Let us strive to deserve it and use it well.³⁹⁹

I then delivered a lecture which ambitiously ‘tackled the world’. Its preparation had taken months of reading and thinking. These had convinced me of the deep seriousness of the human situation.

THE DAME EILEEN YOUNGHUSBAND MEMORIAL LECTURE 1984

Human Survival and Development: Our Urgent Need for a Reflective Universal Morality

Preamble

We are in very deep trouble. This is not the pompous royal ‘we’, nor is it the ‘we’ which may embrace our families, fellow citizens, or even our groupings of nations. It is the ‘we’ of the human species – the universal, collective ‘we’, past, present and future. For the first time ‘survival’ as well as ‘development’ is the focus of these international social work meetings. Survival is obviously a necessary, but, as especially social workers know, certainly not a sufficient condition of human well-being. The prophets of impending doom multiply in our midst, sometimes peddling their own particular brand of salvation, more often spreading cynicism and despair, foreshadowing a likely future that we do not want to know about or take responsibility for. ‘The future is no longer what it used to be’⁴⁰⁰ captures the current mood and reality.

What can we as social workers contribute to coping with the present human situation? After all it is our lives and those of our species that are at stake; but not only this, it has been our historic destiny to try to help ‘people in trouble’ and to try to achieve a better life for human beings. No group’s values could be more under threat than ours in the present prospects of increasing violence, growing injustice, and possible eventual annihilation.

Is there any way ahead which could open up a sense of purpose and achievement, and recapture a sense of direction, and one in which social workers might make a significant contribution? In this first Dame Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture I am going to argue that there is. Very briefly, I will be

399 Benjamin Schlesinger & Richard C. Nann, (eds), *Proceedings, 22nd International Congress, International Association of Schools of Social Work, July 31-August 4, 1984*, pp.1-2.

400 Title of the first chapter in Aurelio Peccei, *One Hundred Pages for the Future: Reflections of the President of the Club of Rome*, London, Futura Publications, 1982.

arguing the urgent need for a reflective universal morality which rests on human beings justifying their behaviour to themselves and others by giving what are seen as good reasons for it. This will enable us to harness our spectacular growth in technical capacity for justifiable ends. I am no Luddite. Modern technology has been, and can be enormously beneficial for human beings, making human lives more secure, better informed, and rich in choice. But inevitably it raises issues of costs and benefits in increasingly acute form, and in the final analysis, these are moral issues.

I will be emphasising our cognitive capacities, the essentially normative and value-laden basis of our survival and development, and challenging views of human beings as merely genetically programmed animals or merely biological and physical machines. I will also be challenging various narrow views of morality, which for too long have made moral concepts pre-empted and suspect in modern thinking – for example, the notion that morality is essentially bound up with religious faith, that it is synonymous with sexual behaviour, that it is a bourgeois invention, that it is essentially a Western concept, that it is bounded by any closed system of thought – religious, political, cultural, or professional, that morality is only concerned with assessing results of human conduct, or only with intentions not outcomes, or only with emotions, or only with the claims of some people and not others, or only with the claims of other people and not of one's self, or only with duties, or that it is only a matter of linguistic analysis (getting our concepts 'straight').

A Human Life the Measure

It may at first seem incongruous that any person's name should now be attached to the keynote lecture at our international social work meetings. As is apparent from the special memorial edition of *International Social Work*,⁴⁰¹ edited so skilfully and lovingly by Katherine Kendall, and as will I am sure be portrayed eloquently in Kathleen Jones's official biography, Eileen Younghusband was certainly a person of rare qualities and exceptional achievement, internationally as well as in Britain. I, and countless others, greatly valued her both personally and professionally. But inevitably our chosen topic at these meetings will be dealing with large issues seemingly far removed from particular individuals, and the lecturers and the audience over the years will have diverse backgrounds and interests. I am going to argue, however, in this first lecture, that human survival and development are basically about named real-life people living their lives together on this planet under specific circumstances, making choices and assuming responsibilities.

Societies, nations, economies, social structures of various sorts, do not exist without people living in and through them, giving point or meaning to them, changing them, creating them, demolishing them. If we lose sight of individual named people and their lives, we have lost our way. We have forgotten who and what we are in our fascination for things and systems. Even when we do talk about people we characterise them increasingly on single dimensions – their

⁴⁰¹ *International Social Work*, Vol. XXV, No. 1, 1982.

age, or their sex, or their level of intelligence, or their family status, or their work status, or their nationality, or their social class and so on. Yet our selves and others we know, are obviously many-dimensional, and even when we are described in all such dimensions we have not given a full and sufficient account of a person. That person is a cognitive, choosing, living creature, experiencing, interpreting and interacting with his or her environment. He or she is not fully determined biologically or sociologically. If they were, our notions of 'free-will', 'choice', 'responsibility' and 'rationality' would make no sense. The choices may be cruelly circumscribed, the level of responsibility low, the will timid, and the rationality limited, but no human being can survive with any sense of identity, let alone flourish, without some performance on these counts, and our concepts of 'well-being' are tied up with these peculiarly human notions.

In his recent significant book on moral theory, Alasdair MacIntyre emphasises how difficult it is in the modern world to envisage each human life as a whole. 'Modernity', he says, 'partitions each human life into a variety of segments, each with its own norms and modes of behaviour'. Work is divided from leisure, private life from public, the corporate from the personal. Childhood and old age are distinct realms wrenched away from the rest of human life. We are taught to think and to feel in terms of the distinctiveness of each of these separations, not the unity of the life of the individual who passes through these parts. Sociological and existential theories lose sight of the unity of human life when they make a sharp separation between the individual and the roles that he or she plays, and between the different role enactments of an individual life.⁴⁰²

MacIntyre argues that there is no such thing as 'behaviour' to be identified prior to and independently of intentions, beliefs and settings. When we identify a particular action, we place the agent's intentions in causal and temporal order with reference to their role in his or her history; and we also place them with reference to their role in the history of the setting or settings to which they belong. Narrative history is basic for the characteristics of what we call human actions. MacIntyre suggests that we all live out narratives in our lives and understand our lives in terms of the narrative that we live out. This in turn makes the form of narrative appropriate for understanding the actions of others.⁴⁰³ The notion of narrative is closely linked to the notions of intelligibility and accountability, and all three are integrally linked to the concept of personal identity.⁴⁰⁴

Before proceeding any further, I need now to back-track and substantiate my rather dramatic opening claim that we as a species are in very deep trouble. I will then elaborate on reflective universal morality as offering the most reasonable way ahead, and will conclude with some suggestions on its implications for social work education and practice.

402 Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, London, Duckworth, 1981, p. 190.

403 *Ibid.*, pp. 194–7.

404 *Ibid.*, p. 203.

OUR TROUBLED WORLD

Seeing Ourselves in Perspective⁴⁰⁵

The human mind, at least this one, finds it difficult to comprehend the microscopic world, but perhaps even more the vastness and time-scale of the universe in which we live, and how recent is our ascent to primacy on the Earth. Our Earth is about half the age of the Universe and is the merest of specks in it, its galaxy of stars being but one amongst countless others. After about 3 billion years, signs of life began to appear and so began the long evolutionary process culminating about 1 million years ago in the human species 'homo sapiens', with our unique assets of our brains and our hands. Our recorded history began only about 10,000 years or 100 centuries ago, a mere 1% of the human era. The shift to cultivating land had far-reaching effects. We no longer needed to be predators of animals and plants to survive. We could settle on fertile land, satisfy less pressing needs, and could record important events in our lives. We still numbered just a few million scattered in small family or tribal communities, but the invention of agriculture laid the basis for demographic as well as cultural expansion.

In the grand sweep of human history, Aurelio Peccei, President of the Club of Rome, has emphasised two periods. First is the 25 centuries or so to the advent of Islam in the middle of the 7th century A.D., when the great religions of the world were founded. He comments, 'These great spiritual movements have survived all kinds of upheavals and still have a deep, although no longer decisive, influence on the life of our technological societies'. He is sharply critical of the rigidities of the formal interpreters of the great religions, their reciprocal intolerance, their 'stubborn adherence to dogma fed by an assertion of religious supremacy, which is the counterpart of national sovereignty'. Yet, as he sees it, humanity has a profound continuing need for spirituality, especially in the circumstances brought about by the second outstanding period in human history, the most recent period of the material revolutions of the last 200 years. The industrial, scientific and technological revolutions have transformed our economic, political and social systems in ways often unexpected and now increasingly brought into question.⁴⁰⁶

The World Population Explosion

We are now caught up in a world population explosion. There are so many more of us with lives to be lived, and our projected increased numbers are frightening, despite efforts to keep them in check. 2,000 years ago there were about two or three million of us; by 1600, still fewer than 500 million; by 1750 about 700 million. We reached our first billion about 1830; our second in 1925; our third in 1962; our fourth in 1975. By 1980 we numbered 4.5 billion, and although fertility is almost everywhere now on the wane, median projections indicate there will be 6.3 billion of us by the year 2000 just 16 years away, and 8 billion by the year 2020.⁴⁰⁷

405 See Peccei, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–21.

406 *Ibid.*, pp. 22–6.

407 *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 37.

An especially worrying feature of the population projection is the ever widening gap between the industrial countries, with stabilised and ageing populations, and the young and prolific Third World. By the year 2000, the Third World population is projected to reach 5 billion, yet at present the Third World cannot feed half that number adequately. Again by the year 2000, the world's population is likely to have become divided almost equally between the country and the city. 20 of the 25 urban complexes with more than 10 million inhabitants are expected to be in the Third World.⁴⁰⁸

This month in Mexico City, the United Nations Conference on Population will be reviewing the World Population Plan of Action adopted at the 1974 World Population Conference.⁴⁰⁹ This plan stressed the fundamental relationship between population factors and over-all economic and social development. A stated cornerstone of the plan was that men and women have the right freely and responsibly to decide the number and spacing of their children and the means to do so, and the right to information concerning these.⁴¹⁰

According to a recent report of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, the policies and programmes of the various governments, supported by the UN system, have gone a long way to correcting the imbalance between birth and death rates. The rapid decline in fertility has begun among nearly two-thirds of the developing world's population. The report claims that a majority of the governments now perceive lower fertility as essential for national development.⁴¹¹ A stable world population may well not be reached, however, until the middle of the next century and in the meantime our numbers may have reached an unbelievable 10 to 12 billion, if disaster has not hit before this.⁴¹²

Our Exploitation and Pollution of the Earth

The explosion in our numbers is being accompanied by a 'revolution of rising expectations' in all countries, leading to a massive exploitation of the Earth's natural resources and pollution of the human environment. It has been estimated that the Earth's present inhabitants will consume more natural resources during their lifetimes than all their ancestors have consumed.⁴¹³ At this rate, what will be our legacy to future generations of our species? or don't we care?

The first United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm adopted a Declaration and an Action Plan to protect and improve the environment for present and future generations. The main concerns were – the power of mankind, for good or ill, to transform the environment in

408 Ibid., pp. 36, 38.

409 *Population Newsletter*, UN Department of International Economic and Social Affairs., New York, No. 33/34, October 1983.

410 United Nations Fund for Population Activities, 1982 Report, p. 18.

411 Ibid.. The first UN Population Award was shared in 1983 by the Prime Minister of India and the Minister in Charge of the State Family Planning Commission in China. Between them, India and China account for over a third of the world's population. (*Population*, UNFPA Newsletter, Vol. 9, No. 10, October 1983.)

412 Peccei, op.cit., p. 36.

413 Ibid., p. 44.

countless ways and on an unprecedented scale; the growing evidence of dangerous levels of pollution, of disturbance in the balance of nature, of destruction and depletion of irreplaceable resources, and of harmful environmental deficiencies; the imbalance in development across the world; the environmental impact of rapid population growth; and the lack of awareness of environmental problems.⁴¹⁴

The United Nations Environment Programme undertook a comprehensive review of the world environment in 1982 and identified seven principles and approaches which have emerged.

1. Economic growth has been reconfirmed as an essential instrument in achieving social goals, particularly in developing countries.
2. Alternative life-styles and patterns of development which are not wasteful of resources are needed.
3. The interrelationships among people, resources, environment, and development require integrated policies.
4. The process of development is not a localised phenomenon but a regional and global one, as had been stressed by actions to establish a New International Economic Order.
5. The components and processes which support the life of the planet are importantly interconnected.
6. Environmental development and planning should be flexible, because of the fallibility of models of technological and social change and the unpredictability of the timing and location of rare events.
7. Development plans must not rely unduly on the continuation of current trends in environmental systems, because resources are finite and also social values and aspirations change.⁴¹⁵

The conclusion was that fair-to-good progress has been made, but it is uneven especially where States are called upon to assume financial or legal obligations.⁴¹⁶ With the projected population increases, however, and the continuing rapacious consumption rates of the rich nations the task becomes more and more difficult.

A Growing but Inequitable and Inefficient World Economy

Closely related to our population and environmental problems are our economic problems. No country is self-sufficient; all must participate in international trade, but on what and whose terms? There has been a rapidly growing interdependence between our national economies and an emergence of a world economy which has not been working well. Another United Nations publication, 'Toward a World Economy That Works', highlights relevant issues.⁴¹⁷

414 United Nations Environment Programme, UNEP, *What it is, What it does, How it works*.

415 United Nations Environment Programme, *The Environment in 1982: Retrospect and Prospect*. UNEP/GC, 29 January 1982, pp. 36–41.

416 *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 35.

417 United Nations Department of Public Information for Economic and Social Information, *Towards a World Economy That Works*, New York, United Nations, 1980.

The main units of the world economy are 150 countries which operate roughly in three main groups – developing countries, developed countries with market economies, and developed countries with centrally-planned or nonmarket economies. The 118 developing or Third World countries include all the poor countries as well as oil exporting countries which may be financially affluent but do not have developed economies. Most of the developing countries came into existence as independent states in the great wave of decolonisation in the last four decades. The developing countries operate in a loose but effective political caucus in the United Nations, where they have overwhelming voting power. They supply raw materials to the economies of the developed countries and provide important markets for their manufactured goods, yet their leverage in the world economy does not reflect this.⁴¹⁸ Within this group of developing countries about 30 least developed countries have been the focus of special concerns of a United Nations conference on the topic in 1981.⁴¹⁹

24 countries constitute the developed market economies of the West. They are the richest and most technologically sophisticated countries. The decisions on monetary and trade affairs, made by them determine the overall fate of the world economy. They account for about two-thirds of the world's GDP, yet have only 18% of the world's population. They cooperate in bodies like the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Development Assistance Committee, and have considerable economic cohesion as a group.⁴²⁰

Almost all the huge transnational corporations are based in these countries. On one projection these corporations could control more than 40% of world production (excluding the centrally planned economies) before the end of the 1980s.⁴²¹ The impact of the development of these corporations on the world economy, on international relations, and especially on developing countries has become a major source of concern and study.⁴²² After a report by a Group of Eminent Persons, the United Nations, in 1974, established a Commission and a Centre on Transnational Corporations. The United Nations Code of Conduct on Transnational Corporations is still to be agreed upon, and their concentrated seemingly irresponsible power represents one of the major emerging challenges of the world scene.

The third economic grouping of the world's countries consists of the 9 developed centrally-planned, or nonmarket economies of the East (8 of them being in Eastern Europe). With 9% of the world's population they produce 15% of the world's GDP. Trading of this group with the rest of the world has

418 Ibid., p. 12.

419 United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, *Newsletter*, No. 1, April 1981.

420 *Towards a World Economy That Works*, p. 12.

421 Referred to by Daphne Miller, 'Transnational Corporations: Obstacles to and Catalysts of Development', *Development Issue Paper for the 1980s*, No. 9, UNDP, p. 2.

422 See for example: Ahamed Idris-Soven et al. (eds.), *the World as a Company Town: Multinational Corporations and Social Change*, The Hague, Mouton Publishers, 1978; Thomas J. Biersteker, *Distortion or Development? Contending Perspectives on the Multinational Corporation*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1978; Klaus W. Grewlich, *Transnational Enterprises in a New International System*, Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands, Sijthoff and Noordhoff, 1980; and *The CTC Reporter*, a periodical of the UN Centre on Transnational Corporations.

greatly increased in the last decade or so. Their Council for Mutual Economic Assistance gives them considerable economic cohesion.⁴²³

Although the world economy is now showing signs of recovery after the most recent recession,⁴²⁴ it has not been functioning well, even for the richest countries who have experienced high unemployment, stagnant economic growth rates, and high inflation. It is the most vulnerable who suffer most in these conditions – the developing countries as a group and also, as social workers are acutely aware, particular sections of people in both developing and developed countries.

The New International Economic Order called for by the United Nations General Assembly in 1974, is based on the belief that the world economy works unfairly for developing countries, and is also increasingly inefficient. The United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim commented:

Many new nations, having won political independence, find themselves still bound by economic dependency ... The international system of economic and trade relations which was devised 30 years ago is now manifestly inadequate for the needs of the world community as a whole. The charge against the old order was that it worked well for the affluent and against the poor. It cannot now even be said that it works well for the affluent.⁴²⁵

Since 1974, the so-called North-South dialogue between the developed and the developing nations has taken a variety of governmental and non-governmental forms, but little appears to have been achieved.⁴²⁶ The 1981 Meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government expressed concern about the stalemate which had developed in the North-South dialogue especially in view of the world economic crisis and particularly grim prospects for many developing countries. They requested a group of experts for focus on problems in the negotiating process. The resulting report stated that basic changes in approach and attitude were required on the part of the North and the South. Mere exhortation was unlikely to get very far. Governments had to be convinced their real interests would be better served by different approaches. A major part of the problem, according to experts, was the complacency and indifference displayed by the developing countries. But the South could concentrate on the mutual benefits from the South's development, from reforms which permitted their full commitment to the international economic system, and from action designed to avert great and growing danger of widespread disorder, breakdown and violence if these goals are not achieved.⁴²⁷

Unless both sides of the North-South negotiations make a greater effort, the

423 *Towards and World Economy That Works*, p. 13.

424 The World Bank, *World Development Report 1983*, Oxford University Press, 1983. This includes World Development Indicators, which set out selected social and economic data for more than a hundred countries.

425 Quoted in *Towards A World Economy That Works*, p. 19.

426 *Ibid.*, p. 21. See also Kurt Waldheim, *Building for the Future Order: The Search for Peace in an Interdependent World*, ed. by Robert L. Schiffer, New York, The Free Press, 1980, pp. 85–121.

427 *The North-South Dialogue: Making it Work*, Report by a Commonwealth Group of Experts, Commonwealth Secretariat, London, 1982, pp. 13–18, contains detailed suggestions for both the North and the South, which would make for more successful negotiations.

world economic system will continue to be highly inequitable and inefficient, and may even collapse.

The Arms Race and the Threat of Violence

Overshadowing the population, resource, environmental and economic troubles I have briefly sketched, and related to them in various complicated ways, is the continuing resort to violence and the threat of violence to try to get one's way. What is new is the completely unprecedented destructive power of nuclear and other weapons, thanks to 'advances' in science and technology. On the personal level, I can recall at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 fearfully wondering what kind of world, if any, our three (then) very young children were going to inherit. They are now in their twenties making their own way in our troubled world. One is researching international humanitarian law, another is developing a sophisticated understanding of moral education and is keenly interested in the possibility of international social work, and a third is studying theology in another country and will be living there for some years. Although we are a scattered family, I am thankful for their international concerns and perspectives and believe these are a positive sign of the times.

The figures on armaments are almost unbelievable. Yet the escalation and proliferation continues, and takes new and ever more worrying forms as each side tries to gain an advantage.⁴²⁸ A recent report refers to 'the growing public awareness of the dangers of war, particularly nuclear war, and the adverse socio-economic consequences of a mindless arms race'.⁴²⁹ Despite all the talk and the mounting publicly expressed concern, not a single atomic or conventional weapon has been eliminated by disarmament negotiations since 1945.

The current count of nuclear warheads is over 50,000, and they have a destructive capacity 1.6 million times that of the Hiroshima atomic bomb. The global military expenditures now exceed \$600 billion a year. Just two countries – the United States and the Soviet Union – are responsible for more than half of the armament expenditure, and for much of the arms trade. Most of the arms trade is in conventional not nuclear arms, but conventional weapons become more and more destructive, and at least 10 countries are seen as now having, a military nuclear option, or being able to create one. Practically all the estimated 130 military conflicts since 1945 have occurred in 90 developing countries. They have been largely fought with weapons and technological know-how imported from those engaged in the arms race, with a loss of life estimated to be anywhere between those dead in the Second World War and between those who died in both world wars. In 1980, roughly a quarter of the entire world expenditure on scientific research and development was for military purposes.⁴³⁰

In a notable recent book on international affairs, Abba Eban comments in

428 See for example: Curtis Peebles, *Battle for Space*, Blandford Press.

429 *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures*, A Report to the Secretary-General by a Group of Consultant Experts, New York, United Nations, 1983, p. 4.

430 *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 24, 60; *Basic Facts About the United Nations*, New York, United Nations, 1983, p. 36; Abba Eban, *The New Diplomacy: International Affairs in the Modern Age*, New York, Random House, pp. 288–291.

relation to the arms race, 'It would be an instructive exercise for historians to inquire if there is any comparable instance in history of a problem so universally defined as grave and perilous with so little serious effort to achieve its solution or diminish its virulence'. He acidly observes that the contribution to arms control has consisted largely of 'institutional proliferation', none of which had had any substantial effect.⁴³¹

The United Nations First Special Session on Disarmament, in 1978, drew up a Programme of Action which attempted to enhance the security of nations at progressively lower levels of armaments and stressed the central role and primary responsibility of the UN in the disarmament field, in accordance with its Charter. It established a new Disarmament Commission composed of all UN Members, and welcomed the broadening of the composition of the existing negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament. The UN Second Special Session on Disarmament, in 1982, expressed profound preoccupation over the danger of war, particularly nuclear war, and stressed the need for strengthening the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.⁴³² But, reflecting the deteriorating international climate, agreement could not be reached on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, or on why the disarmament strategy of the first special session had not been implemented.⁴³³ In May 1984, a Soviet senior official described Soviet-American relations as being 'at the lowest level' since 1945.⁴³⁴

Not surprisingly, the United Nations International Youth Year in 1985 is being followed in 1986 by the International Year of Peace. One of the most distinguished researchers, Alva Myrdal, declared in 1980, on hearing of her award from the Albert Einstein Peace Prize Foundation, 'How could anyone be worthy of the peace prize, when we are so far from any stable peace?' When presented with the award, she said:

... youth is being betrayed. They have not asked for this kind of world. The impact of the weapons culture, in which we are now living, is creating a climate of hopelessness about our future among our young people ... With the aid of the mass media we are actively engaged in teaching the young to accept brutality, aggressiveness, hawkish nationalism and unconcern for the rights of others as a way of life. We are legitimizing all that through our preoccupation with the preparedness for war. But this is not what should have to be their way of life.⁴³⁵

Peace research is an emerging academic discipline reflecting a variety

431 Ibid., p. 289. The United Nations has been a forum for disarmament discussions and negotiations, a source of recommendations to States, and has initiated studies on various aspects of disarmament. Treaties have been drawn up for nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Antarctic, the sea-bed, outer space and Latin America. There are partial test ban and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons treaties. A UN Convention aims to prohibit the development of biological and chemical weapons and to destroy existing ones. *Basic Facts About the United Nations*, pp. 35–7.

432 Ibid., pp. 38–40.

433 *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures*, p. 58.

434 Leonid Zamyatin, Head of the Information Department of the Communist Party's Central Committee – AAP-AP-Reuter Report, 28 May 1984.

435 Statement by Alva Myrdal, 29 May 1980, *Disarmament*, a Periodic Review by the United Nations, Vol. 111, No. 3 1980, pp. 45, 50–1.

of values and approaches. Increasingly it goes far beyond strategic studies and arms control into broader questions of conflict resolution, justice, and development.⁴³⁶

Paradoxes

According to Eban, the current international scene contains a series of paradoxes. Summarised, they are:

- The proliferation of nation-states and the continuing emphasis on their sovereignty, but at the same time the growth of regional and supranational institutions.
- The ever more expensive balance of nuclear power which is expected not to be used, and hence a more permissive atmosphere for limited, local war.
- The continually growing gap between rich and poor nations despite the greater capacity, and new international consciousness of the need to close it.
- The recognition of international responsibility for human rights but the reluctance to increase international tension by pressing the responsibility with sovereign nations, especially the Soviet Union and new nations.
- The remarkable achievements provided by science and technology but at the same time its power for destruction.
- The copious literature and impressive cluster of institutions in international law, but the reluctance of states to organise their relationships in accordance with legal principles and procedures.⁴³⁷

Eban comments, 'Many of the contradictions between expectations and realities in international politics can be attributed to a lack of clarity about the moral element in these relations. Ideas of what is right and what is wrong are fairly well developed in the domestic consensus and national cultures of most countries, however imperfectly they are carried out. In the international field there is not even a theoretical consensus'. Recent study⁴³⁸ does show that states are at least sensitive enough to seek moral justification for what they have already done or decided to do. But, says Eban, 'this is not the same as abstaining from advantageous decisions on moral grounds'.⁴³⁹

I have not even mentioned current biological experimentation which may well get out of hand, but by now perhaps I have said enough to establish that the human species does appear to be in deep trouble. Much of it stems from a blinkered or ruthless pursuit of sectional interests – personal, group, class, national, or generational – in our increasingly interdependent world of finite resources. We have a shared destiny on this planet, and we urgently need ways of thinking and behaving that will continue to make living worthwhile for

436 See Andrew Mack, 'A Peace Research Institute for Australia?', *Current Affairs Bulletin*, Vol. 60, No.1. The topics nominated, after consultations with academic organisations, for research in connection with the UN International Year of Peace indicate the breadth of concerns now seen as relevant. *Draft Programme of the International Year of Peace*.

437 Eban, op. cit., p. 398.

438 For example, Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust War*, New York, Basic Books, 1982.

439 Eban, op. cit., p.368.

human beings. Or will our generation have the distinction – although no-one would be left to take note – of ending the human adventure which began at least 1 million years ago?

We make sense and give order and purpose to our world through our norms and values, which are both cultural and personal products. These are not in our genes. Our genius and our vulnerability as a species lies in each generation's capacity for learning, thinking and evaluation. We urgently need, in this generation, for our ways of thinking to be relevant for the kind of world we are facing. We urgently need to think more systematically about our ends and our means and the relationships between them. For example, the very concepts of 'technology' and 'means' make no sense separated from ends to which they logically must be related. There is both logically and morally no such thing as a 'technological imperative'. Just because we can do something, does not, of course, mean that you ought to do it. Again, there is much modern talk about 'effectiveness' and 'efficiency', especially by economists, but these concepts cannot logically or politically be separated from the ends being pursued. I am singularly unimpressed by more effective and efficient ways of killing people.

Where might we turn to recapture some sense of a future, and one worth working for? As mentioned at the outset I believe our best hope lies in the human idea of morality – but a reflective universal morality, not morality in one of its more restricted guises.

A REFLECTIVE UNIVERSAL MORALITY

What is Morality For?⁴⁴⁰

We have inherited concepts like 'good' and 'bad', 'right' and 'wrong', and 'praise' and 'blame', to use in the evaluation of human conduct. What is being evaluated when they are being used morally?

The answer seems to be the actions of rational beings. Humans, as rational beings, have at least some ability to perceive and consider alternative courses of action, to appreciate what is said for or against the alternatives, to make a choice or decision, and to act accordingly. We evaluate things for certain purposes, or at least because we have some preference as between one thing or another.

According to Oxford philosopher Geoffrey Warnock, the point of moral evaluation is to ameliorate the particular conditions under which human beings find themselves. It is to contribute, by way of the actions of rational beings, to amelioration of what he calls 'the human predicament'. He points out that things are inherently liable to go badly for people – because resources are limited; knowledge, skills, information and intelligence are limited; people are often not rational, either in the management of their own affairs or in the adjustment of their own affairs in relation to others; they are vulnerable to

440 See G. J. Warnock, 'The Human Predicament', in *The Object of Morality*, London, Methuen and Co., 1971, pp. 12–26.

others, and dependent on others, and yet inevitably in competition with others; and, to put it mildly, human sympathies are limited.

Each aspect of the human predicament is important, but, Warnock argues, because rationality, intelligence, skill and resources can be used to do harm as well as good, nothing in the end is more important than the role of moral evaluation in expanding our 'human sympathies'. Moral evaluation seeks to countervail limited sympathies and their potentially most damaging effects. Hence my belief that our best hope lies in the direction of moral evaluation – or a reflective morality which considers the claims of all human beings, not just of those we happen to feel sympathy with.

The Changing Fortunes of Moral Philosophy

The field of moral philosophy or ethics in academia dates back at least to the ancient Greeks. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, the most important course in the college curriculum in the United States was moral philosophy, taught usually by the college president and required of all senior students. Much of what we now recognise as the social sciences first appeared in the college curriculum in the moral philosophy course.

The attempted intellectual and social unity of nineteenth century moral philosophy did not, however, survive the burgeoning growth of specialised disciplines most of them professing to be scientific in character. Both in the United States and elsewhere, instruction in ethics became confined to departments of philosophy and religion, and became intellectually isolated from both the social sciences and the growing number of professional disciplines, all of whom, one way or another, were dealing with issues which can be seen as ethical in character. A result of all of this is that the systematic evaluation of criteria for social choice, or normative ethics, which might have provided an integrating focus for all the specialised technical endeavors in modern society, has remained relatively neglected although there are now signs of change.⁴⁴¹

Moral concepts are constantly invoked by modern decision-makers, but usually they would be hard put to provide an adequate moral rationale for their views. Professional groups, both old and new, who claim to be educated and not just technically trained, have so-called codes of ethics that reflect the fragmented and chaotic notions which currently masquerade as ethical or moral.⁴⁴² What, then, briefly would be involved in a reflective universal morality?

What Constitutes a Reflective Universal Morality

Moral questions are practical questions. They seek an answer to the question what is it reasonable for a human being to do, or how to act as they live their lives. The focus is on decision-making in the real world, not in some abstract utopia or merely as an intellectual exercise. It is about making decisions which

441 For example, Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok (eds.), *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education*, and *The Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education*, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, The Hastings Centre, 1980.

442 R. J. Lawrence, 'The Relevance of Moral Philosophy for Professional Education', Rutgers University Colloquium, April 1983.

includes implementing them. The things we do affect ourselves and other people, both short-term and longer-term. It seems reasonable that we should therefore take this into account in our decisions. If we concentrate only on our own welfare, this is not seen as reasonable and we are challenged to consider others as well as ourselves. If we only consider some others, and not all others likely to be affected by our decision, what justification can we give for the exclusion?

Who will be affected and in what ways, requires knowledge and judgement about the nature of the effects, their extent and how they might be seen both by the people themselves and by others. Both benefits and costs to all concerned are expected to be considered and weighed, and not just economic benefits and costs but benefits and costs in terms of the full range of human values. In deciding what to take into account, relevant laws, or moral conventions, or religious rules have a *prima facie* claim to consideration, but reference to legality or to moral convention is not in itself and adequate justification for a decision, nor is reference to religious authority. In each case, the decision-maker can be challenged to give reason why he or she ought to be adhering to the law, or to conventional morality, or to a particular religious faith. In each case there is the further question still to be answered, 'but is it (the law, the convention, or the religious rule) morally right?' And this is only satisfied when the decision-maker is no longer confronted in his or her own mind by this 'further question'. Reflective universal morality is attained when, in the reality constraints of resources, time and knowledge, the decision-maker decides what he or she ought to do having genuinely given impartial consideration to all the claims of those going to be affected by the decision.

There are, of course, great practical and theoretical difficulties in trying to calculate and weigh the needs and interests of the people involved. This is especially so when the decision is seen to affect future generations, or the decision-maker and others far into the future, or others with different values, or there is collective decision-making and not just one decision-maker. Yet why should we think that doing what is morally right is going to be easy,⁴⁴³ especially in an increasingly interdependent, changing and complex world? A reflective universal morality may make life even more complicated, and would not necessarily lead to moral agreement on substantive issues. But it would suggest the terms of the debate and ways of dealing with genuine moral disagreement, and would be likely to reduce resort to violence considerably. Might cannot make right; in addition, it breeds resentment and encourages further resort to force.

A reflective universal morality would take into account the variety of forms of power, apart from physical coercion. Disproportionate economic, political or social power in the hands of minorities, and also of majorities, is contrary to most people's perception of what is morally justified. The power of the nation-state can be used to redress the balance; alternatively it may merely make it worse.

443 See Robin Barrow, *Injustice, Inequality and Ethics: A Philosophical Introduction to Moral Problems*, Totowa, New Jersey, Barnes and Noble, 1982, p. 18; and Warnock, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

The Human Rights Movement

The human rights movement is perhaps the most general international development in the direction of the reflective universal morality I am talking about. According to its Charter, the United Nations has both a duty to concern itself with the rights of individuals and a duty not to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.⁴⁴⁴ As yet about half of the member States have ratified the two separate Covenants which were developed from the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights.⁴⁴⁵

In the discussion leading to the two Covenants, both groups of rights were seen as interdependent, but they were separated because civil and political rights were viewed as in a sense 'absolute', while economic, social and cultural rights could only be implemented progressively in accordance with the resources available.⁴⁴⁶ In a nutshell, the first group constituted political democracy; the second, social democracy. Historically in the West, the first tended to precede and lay the foundation for the second, yet the progress towards the second is uneven and has faltered especially in the recent period of conservative governments questioning and, in some cases, dismantling parts of the so-called 'welfare state'. In the socialist bloc the emphasis has been on the second, but often at the cost of aspects of the first. And in many Third World countries both political and social democracy appear to have been singularly difficult to achieve, with the emphasis often on military and/or economic elites linked with powerful external 'friends'.

These covenants on human rights and other more specialised UN conventions draw attention to widely shared values which it is believed ought to be experienced by every human being. Trying to obtain agreement on the formulation of rights acceptable to all the diverse peoples, religions, cultures and ideologies in the United Nations is obviously a formidable task. But the human rights movement has had some achievement. Kurt Waldheim insists that 'we often underestimate the moral effectiveness of agreed international standards of conduct', and further that 'a country's long-term future in the world may be deeply affected by condemnation by other peoples, public opinion or by the United Nations'.⁴⁴⁷

The values prescribed in the various declarations of rights lay claims to be seriously considered by any decision-maker trying to reflect on what should be done if everyone's interests are to be taken into account. For a right to come into effect, however, logically there must be a correlative duty recognised

444 Waldheim, op. cit., p.181.

445 *Human Rights International Instruments*, New York, United Nations, 1983. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights covers – legal protection against cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment; right to a fair trial and protection against arbitrary arrest or detention; freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom of opinion and expression; right of peaceful assembly and of emigration; and freedom of association. The Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights covers – right to work, to fair wages, to social security, to adequate standards of living and freedom from hunger, to health, to education, and to form and join trade unions. Both Covenants include the right of all peoples to self-determination and to use their natural wealth and resources. *The International Bill of Human Rights*, New York, United Nations, 1978.

446 *The International "Bill of Human Rights"*, UN Office of Public Information Background Paper, June 1976, p. 7.

447 Waldheim, op. cit., pp. 184–5.

by others to give effect to the right. All the modern emphasis on 'rights' is understandable politically, but from a moral justification viewpoint it is grossly unbalanced until the relevant duties are also prescribed. A declaration of duties, or even rights and duties, is far less attractive politically.

Implications for Social Work Education and Practice

Having first indicated some of our deep troubles, and then outlined why a reflective universal morality is urgently needed, I will finally suggest some implications for social work education and practice.

We in social work should:

1. Regularly review our education policies and programs from a moral justification viewpoint.
2. Ensure that each program includes formal coursework which introduces students to moral philosophy, and pay due regard to political philosophy as an important sub-set within moral philosophy. (Included would be the justification of the political philosophy or philosophies which underpin one's own nation state, other nation states, and international relations. Also included would be the justification for various forms of production, distribution and exchange of goods and services.)
3. Ensure that each part of the curriculum is clearly connected with the basic moral philosophy course, so that normative and value issues are handled systematically throughout a student's learning.
4. Enlist the interest and involvement of moral philosophers and encourage social work educators and practitioners to work with them in the development of teaching, social policy and social action materials.
5. Ensure that social workers gain experience and competence in giving moral justification for the intervention in other people's lives that we are inevitably engaged in whenever we are practising our profession.
6. Develop the capacity to encourage all decision-makers to accept moral responsibility for their decision-making and especially those in influential positions. (This is perhaps the most difficult and important challenge of all.)
7. Ensure that we are as fully aware as we can be of the norms and values of the people with whom we are involved. Encourage social scientists and historians to pay greater attention to the empirical verification of people's actual norms and values.
8. In trying to judge the effects of different courses of action on the lives of the people involved, make full but critical use of existing work in the various scientific and professional disciplines, and encourage this as an important research perspective.
9. Ensure that social workers understand the different forms of power (political, economic, social, moral, and physical) that operate in human affairs and can review critically their use from a moral viewpoint.
10. Regularly review from a moral justification perspective, the deployment of the profession so that justifiable direction of development can be determined.

11. Increase our numbers working at the regional and international levels, and develop specialised educational programs, in carefully chosen locations, that will prepare experienced social workers for this work.
12. Ensure that we collaborate effectively with members of our profession working at the different levels of social organisation – individual, group, community, societal, regional and international – and with others who are pursuing justifiable ends at these different levels. Action at all levels affects people's lives and is interdependent. Much of the justification of social work lies in its understanding and use of the relevant interdependencies.
13. Ensure that the profession is well organised in each country through an association of schools of social work and a national professional association, and that these in turn are active participants in the IASSW and the IFSW and their regional groupings. This means giving adequate scope for the various specialised interests within the profession but in the context of the overall concerns of the profession, so that specialised interests remain in a balance that is morally justifiable.

If we were to take all of these strategies seriously we and our fellow human beings could see our profession as a justified human activity and institution, making our contribution to a better world. It will, of course, be modest because our numbers are small, and our knowledge and influence limited, but it may well not be insignificant if more and more of humanity are persuaded, by us and by others, that we urgently need the kind of reflective universal morality I have been arguing for. The present troubles of the human species are likely to end catastrophically unless moral reasoning prevails amongst the peoples of the world. Reversion to systems of closed thinking, to military solutions, or to thinking that somehow science and technology will save us are now I suspect fatal prescriptions – as well as being unreasonable.

The morality I have been talking about is a morality of decision making and decisions are always bounded by the time, resources, location and knowledge of the decision makers. It is a morality of intentions and outcomes, a morality of rights and duties, a morality which recognises present and future claims of self and relevant others, a morality of using scarce resources wisely, a morality which appreciates human difference and human likeness, a morality of all the things that make human living worthwhile, a morality which minimises human suffering, a morality which requires courage and honesty – in short, a reflective universal morality, or even shorter, plain morality. This is a tall order, but we are in this together, all of us, and despite the present widespread cynicism and gloom, there has been quite remarkable moral achievement, which we should build on and not continually discount.

Human life is better, on many counts, for an unprecedented number of human beings. A return to 'the good old days' in industrialised countries would be a return for most of the population to conditions of ignorance, squalor, disease, hardship and insecurity. Our challenge is to extend human gains in sensitive ways to all of our burgeoning numbers, but also to restrict our numbers at levels which will enable all of us of present and future generations to lead worthwhile lives.

Because we are thinking social beings we cannot escape from our moral challenge. Before it is too late, we need to gain greater understanding of the moral dimension of our lives in a world where our power for good and evil is quite unprecedented. We often project our personal or our sectional group destinies onto the whole of humankind. If we are personally running out of time, or our group is in deep trouble, this can easily become a version of the world's destiny. I do not think that this is all that is happening at present. We as a species are, indeed, in deep trouble, but morality taken seriously does offer a way ahead if we have the good sense and courage to take it, and we are members of a profession which could have a modest but significant part to play.

The large audience of over 1,000 social work colleagues did not have a chance to give any reaction except generous applause at the conclusion of the lecture, but split into discussion groups to discuss its contents. I appreciated Dick English, a co-chairman of the program planning committee, rushing up immediately after the lecture to congratulate me. In his Christmas letter for 1984, Dick Splane wrote, 'It was good having you in Montreal, John, and I was proud to be the first to congratulate you on the quality and significance of the first Dame Eileen Younghusband address. It was too bad that Trish was not there to hear it.' A British participant (he edited a British social work publication) thought its focus on morality was not very helpful! Harriet Jacobssen thought the content was fine although it was rather long. I knew I was at the upper end of my prescribed time, but I did not go over it and my approach seemed to need it! The written version was what I hoped would stick in people's minds. Herman Stein approved of the lecture and told me he always knew I was a 'rum' fellow – a typical Steinian quip. Jona Rosenfeld was grateful for the up-to-date UN data. Jack Otis (University of Texas), who was giving a paper on 'Universal values which underly social work practice and education' was particularly interested in the lecture. My friend Howard Goldstein from Case Western Reserve University, gave a paper, 'Crossing the cultural boundaries of social work education: a cognitive-humanistic approach', which was obviously congruent with my lecture. ... and so on.

I appreciated this immediate feedback, but hoped the argument of the lecture would be persuasive for anyone who understood it, not just immediate colleagues and friends. That was the whole point of the lecture. My brother Jim, not often given to using superlatives, had described a final draft as 'superb', and this was encouraging. Back in Australia copies were distributed to a variety of people. Senator Peter Baume, who had held portfolios of aboriginal affairs, health, and education, in the recent Fraser government, wrote that it made him aware of how much politicians fell short of their responsibilities.

Sir Walter Crocker's Letter to my Wife⁴⁴⁸

I particularly valued this response from Sir Walter Crocker,⁴⁴⁹ a very experienced internationalist and distinguished friend of my father-in-law Dean Berry.

Dear Mrs Lawrence,

It was good of you to send me a copy of Professor Lawrence's Lecture. I have spent most of this afternoon going through it.

It is an impressive piece of work, and for me, a sceptic about certain manifestations of social work, a great encouragement that a Professor of Social Work can write with such a sweep and such wisdom – with roots (unparaded) in the past and with visionary eyes on the present and the future. Toynbee would have liked this lecture; so would Santayana; and so too would Dame Eileen Younghusband.

I'm glad she is being honoured with a Lecture. I once saw something of her, and I admired her father, a splendid man (your father is another splendid man).

And I hope this lecture will have got the applause it deserved.

If the Professor were at hand I would question him on some of his constructive suggestions, for example the Human Rights movement. Also on the need to address ourselves to the system of government in all countries and its inadequacy for dealing with 'the deep troubles' the human race is in – governments not only in Uganda and Albania but in the Western World, including Australia. Has the human race become ungovernable?

Our best hope is that we have idealists who have intellect, like Professor Lawrence and like your son whose Queensland paper⁴⁵⁰ I have recently read.

As mentioned, I was disappointed a copy of the lecture was not available to everyone at the conclusion of the lecture, but was assured it would be fully printed in the IASSW proceedings aimed to be shortly available. In the event, the proceedings, jointly edited by Ben Schlesinger and Dick Nann, did not appear until well into 1985, and I was very disappointed, to put it mildly, by the quality of the production. The content appeared in a most unattractive, poorly-printed type-face throughout the whole document, with no attempt made to encourage some-one to read it! I thought the presentation was a disaster. The lecture also was subsequently reproduced in the proceedings of the IFSW symposium, but not until 1986. The printing was more legible, and a better type font was chosen, but again it was jam-packed, with no effort to make it an attractive read. And this time, the title of the lecture appeared as: 'Human Survival and Development: Our Urgent Need!' Not to ensure that accurate, timely, attractive publications came out of the Montreal meetings was

448 Walter Croker to Patricia Lawrence, 6/8/84.

449 Walter Croker (1902 – 2002). After graduating from the Universities of Adelaide, Oxford and Stanford, he had worked for the Nigerian Colonial Service (1930–4), ILO in Geneva (1934–40), had served as a lieutenant colonel in the British army mainly in West Africa during World War 11, was chief of African Section of UN Secretariat (1946–9), founding professor of international relations at ANU (1950–2), in diplomatic service at ambassadorial level in India, Indonesia, Canada, Nepal, Belgium, the Netherlands, Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, and Italy (1952–1970), lieutenant governor of South Australia (1973–82). See: *Travelling Back: The Memoirs of Sir Walter Crocker*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1981.

450 Peter Lawrence, *Australian Opinion on the Indo-Chinese-Refugee Influx 1975–79*, monograph, Griffith University Press, Brisbane, 1983.

a sad betrayal of all of the planning and work that had gone into the meetings. Through David Macarov (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), a member of the editorial advisory committee of two associated international journals, the lecture was properly printed in both journals in 1987, three years after the event— *International Journal of Social Economics* (vol. 14, no. 6), and *International Review of Economics and Ethics* (vol. 2, no. 2).

I had little idea how influential, or otherwise, the lecture, would be in social work circles. I know that Harold Lewis circulated it to all of his faculty prior to my spending a year with them as the Moses Professor in 1987–88. Back in Australia, I sent a copy to many of my colleagues both locally and internationally. Brian McKendrick sent me a Christmas card thanking me for my friendship in North America this year, and enclosed a copy of an exam paper he had set at the University of Witwatersrand which asked candidates to discuss the principal issues I had addressed in my lecture, and suggest how South African social work and particularly social work education should respond to them. Suthinee Santaputria, Faculty of Social Administration, Thammasat University, also wrote a card – ‘Thank you very much for your friendship in New York and Montreal. Your paper is very useful for my colleagues and when I discuss with them and my students, I always refer to your points in the paper. I am glad to have met you. I hope we will have a chance to see each other again. When will you visit Thailand? Please let me know if there is anything I can do for you in Thailand.’

An IASSW Milestone – a Secretary-General from India

Vera Mehta wrote a typically warm, rather effusive Christmas letter in 1984, a very eventful year for her – the CIDA study program in Canada, the Montreal meetings on Social Development, the submission of her doctoral dissertation at the technical university of Berlin, West Germany, the editing and publication of *Women in Action*, and *Ideas in Action*, conducting two regional studies for APASWE, and producing the first issue of her college journal *Perspectives in Social Work*. Most rewarding had been the close collaboration between IFSW-Asia and APASWE in the Asian region, which had brought the profession close together, and Vera hoped this could be extended to other regions of the world. ‘To you, I owe a deep sense of gratitude for your effort and conviction in a global fraternity.’ She was preparing to go to Vienna in January 1985 as secretary general of IASSW. ‘I will need you to stand by me more than ever before to fulfil the visions we have dreamed of. ... Ours is a friendship that transcends time and distance’.⁴⁵¹

451 Letter, Vera Mehta to John Lawrence, December 1984. Vera had been a social work educator at a college of social work affiliated with the University of Bombay for almost 20 years. Since 1981, she had been secretary of APASWE, and was also secretary of publications for IFSW in the region. A graduate of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences and the Boston University School of Social Work, her doctorate was a study of how an Anglo-American model of social work education undergoes changes based on historical, political, socio-economic and cultural factors of a country. *IASSW News*, December 1985.

Chapter 25

World Meetings 1986 – Tokyo

As part of my project on professional ethics, I successfully applied for a grant of \$2,485 from the Faculty's Special Research Funds at UNSW, to enable me to attend the world meetings in Tokyo in 1986 to present a paper and discuss my research with colleagues from other countries.⁴⁵² My presentation on 'The Ethics of Social Work Education' was at the 23rd International Congress of Schools of Social Work, August 27–31. The congress theme was 'Developing Human Relations and Social Structures for Peace'. The theme of the following ICSW Conference, ending on 5 September, was 'Strengthening the Family and the Community; a Significant Contribution to Social Welfare'. I will not attempt to cover the range of interesting material generated by the Congress and the Conference, or my interactions with colleagues. Our Japanese hosts, and many others, had obviously done a great deal to ensure the success of the meetings.

My paper, was obviously a follow-on from the Younghusband Lecture, although this time the audience was small. (Many other special interest papers were running at the same time.) As has been made clear, my professional ethics project was necessarily addressed to professional behaviour in general, not just the behaviour of one occupation claiming professional status. This 1986 paper suggested in general terms what might be entailed in a moral review of the practice and education of any profession, including social work. It included the following questions for the practice and education of any ethically conscious profession. These were grouped under four headings:

1. What is the nature and worth of the product of the profession?
2. Who can and should benefit from the product?
3. Who can and should practice the profession?
4. How well organised is the profession, nationally and internationally?

Under each of these headings will be a series of questions which are intended as stimuli to moral analysis.

⁴⁵² Letter, R. J. Lawrence to Tony Vinson, Head of the School of Social Work, UNSW, 14/11/85.

In raising these concerns, I am assuming the validity of a utilitarian basis for ethical judgements – that morally right action is determined by trying to maximise the benefit and minimise the harm to human beings. I am, however, also remembering the need to nurture the virtues. Alasdair MacIntyre has pointed out that ‘What sort of person should we be?’ has become lost in modern philosophy’s pre-occupation with rules, rights, and utility. He asserts that virtues should be restored to their central place in morality, and argues that these are exhibited and defined in various arenas of ‘practice’, including the ‘practice’ of a profession. (MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, London, Duckworth, 1981)

The Worth of the Product?

Without a worthwhile product, a profession is without any moral basis for its work. First, then, there are various questions about the nature and worth of the product of the profession.

- What are the knowledge, skills and values components and how do they interact to produce the profession’s product?
- Is the production of the product the exclusive domain of the profession? Should it be? Should the situation be protected by law?
- Does the nature of the product require the length and type of training specified by professional bodies and educational institutions?
- Can it be adequately maintained without substantial continuing education?
- Is it changed and improved in response to new knowledge and techniques?
- How much variation in the product occurs from practitioner to practitioner? Is the variation harmful or helpful?
- Whose values are reflected in the nature of the product?
- What is the impact of the product on the lives of its consumers? What are the negative as well as the positive aspects?
- If no one profession can possibly provide all the specialised products needed for contemporary living, how does the profession’s product get related to the other needed specialised products. Is this left just to the product consumers to do the best they can, or in its education and practice, does the profession give serious attention to inter-professional collaboration?
- Is the usefulness of the product regularly evaluated and from whose points of view – the practitioners’? the consumers’? the employers’? the governments’?
- Is the profession reasonably remunerated for the product?

Who Has Access to the Product?

Second, assuming that the profession’s product is valued, and for good reason, there are then crucial questions about who can and should benefit from it?

- Do all members of society have equal access to it according to their need for the type of product it is, irrespective of their socio-economic status, their age, their sex, their ethnicity, their religion, where they live?
- Do the social, political and economic processes that distribute the product do this in ways that are seen to be equitable?
- What roles should be played by the various distribution mechanisms – commercial or private enterprise, non-profit voluntary organisations, and

government agencies at various levels?

- Does the development of specialised aspects of the profession's product reflect an overall concern to provide maximum benefit to society?
- Are the profession's resources equitably distributed across its various specialties in terms of the society's need for these specialties?
- Should a profession give prime allegiance to its clients when this ignores the claims and interest of others?

Who Can and Should Practice the Profession?

A third series of questions focus on the people who can and should be responsible for the profession's practice.

- Are there sufficient numbers of the profession to produce a valuable product that can be equitably distributed throughout its society?
- Do all members of the society capable of undertaking the work have equal opportunity to become members of the profession?
- Do the members of the profession, and especially its leaders, manifest the virtues of justice, courage, honesty, and sense of tradition, that MacIntyre sees as essential to attaining standards of excellence in any human 'practice' as he had defined it?
- How dependent are the members of the profession on external goods, like money, power and fame, compared with the standards of excellence or the goods internal to professional practice?
- Do the members of the profession have a prime commitment to it and see their adult life story as importantly bound up in their pursuit of their profession?
- How much do members of the profession identify with the profession as a whole as well as with the particular aspects in which they are engaged, or sub-groups to which they belong?
- If members of the profession are not self-employed, to whom do they see themselves as owing their prime allegiance in the case of conflict, their employer or their profession?
- Do the members of the profession belonging to different generations view each other with mutual respect?

How Well Organised is the Profession?

A fourth and final series of questions focuses on the organisation of the profession.

- Does the profession have the relevant structures that enable it to address effectively, both in its education and in its practice, the kinds of questions and issues I have been raising?

The Context of the Nation-State.

Most people would tend to agree that it is primarily within the context of each nation-state that all the questions I have been raising ought to be addressed.

- Does the profession have an over-arching national professional body which has the leadership, membership commitment throughout the nation, resources, linkages and professionalism, which enable it to maintain and develop the profession in morally justifiable directions?

- How are the profession's educational institutions organised? How future-oriented are they?
- If education is located in primarily technical institutions, does this mean broader knowledge and value questions are neglected? If it is located primarily in universities, does this mean technology is relatively neglected?
- What are the respective roles of the professional association or associations, the educational bodies and employing bodies, in shaping the initial and continuing education for the profession?
- Does the organisation of the profession's work enable it to pursue excellence in its practice?
- Is it too much in the employ of others to be fully responsible for its actions and outcomes?

The International Context

It is difficult enough trying to address these questions in the context of each nation. Yet a crucial aspect of a profession is its existence across national boundaries. At least initially, professionals are strongly influenced by the so-called professional literature and often by educators who have received some of their education from educational peers in other nations. The literature is obviously massively skewed in the direction of numerically large nations with resources to publish and sell their products throughout the world. What should be the attitude of a small struggling professional group in a third world country, or a country like Australia for that matter, to professional literature that has arisen in a social, political, and economic context that is obviously different from one's own? But how different, and do you ignore it at your professional peril, and is it not a source of support and security to know that the concerns of your profession are not just local and peculiar, but shared concerns in other nations of the world?

We need, then to ask each profession, how does it function internationally, as well as nationally. Do international influences help or hinder the profession's pursuit within each nation? How well organised is the profession internationally? Is it utterly unrealistic to expect a profession to see itself as a world social institution and therefore to ask that each of the questions I have posed be addressed internationally? Should national professional groups devote a considerable amount of their resources to international affairs so that the development of their profession is more equitably achieved throughout the world, and not just within each nation-state?

The paper then turned to *The Ethics of the Social Work Profession and its Education*:

If social work, or any of the other professions, is to continue to be morally justified, it needs to address the sorts of concerns I have raised. This paper suggests that these should be shared concerns, not only within the one professional occupation, but between professional occupations. As such, much more adequate justifications can be gained from comparative study. Unless a profession is well educated in terms of the moral dimensions of choice, it can scarcely lay claim to being 'educated' at all. It may be highly trained technically, but it has no thought-through, morally justifiable value base. It may have considerable power and status but these are not morally grounded.

After a long period of relative neglect, there are now clear signs of 'professional ethics' being taken far more seriously – at least within some educational institutions and at least in some areas of practice. The projects and publications of the Hastings Center in the United States reflect this development. A strong case can be made for ensuring that all members of the professions, including social work, have a systematic grounding in ethics or moral philosophy in their basic professional education, and for the normative and value issues inevitable raised by professional education and practice to be systematically related to this grounding. In this way, professional ethics worthy of the name would develop as an important sub-field of general ethics. Further, the more genuinely ethically concerned professional groups become, the sounder the basis for collaborative work in the public interest, within nations and between nations.

It can be argued that the particular history of the social work profession has made it both peculiarly open to and aware of moral challenge. At least on the face of it the profession claims to be concerned primarily with the social welfare of people, and the responsibility of society for social welfare. This is the very stuff of morality. Although it may cringe at the description, the social work profession is trying to take seriously the concept of 'doing good' in our complicated modern world. But every profession, not just social work, seriously affects the lives and fortunes of human beings and therefore cannot escape moral challenge. Being explicit about the nature of this challenge and ways of meeting it constructively is a central task for all of us involved in education for the professions. It makes no societal sense for each professional group to tackle its ethical challenges in isolation from other professional groups, especially in adjacent and overlapping functional areas; or in isolation from outside scrutiny, especially from various community groups and from government. Ethics is very much concerned with giving what are seen to be good reasons for acting in particular ways. It is by its very nature a public activity, even though engaged in by individual actors. I suspect that any profession which unilaterally determines its so-called 'ethics' is unlikely to be able to justify its position when this is placed under critical moral scrutiny by independent outsiders.

World Meetings 1986 - Tokyo



Sight-seeing in Tokyo - Joe and Sarah Neipriss (Israel)



Janet George, RJL, Beryl Dwyer, and ?



South African social work educators (Brian McKendrick on left)



Remarkable Buddhist temple, mountain region outside Tokyo (trip with Janet George)



RJL and Katherine Kendall - food shopping, Tokyo



Tokyo Tower (opened 1958)



Tokyo from an observation deck, Tokyo Tower



Street in Tokyo

Chapter 26

Nomination For IASSW Presidency 1988–92?

In Montreal in 1984, Heinrich Schiller raised with me the possibility of accepting nomination for the presidency of IASSW in 1988, at the conclusion of his term of office. In August 1986, at the next world meetings in Tokyo, Heinrich had a long talk trying to persuade me to accept nomination, resuming our earlier discussion. We discussed alternatives. Heinrich said he was very willing to do all he could to help on the board⁴⁵³ and in Vienna. An important new development was that future board meetings would not necessarily be held in Vienna. Heinrich reminded me that Robin Huws Jones as president had received financial help from the Rowntree trust in the UK, and he had received funding from his own government. I told Heinrich that there was little likelihood of this kind of support in the Australian scene. Heinrich was very enthusiastic about Vera Mehta's performance as secretary-general. I would need to make up my mind and let the nominating committee know by the end of the year. He assured me there was very enthusiastic support for my nomination. I discussed with him my current professional priorities, especially my firm intention to complete the general professional ethics book. He said he fully understood, but hoped that this might be able to be accomplished before the presidency became available.⁴⁵⁴

In October, a fulsome letter from secretary-general Vera Mehta told me she had been thinking about our discussions in Tokyo:

... I think we would make a super team with our appreciation and adherence to the highest values, for rightness in our approach to principles, intenser commitment to the profession and education, extreme resilience, drive and capacity for hard work. To this, add willingness to take risks but not without prudence, and a keen intellect accompanied by a never ceasing cheerfulness, full of mirth and outbursts of laughter, the latter typically characterising you, and me, I would say perpetual smiles. The latter two would help pull through difficult times and constraints in IASSW.

453 As past president serving on the board.

454 I kept a brief diary while in Tokyo.

My assessment of you would be a reply echoed by others and it will be good to have you back into IASSW. ...⁴⁵⁵

On 29 December, 1986, I wrote to Heinrich, sending a copy to Vera:

... The problems which I discussed with you – my geographic isolation, the personal financial cost likely to be involved, and the diversion from the serious writing program I have set myself over the next few years – are still real. I have decided, however, that if there is strong support for my candidacy, I am willing to be nominated, and will cope with these and all the other ensuing problems as best I can. I have no illusions about how demanding the responsibilities of the Presidency would be, particularly trying to deal with many of these at a distance. If the Nominating Committee finds stronger support for another more suitable candidate, I would be quite happy to withdraw my acceptance of nomination.

One important reason for being willing to accept nomination is the knowledge that your experience and wisdom will be readily available for the in-coming President.

I am just about to begin a work program I mentioned to you in Tokyo. For the first part of 1987, I will be on study leave from my School and will be attached to the University's Social Welfare Research Centre. From 1 September 1987 to 31 August, 1988, I will be at the Hunter College School of Social Work in New York occupying the Moses Distinguished Chair. Throughout this period I will be working on an ambitious general book on professional ethics, aimed at all occupations claiming professional standing.⁴⁵⁶

Heinrich was very happy that I was willing to be nominated. 'There is quite a bit of talk about the best person for the next president'. As well as my name, Aida Gindy's, was being considered. She was a very well-known international person, although Heinrich doubted if she had the close touch to social work training, which was so essential for this office. Sadly the next international congress would not now be held in Berlin, but Östersund, Sweden,

a very lovely little town with very good facilities for hosting a congress at the university and the student dormitories. It will be like Brighton, keeping participants close together with a good chance of developing a good corps d'esprit. It would certainly be a good place to hand over the responsibilities of my presidency to a very cherished and competent successor.⁴⁵⁷

The executive meeting discussed the nomination for the presidency at its meeting 20–22 March in Vienna.

You were named by several people, but the fact that you live so far away from Vienna was not considered very favourable for your candidature. It was also mentioned that you had indicated that you would have problems finding the necessary financial means for frequent travelling especially to Vienna. Because of the fall of

455 Letter, Vera Mehta to John Lawrence, 13/10/86. Under separate cover, she sent me up-to-date material on IASSW.

456 Letter, John Lawrence to Heinrich Schiller, 29/12/86.

457 Letter, Heinrich Schiller to John Lawrence, 11/2/87.

the dollar, IASSW is in a very grave financial situation, so that the Secretary General has almost no financial means to travel, and therefore it would be necessary for business meetings between congresses to take place in Vienna.

A possible candidate, who doesn't live as far away from Vienna as you do, has to travel to Europe frequently for other business and who also can tab his government, is our present treasurer, Ralph Garber, from Canada. He was approached during our ExCo meeting and he has agreed run for the candidature.

If you are able to find financial resources, which make it possible for you to come more frequently to Europe than you have indicated, I still see a great chance for your election. Please let me know as soon as possible whether our school should nominate you.

As I indicated before, we have had large problems with the 1988 congress in Berlin. By now we have learnt that, due to the South African issue, Sweden - our next choice - is not able to host us either. Our creative and dynamic Secretary General, Vera Mehta, has found ways and support in Vienna to host our congress there, with many favourable prospects.

I hope to hear from you soon.⁴⁵⁸

Seeking Financial Support

To visit IASSW headquarters in Vienna from Sydney for ten days twice a year for four years, 1988-92, the estimated cost would have been \$28,448 (\$20,488 for air-fares, the rest for accommodation and meals). Adjusted for inflation and currency changes, the expected total expense would have been \$30,000. When Brian Howe visited the Social Welfare Research Centre at UNSW, I raised with him the possibility of receiving government support to enable me to attend meetings of the IASSW were I elected President. Brian Howe was minister for social security in the Keating Labor government since 1984, and later became deputy prime minister. I indicated I would need to be assured of a total of about \$20,000 over four years to make mine a feasible nomination. This would only cover my airfares, with me meeting the difference most likely from my own personal pocket.

Brian Howe's response was enthusiastic, but very disappointing financially:

I am very anxious to support your candidature for the Presidency of the IASSW. It would fit in very well with my belief that Australia should be active in the international welfare arena and that we should take whatever opportunities are available both to contribute and to receive the benefits of participating in major international welfare bodies such as the IASSW.

It is not the best time to seek funds from my Department. Indeed, at present we do not have a source of funds for a financial contribution of the kind you are seeking.

Nonetheless, I would be confident that you could act on the basis that if you were elected as President you could count on funds of up to \$5,000 for travel to attend meetings of the executive. I am assuming that the major financial contribution would come from the schools of social work or some other associated source. ...

458 Letter, Heinrich Schiller to John Lawrence, 28/3/87.

I do hope you proceed with your candidature and that you are successful. Arrangements for our contribution for your travel costs could be made very quickly thereafter.

With kind personal regards.⁴⁵⁹

I then wrote urgently to Bill Hayden, minister for foreign affairs, to ask if his department would be willing to provide me with the balance of \$15,000 travel expenses, were I elected IASSW President.

Brian Howe's letter (which I enclosed) mentions the possibility of financial help from the Australian schools of social work. From my knowledge of their various situations, this is an unlikely source of any consequence. Also, of course, as President I would be operating as an individual and should be seen as in no sense representing the schools of my own country.

The IASSW is the primary international spokesperson for social work education in every region of the world, representing 24 national associations of schools of social work and nearly 500 schools of social work in every continent. It holds consultative status with the UN, UNICEF, UNESCO, Council of Europe and the Organisation of American States, and works closely with the IFSW and the ICSW. It would, of course, be a considerable honour to be the first Australian to be elected as IASSW President, but much more important, it would enable one of us to contribute in a significant way to the international social welfare and social work scene. Our mutual friend, Professor Edna Chamberlain, is currently President of APASWE (the Asian and Pacific Association for Social Work Education), one of the regional bodies of the IASSW, and my nomination for Presidency has her firm support. ...⁴⁶⁰

Unfortunately, Hayden was out of the country and would not be returning until 26 May. I immediately let Heinrich know the situation, asking the deadline for making the nomination, and commented that in general, the Australian government's financial position was grim as indicated by a harsh mini-budget it had just been forced to introduce, so I was not very hopeful but it was certainly worth the try, and it was good to have received Brian Howe's written support.

Senator Gareth Evans, as acting minister foreign affairs, replied to my letter. He regretted there were no programs administered under the foreign affairs portfolio which could be used to meet a request of this kind and said 'I do hope that this will not discourage you from proceeding with your candidature'.⁴⁶¹ On 27 May, I again wrote to Bill Hayden asking him to personally consider the matter before I wrote to the President of the IASSW telling him I was unable to accept nomination for the presidency because I was unsuccessful in obtaining the requisite financial support from the Australian government.

... I fully realise the difficulties of the present economic climate, but what I am talking about is a tiny financial commitment in return for which Australia should

459 Letter, Brian Howe to John Lawrence, 27/4/87.

460 Letter, John Lawrence to Bill Hayden, 29/4/87.

461 Letter, Gareth Evans to John Lawrence, 22/5/87.

gain substantially in prestige and goodwill in the social work and social welfare communities in at least 70 countries. I am reluctant to push my personal case, and have no illusions about the difficulty of the task were I to be elected, but I feel bound to try to persuade you because it is more than time that Australia pulled its weight in international social work and social welfare matters and this is a rare opportunity not only to do so, but to be seen to be doing so.

I did not expect that assurance of the financial support I am seeking would necessarily need to come under any particular program of the Department. Clearly it is an unusual request and situation, but surely there can be no question about its central relevance to an important aspect of the work of our Department of Foreign Affairs – the need through international action for Australia to contribute to improved social work and social welfare programs throughout the world.

For easy access, I have taken the liberty to enclose copies of my original request to you. I have also enclosed a copy of the First Dame Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture, delivered in Montreal in 1984, which you may find of interest. From 1968 to 1982 I was Head of the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. Currently I am on leave from the School, and am attached to the Social Welfare Research Centre. From September 1987 to August 1988, I will be the Visiting Moses Distinguished Professor, at Hunter College, City University of New York. My major current task is writing what I see to be an urgently needed *general* book on professional ethics.⁴⁶²

Brian Howe pointed out that his offer of \$5,000 was conditional upon me receiving no financial support from another Government agency in the same financial year. He was happy to make it available in the 1987–88 financial year. An assurance of financial support by another agency would need to be in respect of subsequent years of my term as President. In the light of this, I wrote again to Bill Hayden that my request of \$15,000 was for a \$5,000 grant for each of the financial years 1989–90, 1990–91, and 1991–92. Finally, on 25 June, I received a letter from J.M.L. Woods of the public affairs branch of the Department of Foreign Affairs. Mr Hayden had asked him to thank me for my letters, but to confirm that Senator Evans' advice that funds from this department were not available for the purpose I had requested. They were pleased to note that the Minister of Social Security had indicated he could provide some financial assistance should my nomination for the Presidency be successful. 'We wish you well with your candidacy.'⁴⁶³

Professor Phyllida Parsloe wrote to me on 2 July:

When I was in Australia you told me that you were willing to stand for President of IASSW. I am writing now to know whether this is still the case. I hope it is.

I would be grateful if you could let me know fairly fast since I am attending the IASSW Board in Vienna at the end of July and would like to be clear what the position is before I go.

So far as I know (but communication is not IASSW's strong point), the only nominee for President is Ralph Garber.

462 Letter, John Lawrence to Bill Hayden, 27/5/87.

463 Letter, J.M.L. Woods to Professor J. Lawrence, 25/6/87.

I hope you and your family are well. I have very happy memories of my visit to your holiday home and in fact of all my stay in Sydney. I hope to get back soon!⁴⁶⁴

I told Phyllida in my reply that the situation was still uncertain, but should be clear soon. The key issue was whether I could obtain assurance of sufficient financial support to make the task feasible. I told her the disappointing, but not surprising outcome of my approaches for national government financial support. The timing of my request could not have been worse, because the national government was desperately trying to cut back on public expenditure to reduce the budget deficit. I had now turned to the non-government sector and had asked for assurance of financial support were I to be elected, from The Sidney Myer foundation in Melbourne. Their meeting was on 13 August. If this was unsuccessful, then I would not proceed with my candidacy. 'I would have confidence in Ralph Garber in the job, although I would prefer someone not from North America.'⁴⁶⁵ On the same day as I wrote to Phyllida, I also wrote to Heinrich Schiller telling him the situation about my nomination, and that Phyllida had been in touch with me.⁴⁶⁶

Rupert Myer rang me from Melbourne on 15 July. I knew him well as president of ISS in Australia, because I chaired the committee which ran ISS operations in Sydney and was also on the ISS board which met periodically in Melbourne. Rupert told me my request was a fair way outside the Sidney Myer Foundation guidelines, and two days later Michael Liffmann, the foundation's executive officer told me he had discussed it at length with Rupert Myer. The foundation's guidelines explicitly precluded funding overseas travel and allowed no real latitude in this regard. The only significant philanthropic trust which did operate in this field was the Potter Foundation in Melbourne.⁴⁶⁷ On 12 August, I was told the governors of the Potter Foundation and considered my request and the foundation was 'unable to offer assistance on this occasion'.

I wrote to Heinrich that regretfully I did not think it realistic for my nomination for the Presidency to proceed:

It would have been an honour to be nominated by your school, and possibly to succeed you in this most important position. I would have given it my whole-hearted commitment and would have thoroughly enjoyed working with colleagues from around the world, pressing ahead with the many IASSW initiatives for which you and Vera in particular have been responsible. This is not to be, and I will have to settle for other ways of trying to make a contribution to our profession and the values for which it stands.⁴⁶⁸

I also informed Vera Mehta of my decision. It would be a joy to see her at the IASSW and IFSW conferences in Europe in 1988, which Trish and I were planning to attend. Keep up the good work, but also enjoy some personal

464 Letter, Phyllida Parsloe to John Lawrence, 2/7/87. Phyllida was chair of the nominations committee.

465 Letter, John Lawrence to Phyllida Parsloe, 14/7/87.

466 Letter, John Lawrence to Heinrich Schiller, 14/7/87.

467 Letter, Michael Liffman to John Lawrence, 17/7/87.

468 Letter, John Lawrence to Heinrich Schiller, 17/8/87.

time, as well as giving so much of yourself to the concerns of our profession.⁴⁶⁹

I also told Brian Howe of my unsuccessful approaches for the rest of the money I would have needed, and that I would not be proceeding with my nomination.

At the end of this month I go to New York for 12 months. My attachment to the Social Welfare Research Centre since March had been productive, and it has given me a good opportunity to get a closer look at the Centre's work. I believe the Centre is doing well and anticipate you will receive a favourable assessment from the present review committee. Your demonstrated interest in the Centre has been especially important for staff morale and confidence.

Congratulations on the outcome of the recent election and good luck with pursuing the responsibilities of your important portfolio. I must say that I was pleased to see that you sometimes have time to relax. I caught a glimpse of you on the television watching the Hawthorn-Swans game on Saturday.⁴⁷⁰

Heinrich found my letter of 17 August on his return from vacation and was very sorry that after all my 'diligent interventions' I would not be able to raise the necessary funding.

Nevertheless, it looks as if our treasurer, Ralph Garber, is willing and able to take on the candidacy, and after knowing him in his very active role as treasurer and Board member, I am very convinced that he would be an excellent president. Of course I would have liked to have somebody from another area than the anglo-american culture, because most of our presidents came from there. However, it is more important to look for the right person than for the right area.

I still hope, dear John, that you will lend your help and activities to IASSW as you have done in the past.

With warmest best wishes from your friend and colleague.⁴⁷¹

469 Letter, John Lawrence to Vera Mehta, 17/8/87.

470 Letter, John Lawrence to Brian Howe, 17/8/87.

471 Letter, Heinrich Schiller to John Lawrence, 27/10/87.

Chapter 27

The Social Work World Meetings 1988

Near the end of our year in New York, Trish and I flew to Europe to attend the IASSW Congress in Vienna, 18–23 July, 1988, the IFSW Symposium in Stockholm, 26 – 30 July, and to visit our son Peter in London, before returning to New York on 7 August.⁴⁷² On 11 August, I had a long talk with Katherine Kendall about the international conferences, especially the IASSW one, the first she had missed for decades.

27.1 24th International Congress of Schools of Social Work – Vienna

When we arrived in Vienna on Sunday, 17th July, everything looked clean and tidy after Manhattan. Our hotel, the Atlas Hotel, was very well located – near downtown, the Parliament, the Palace, and various museums. We met Brian McKendrick, my colleague from the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa, who was in the room next-door, and had lunch in a park opposite the Parliament and the Palace. After a sleep, Trish and I took a tram ride to the Danube on the ring, walked to St Stephen's Cathedral (disappointing), saw State Park, had a meal in an open-air café in a street off Kartner Strasse where many people were walking, and walked back around some of the ring road to the hotel, where we had tea with the Schwartzs and Stamatine K. from Greece.

Monday, 18 July, was the opening day of the Congress. Registration for the congress was at Wirtschaftsuniversitat (University of Economics) where all the sessions were to be held. It was a 20-minute tram ride from our hotel. I saw many old friends at the registration. Some of us took a bus ride to the Schonbrum Summer Palace, and then returned around the ring to the University. I lunched with Gherston David and his wife from the USA.

The Congress theme was 'Social Development and Social Rights: Curriculum Imperatives for the Year 2000 and Beyond'. At the opening session, 5–7pm, the main speaker was the psychiatrist Victor Frankl. He spoke on 'Resources and Survival'. I found it interesting but very limited. We went back to the hotel to

⁴⁷² What follows is based on the diary I kept at the time.

change for the mayor's formal ball in the Vienna Town Hall, 8.30–11pm – a very enjoyable occasion.

The next morning I chaired the plenary session, and introduced the Younghusband lecture and the speaker, whom I knew well. It was Armaity Desai, director of the Tata Institute in Bombay, India. Armaity told me she found it reassuring when she heard I would be doing this. Armaity tackled the topic of trying to orient social work education to an effective social change and social development purpose. In the morning tea break, I discussed with Terry Hokenstad, my chapter on professional conduct in the book I was writing. A panel presentation on UN and interdisciplinary strategies for social development and social welfare was in the next session. I had lunch with Jona Rosenfeld from Jerusalem and we talked about the nature of ethics. In the afternoon, Trish and I went to the Albertina Museum (Durer drawings, etc.), and Secession, a nouveau art centre (Klimt's Beethoven freize, etc.). In the evening, we went to the Austrian Night and Garden Party.

The plenary session on Wednesday morning consisted of reports from each of the IASSW regions. My Australian colleague David Cox, made a notable report on the APASWE region. Clearly he was making his mark in international social work.⁴⁷³ I had a long talk with Elizabeth Ozanne from the University of Melbourne about the Australian social work situation and my general book on professional ethics. At lunch, I talked with Janice Wetzel about her project on getting women's issues into the social work curriculum, and the need to get it morally grounded. (She was the next Moses Professor at Hunter.) At 3.30pm, I went to the session on doctoral education given by Shankar Yelaja. It was apparently my participation in this session which led Shankar subsequently to invite me to Wilfrid Laurier University in Canada to assist with their doctoral program.

In the evening we shared taxis with the Dick and Verna Splane. First, was a drop-in party at Rao's home and then we went to the home of Friedrich Schwank and his wife Merran, who was the daughter of Professor Lowenthal of Sydney University, a friend of Jim's. From the Schwanks', a group of us had a meal at an outdoor restaurant in the foothills of Venice.

On Thursday, 21st July, I went to a session with papers on international content of social work curricula by Lynn Healey and Dougal McDonald, and Yoko Kajima. A session on religious values in the social work curriculum by Frank Lowenburg was disappointing. Trish joined me for the lunch in honour of Heinrich Schiller, the outgoing IASSW president. We sat with Ralph Garber, the incoming president, and his wife Eileen. After lunch, I attended the session on the UN and Social Work given by colleagues and friends from Hunter College – Chuck Guzzetta, Florence Schwartz, and Yvonne Asamoah. The

473 I was on the selection panel when he was appointed to a chair of social work at La Trobe University in 1988. For nearly 20 years David Cox worked as a social worker with refugees and migrants mainly as director of ISS – Australia, based in Melbourne, before moving into academic work at the University of Melbourne. His publisher consulted me about his book manuscript on social work with migrants. David also asked me, 'as the best know Australian in international social work circles', to chair the NSW committee of ISS and be a member of the ISS Governing Council. I came to know him well in the course of our ISS work together.

final session for the day took the form of a meeting of APASWE chaired by Edna Chamberlain, with the Indians in prominence. Liz Ozanne joined Trish and me for a meal in the old city, and then at an open-air concert in the Town Hall courtyard with choirs and orchestras who had been competing in an international festival. Afterwards we went on an abortive trip on the underground to the Danube, looking for coffee and cake besides the river.

At the Friday morning session I went to papers on empowerment by Eli Teram (Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada) and Stuart Rees. I had lunch with Ralph Garber and talked afterwards about my ethics book. In the afternoon was a very difficult General Assembly meeting – 52 voted for a motion recommending the expulsion of the South African JUC from the IASSW, 48 voted against, and 5 abstained. In the evening, the Splanes, McDonalds, Garbers, Lawrences, and Yoko Kajima, had a meal together in a restaurant in the older part of Vienna.

The Congress closed on Saturday morning with a disappointing paper on 'Ethics and Humanism in Social Work' by Cardinal Dr Franz Koenig. Trish and I saw Freud's home converted into a museum, had lunch with Edna Chamberlain at a restaurant near her monastery accommodation, and visited the Belvedere Palace, the 20th Century Art Museum, tower and gardens, the Old City.

Copenhagen

On 24 July, we flew by Scandanavian Airlines from Vienna to Copenhagen arriving at 1.30pm. After booking in at hotel Sankt Jorgen, a modest, well-located, cheap hotel (recommended by Barry Egan), we viewed the Thorvalsen Museum (Danish sculpture 1770–1844), and the National Museum of Fine Arts, went for a sight-seeing trip on the canals, wandered along the walkways in the older part of the city, and went to the Tivoli Gardens where we had meal at Perlen Restaurant. On Monday 25th, after more sight-seeing in the older part of the city, we took the bus to the airport.

Stockholm

We had a splendid view of Stockholm as we flew to its airport about 45 miles north, arriving at 4.30pm. We were staying at Tegnerlunden Hotel, adequate accommodation within walking distance of the central railway station and the central part of the city. We walked around the old part of Stockholm, and a shopping walkway, and had a meal.

27.2 10th International IFSW Symposium Stockholm

On Tuesday 26th, after looking at a Milles sculpture in a square used as a market (Carl Milles was Sweden's most celebrated sculptor), and a lunch of rolls, we went to the Sheraton Hotel where a symposium sight-seeing tour by bus started. During the tour we sat with Claire Bunday, our friend and my former close colleague at UNSW.

The symposium was held at 'Massan', the Stockholm international fairs and congress centre, at Alvsjo, a southern suburb. It was constructed in 1975, with a capacity for 4,000 people. At the official opening, 5–7pm, Bengt Lindquist (minister for family affairs and matters concerning the disabled and elderly, Sweden) spoke, followed by Lisbeth Palme (chairperson, Swedish Committee for UNICEF). Lisbeth Palme was a wife of the murdered prime minister. A psychologist by profession, her address was 'Dare we see the children of the world?'. I described it in my diary as an 'emotional, political speech'. The opening was followed by a reception of welcome, 7–9pm.

Doreen Gibson was the plenary speaker the next morning, 27 July. I found her paper, 'Which road for social work: the moral choices and ethical dilemmas', rather ethnocentric. She recommended replacing feminist theory for traditional liberal and radical social work theories but did not ground it morally (according to my diary entry). The ensuing small-group discussions were 'mainly Swedes very bound by government regulation'. I had lunch with Claire Bunday and we talked about my book. It was 'very congruent with her group work model'. From a very range of choice, I chose two presentations in the afternoon. Jon Kolberg, a Norwegian sociologist, gave a 'sensible and helpful' paper, which would be coming out in book form – 'The transformation of the welfare state: comparing welfare states and labour markets – the Scandinavian experience'. The other paper, 'Some conspicuous incongruencies in the ethics of social welfare', was, in fact, mainly about Jane Adams's writings on peace. In the evening was a reception in the Stockholm City Hall, one of the city's major tourist attractions.

Ramesh Mishra (McMaster University, Canada), the plenary speaker on 28 July, spoke on 'Riding the new wave: social work and the neo-conservative challenge', but sadly he miscued the timing and short-changed the latter stages of his paper (not the first time apparently!). He was a highly-regarded social policy scholar. I spoke with him briefly about the Social Welfare Research at UNSW. Phyllida Parsloe had a long talk with me about my book. She was looking forward to reading it and would like to get me to Bristol, especially to talk with David Watson about moral philosophy and social work. Trish and I had lunch at a small café near our hotel, before catching a bus to the Vasa Museum, a remarkable restoration of a 17th century battleship under water for 333 years. In the evening was home hospitality provided by Swedish colleagues. Our hostess was Chris Greby-Sutton. She picked us up at the hotel late in the afternoon. We walked to her pleasant apartment where she provided a meal, and the three of us caught a tube to the Old City where we had coffee and cakes, and an interesting walk.

On Friday, 29 July, Hans Berglind gave his plenary paper 'Social work and

conflicting values in the welfare state'. I appreciated his concern for more careful value analysis. I did not, of course, realise at the time, that we would become working colleagues for a period in the University of Stockholm in 1990. A paper by Martin Bloom on 'Patterns of value choices: a comparative study' was not very satisfactory. It examined forced choices of students from five nations, providing them with responses to case situations representing four major ethical positions (utilitarian, Rawls, Nozick, and Gewirth). I had lunch with my Israeli social policy colleague, David Macarov. A paper 'Social work as an art', based on a book published in 1986, by Hugh English (University of Sussex), was alright as far as it went but it did not go very far. In the evening, we went to Skansen for a picnic meal, folk dancing and cabaret. I had to come home early, however, because a throat infection had set in and I had very little voice.

Trish and I went to the final plenary session when Paolo Friere (Brazil) talked for an hour on educational philosophy and the attributes of the progressive social worker, followed by a paper by a social worker on social work in the service of revolution in Nicaragua. In the afternoon, after a doctor downtown prescribed antibiotics for my throat infection, we went on a short boat ride to the Feather Islands (museum, handicrafts, etc.).

Sunday, 31 July, was our last day in Stockholm. It was cold and windy. We took a one-hour boat trip to Waxholme, had lunch there and returned by bus. I rang Chris, and thanked her again for Thursday evening; then rang Aslog Pontara, and spoke at length with her ethicist husband Guiliano, who taught at the University of Stockholm. Peter Singer had visited their department. Little did we know that in less than two years, we would be returning to live in Stockholm and I would be teaching an ethics course at the University of Stockholm. Our visit to our son Peter in London, 1-7 August, followed these international European meetings. (See Vol. 4, pp. 184-5.)

The Social Work World Meetings 1988

Vienna



PDL - Museum of Fine Arts



Museum's entrance hall



St Stephen's Cathedral



Schönbrunn Palace



Inside Schönbrunn Palace



Art Nouveau Museum



Eileen and Ralph Garber (IASSW President, 1988-96)



Das Wunder (1954) - Marini



PDL - Belvedere Palace



View of Vienna - upstairs, Belvedere Palace



Trish with Giacometti sculpture



United Nations Centre

Copenhagen



Copenhagen wharf



Tivoli Gardens



People photographing 'Little Mermaid' sculpture

Stockholm



*Carl Milles fountain - Haymarket,
behind Concert Hall*



Haymarket



Claire Bunday - long-standing friend and social work colleague, Sydney



Carl Milles Sculpture Garden



David Cox, Elizabeth Ozanne and RJL - IFSW Symposium



Tinguely creations



Elizabeth Ozanne and PDL - Skansen



PDL, Keith Windschuttle (UNSW), and Bob Abramovitz (husband of Mimi, colleague, Hunter College, New York)

Paulo Freire (Brazilian educator and philosopher) - final session, IFSW Symposium



London



Peter and Trish – gardens, Inns of Court



Granite figure, 1850 BC - Amenemhat (12th dynasty Egyptian pharaoh) – British Museum



Modigliani – Tate gallery



Kew Gardens



Kew Gardens Glasshouse



Visiting Bernice Hamilton (retired to Cambridge)



King's College Chapel, Cambridge



With Peter - by the Thames

Chapter 28

Nomination for IASSW Presidency 1992–94?

My letter to Vera Mehta, secretary-secretary of IASSW, at the end of 1990, is self-explanatory:

When we talked earlier in the year about the possibility of me being nominated for the IASSW Presidency for the 4-year period from July 1992, I indicated that I would be in a better position to give you a considered response by the end of the year. This I am now doing.

Your phone-call encouraged me to give hard thought to what I should be doing in the next stage of my professional life. I have now decided to retire in July 1991 from the Chair of Social Work which I have occupied since 1968, so that I can concentrate on the research and writing to which I believe I should be giving priority at this stage of my career. I hope to stay very much associated with the School and the University, and will continue as the Chairperson of the Board of Management of the University's Social Policy Research Centre. (From my discussions with Ralph⁴⁷⁴ in Toronto in February of this year, he will know why I would wish to give continuing priority to this responsibility.) If all goes as planned, by July 1992, I should be well advanced in my writing, and could welcome the challenge presented by the IASSW Presidency if this is what is wished by the members of the Association. As I have indicated to you, however, I would not wish to compete in the nomination with a good third world candidate.

If there continues to be interest in my possible nomination, I would be grateful to be brought up-to-date on IASSW developments, since it had been some time since I was on the Board, and I would like to be as well-informed as possible if I am to tackle the task. As you pointed out on the phone, having an experienced Secretary-General would make a great difference.

Let's keep in touch. I look forward to your response to this letter. I am sending a copy on to Ralph so he knows where I have reached.⁴⁷⁵

In mid-1991, at UNSW I was eligible to retire with full superannuation,

474 Ralph Garber, IASSW president.

475 Letter, John Lawrence to Vera Mehta, 31/12/90.

at 60 years of age. On my return to Sydney after teaching the professional ethics course at the University of Stockholm earlier in 1990, I taught a new professional ethics postgraduate subject for the Faculty of Professional Studies in the second session of 1990, and again in the first session of 1991. On my return from Stockholm, I discovered that a new head of the social work school, without any consultation with me, had decided my two post-graduate teaching subjects, social policy analysis and social planning, would no longer be in the school's post-graduate curriculum, at least in the form that I had taught them! Obviously I was not impressed, to put it mildly, particularly when she was not professionally qualified herself either in social work or social policy. The university had changed to having heads of schools occupying the position for short periods, which I thought was a mistake anyway. I agreed to act as head of school January – March 1991, before the next incumbent Martin Mowbray could take on the responsibility.

Various factors contributed to my decision to retire from the chair when I did – the possibility of future large international responsibilities in the IASSW, uncertainty about my future teaching in the school, a need to press ahead with writing the general book on professional ethics and another one on social policy, and a firm conviction that the school badly needed a new professorial-level appointment to provide leadership to the school and in the profession (I had had my turn). Also, there was some doubt about my health. I had had to give up my beloved squash because of periodic atrial fibrillation, not usually a life-threatening condition but one which reduced physical efficiency, and the likelihood of increased frequency.

My friend and colleague Janet George⁴⁷⁶ from the University of Sydney was chair of the nominations committee for IASSW. I only discovered Ralph Garber might stand again when I talked with her in about mid-1991, when nominations were due. I had heard nothing from either Ralph or Vera, and certainly would have appreciated knowing the possibility of him standing when this became a possibility, since it was information of obvious relevance in planning my own professional and personal life. I told Janet I would not proceed with my nomination if Ralph could, and would stand. Janet wrote to me from Hong Kong in August 1991, that the Board unanimously was of the view that Ralph should be asked to consider nomination and he had agreed to stand again. 'The continuity at this time for developing relationships with Eastern Europe etc. is seen as important'. Consequently she had not put my name forward, but since nominations remained open until 31 December I could reconsider my position and nominate.⁴⁷⁷ Vera subsequently explained that until the Board meeting in Hong Kong, Ralph's eligibility for the position was unclear (was he limited to 8 years on the board, or in the one office?), and his health and financial conditions were also factors. Vera herself did not know

476 We had spent a most enjoyable day together visiting temples and gardens in the mountains in Japan in a break at the IASSW Congress and ICSW conference in Japan in 1986. She was a social policy scholar specialising in health policy. Subsequently she headed the social work school at University of Sydney.

477 Letter, Janet George to John Lawrence, 25/8/91.

Ralph's stand until Hong Kong, so could not inform me.⁴⁷⁸

I told Vera I was, in fact, pleased and to some extent personally relieved, that Ralph was able to do a second term as President. 'It makes very good sense for the IASSW. When we talked earlier, in 1990, this was not seen as a possibility'. 'I have been made an Emeritus Professor and anticipate a fulfilling professional life for many years to come'.⁴⁷⁹

478 Letter, Vera Mehta to John Lawrence, 12/2/92.

479 Letter, John Lawrence to Vera Mehta, 27/3/92.

Chapter 29

The 1994 Katherine Kendall Award Selection Process

My final task for the IASSW, was as chairperson of the candidate selection committee for the Katherine Kendall Award, 1994. IASSW president Ralph Garber caused initial confusion by writing to me at the University of Sydney and giving this as my address to the other committee members. On 10 February, 1994, he faxed 'Many thanks for taking on the task and for ruling yourself out of the running for this year.' (It had never occurred to me that I would or should be in the running.) The other committee members were: Maxine Ankrah (Makarere University, Uganda), Seno Cornely (Brazil), Harriet Jakobsson (Sweden), and David Woodsworth (McGill University, Canada). The selection process was my final experience of the difficulties of trying to operate effectively and efficiently internationally; the closing down of the Vienna office had inevitably exacerbated administrative problems in the IASSW.

The minutes of the July 1993 Barcelona board meeting at which the committee was nominated were taken by individual board members, and the section concerning the award did not reach Ralph Garber until the end of November. Ralph regretted the long delay in writing to us about our task, provided us with material about the award, and asked for our nominations by 21 February. The chair and the committee were free to use whatever means they chose, but Ralph suggested in the interim that each committee member might submit five names (excluding current board members), ranked if possible, for the chair to short list five names, with a second list of an additional five names, to be sent to the executive committee for final decision.⁴⁸⁰

The first time the award was made, in 1992, Heinrich Schiller, immediate past president, had chaired the award committee, but the 'normal procedure' of seeking nominees from the regional presidents had been unproductive. He was aware that his suggested alphabetical list of nine 'outstanding scholars and well know promoters for equity and social justice' 'from many parts of the

480 Letter, Ralph Garber to John Lawrence (designated chair), Katherine Kendall Award, 3/12/93.

world' did not represent 'a truly global view'.⁴⁸¹ Amongst his correspondence was a letter from Katherine Kendall herself:

Your note asking for nominations for the K.A.K. award is on my desk and I am sitting here at my computer wondering whether or not I should respond. As the person most greatly honoured by having an award in my name, perhaps I should have nothing to say about possible nominees. On the other hand, just because the award carries my name, I am most eager that the Committee should consider persons whose life work truly reflects international commitment and achievement of benefit to social work and social work education. In my long years of service to IASSW, I have known a number of such people who may now be retired and therefore not as well known to the Committee as persons still very much in evidence. Thus, I presume to suggest as the first nominee for the Kendall award Miss Aida Gindy, formerly of UNICEF and the UNITED NATIONS. Let me explain why her name is high on my list.

The U.N. and UNICEF no longer play a prominent role in training social workers or in promotion of programs of social work education and we tend to forget what they contributed to the field and to the IASSW in an earlier period. Until well into the 50s, the IASSW was pretty much a European organization with considerable American support and participation. To make it a truly international organization covering all regions of the world was a challenge and a daunting experience. It was also our highest priority. We were able to achieve this goal in large part because of the interest and constant help of UNICEF and the Department of Social Affairs at the U.N.. There were a number of people who helped, but from the mid-60s Aida Gindy was the key contributor.

Katherine then gave an account of Aida Gindy's background and career, and said why her work was of sufficient benefit to social work and social work education to justify nomination for the K.A.K. award.

There are good names on the list of people already suggested and one, in particular, is obviously a first choice because no-one else, not even Aida Gindy, can match the contributions made by Herman Stein. In this age of political correctness, however, it would probably look too much too cozy to give an American and American-named award at a Congress held in the U.S.. If you think it would be okay to Herman get the award at a Congress held in the U.S., I would concur with great enthusiasm. I assume you have all the material on him. If not, let me know as I can supply a mountain of material on his contribution. ...⁴⁸²

Another letter to Heinrich Schiller had come from Terry Hokenstad, who suggested three nominees Aida Gindy (UNICEF and the United Nations), Armaity Desai (India), and Maxine Ankrah (Uganda). Terry was convinced the first awardee should come from the developing world. The IASSW executive, in fact, had chosen Armaity Desai for the 1992 award, but clearly the process needed improvement.

I did not receive Professor Garber's letter of 3/12/93, and its attachments,

481 Letter, Heinrich Schiller to Executive Committee meeting, 22–24 February, 1992.

482 Letter, Katherine A. Kendall (honorary president, IASSW) to Heinrich Schiller, 9/12/91.

until I returned to Australia from the USA at the end of January, 1994 after 7 weeks abroad. (He had rung me in the U.S., told me I could act on his letter on my return and assured me that our submission of names could be delayed if necessary.) I asked each committee member to send to me by 18 February, the suggested two lists of names, with a brief paragraph why the person was being nominated. 'You should be guided by the criteria for the Award approved by the Board, and sent to you by Ralph, but it is clear these are indicative only. The general criterion is 'distinguished international contributions to social work education'. While we were in the U.S., Katherine had written:

It was good to talk to you the other day. Having you so close (we were in California visiting our daughter) made me long to get you to the East Coast to see me in my Old Folks' Paradise. It is really a great place and these last months have confirmed by judgment in coming here. The health care is excellent.

I wrote Ralph about your surprise at being appointed to the KAK Award Committee. Meanwhile, let me send you the enclosed material on Dick Splane who, in my view, has done as much to promote international social work and social work education as anyone I have known. ... I hope you will give him strong support. A factor to be taken into account is the lack of any funds to bring award winners to the Congress. I had to scrounge to get Armaity Desai to Washington. This would not be a problem with Dick. ...⁴⁸³

When I wrote to the executive committee on 21 February, 1994, I still had heard only from David Woodsworth, and that was in response to Ralph Garber's letter of 3 December, 1993, not to my letter of 28 January, 1994. The candidate selection committee had been unable to meet the requested deadline for nominations for consideration at the February meeting of the executive.

To ensure that the nomination processes were satisfactory for the 1996 award, I suggested clarification of the criteria for the award, and the necessary sequential steps for selecting a suitable recipient.

The criteria for the Award need to be clearly described and widely known to enable appropriate nominations to be made. The Award is to recognise a person who had made 'distinguished international contributions to social work education'.

The central focus is 'social work education', that is, the education of social workers, to which the nominee must have made 'distinguished international contributions'. The award is not primarily for contributions to social work practice, social welfare, or to education not directly related to social work practice; contributions to social work education must be 'distinguished', that is, remarkable for their high quality; and they must go beyond the confines of any one nation or society.

Relevant contributions include having an impact on social work education in two or more nations or societies, having an impact on a region, and having an impact at the general international level.

'Social work education' covers organizational arrangements for basic and continuing education, curriculum development, teaching methods, teaching materials, and knowledge development for education and practice.

483 Letter, Katherine Kendall to John and Trish Lawrence, 8/1/93.

(The prime emphasis on the promotion of 'equality and social justice' in the revised wording of the criteria proposed by the British JUC-SWRC in a letter to Dr Schiller, 30 January, 1992, is, I believe, not particularly helpful. It can lend itself to ideological vetting of possible candidates rather than deciding upon candidates in the light of a full appreciation of the complicated mix of values, knowledge and skills which invariably must constitute social work practice and education for practice, wherever they are undertaken. In any case, 'equality and social justice' is a misleading characterisation of the professed general normative position of social work. Any idea of social justice embraced by social work surely includes, or is actually built upon, a concept of equality, at least in the sense of equal consideration of all people.)⁴⁸⁴

In a letter to Ralph Garber on 24 February, 1994, I commented:

As you know, the nomination of Dick Splane has already gone forward through a member of the Candidate Selection Committee, David Woodsworth. I am concerned that the endorsement of a single candidate by the North American Region should not exclude adequate consideration of earlier nominees such as Herman Stein. Dick Splane has made a great contribution internationally, but the extent to which it has been focused on social work education needs to be carefully examined.

Katherine is an obvious source of knowledge about possible nominees but I believe it is inappropriate for her preferences, positive or negative, to have any influence on who is selected. I have felt bound to mention this to Katherine, when talking with her recently.⁴⁸⁵

In another letter on 10 March, 1994, I still had not heard from Maxine Ankrah, which made me wonder if I had her correct address. My colleague Janet George, currently on the executive committee as a regional president, told me the matter of the Award had been postponed until 7 July. I realised the item had not been discussed at any length, but I asked Ralph if he had any comment on my proposals for the nomination process for the 1996 Award – in particular, was the timetable still too tight given international communication problems? (Perhaps the Candidate Selection Committee should be appointed as early as July 1994.) Was the attempt to clarify criteria for the award useful? A couple of the current nominations pointed up the ambiguity of the present statement of criteria. 'I, of course, need to know if the prime focus for the Award really is intended to be social work *education*.'⁴⁸⁶

In response, Ralph, said Maxime Ankrah was thought to be in Washington D.C. but he had been unable to obtain her address. I should proceed without her nominations. 'The African region is no longer functioning and hasn't for the past five years.'

Your comment that social work education at the international level should be the determining criterion, is my understanding as well. The recommendations that you make regarding changes in the criteria should be approved by the Board for the

484 Letter, John Lawrence to IASSW executive committee, 21/2/93.

485 Letter, John Lawrence to Ralph Garber, 24/2/94.

486 Letter, John Lawrence to Ralph Garber, 10/3/94.

next competition. You are certainly correct in your observation that we should begin the search process immediately after the next Congress. I am so advised.

Re Herman Stein, you should proceed as he is *an estimable* candidate, and for some politically inspired reason was not considered for the Washington Congress award because it was thought to be U.S. dominated if he won the KAK award then.

If you have a short list and get it to me before mid-May I would have time to get the c.v.s before the Executive Committee meeting in July.⁴⁸⁷

On 7 April, I sent a list of 10 names considered to be suitable for consideration for the award by one or other members of the Committee. 'Given the process this time round, I cannot pretend the list is a result of careful, informed selection by the Committee as a whole'. ... 'It is impossible for me as Chairperson, or the Candidate Selection Committee as a whole, to attempt to rank order and short-list candidates without fuller information about each of them. And the whole exercise has been made more problematic because it is far from clear that 'a distinguished contribution to social work education at the international level' has been the prime criterion for nomination in each case.' The 10 nominations were in alphabetical order, with brief supporting statements, where they had been supplied by the nominator. The nominees came from Hong Kong, Australia,⁴⁸⁸ USA, Brazil, Uruguay, UK, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Canada, and USA. Although Herman Stein was a second nominee from the USA, I commented, 'He was seen as a strong candidate in the first round but was apparently passed over for political reasons. Surely in a professional body primarily concerned with education, merit criteria should be paramount, not where a person comes from. I believe his candidacy should go forward and should be seriously considered for the 1994 Award.

This letter of 7 April, concluded with the following statement for the next Executive and Board meetings of the IASSW:

The 1996 Katherine Kendall Award

1. In July, 1994, approval should be sought from the Board for clearer criteria for the Award. These might take the following form –
 - The Katherine Kendall Award is to recognise a person who has made a distinguished contribution to social work education at the international level.
 - 'Social work education' covers organisational arrangements for basic and continuing education, curriculum development, teaching methods, teaching materials, and knowledge development for education and practice.

487 Letter, Ralph Garber to John Lawrence, 17/3/94.

488 The Australian nominee, Professor David Cox (La Trobe University), was nominated by Janet George. 'David Cox has extensive experience in both international social work education and practice. His early career included work with refugees in Europe, and is reflected in his academic research and consultancy in immigration. He has been a member of the Board of Directors of APASWE since 1985, serving as President 1989–93. During these years he has encouraged research into social work education at regional level and training for social development. He had lectured and written extensively about international social work education and social development and has worked with UN and ESCAP in this area. He has established a Centre for International Social Development and teaches in this area at postgraduate level.'

- 'At the international level' refers to the general international level, a region of nations, or two or more nations or societies.
 - The contributions must have been 'distinguished', that is, remarkable for its high quality.
- 2. The Candidate Selection Committee for the 1996 Award should be appointed in July 1994, and confirmed not later than September 1st, 1994.
- 3. The letter inviting membership specifies the conditions of the Katherine Kendall Award, the selection criteria, and the responsibilities of members and the Chairperson.
- 4. Once the Committee is confirmed, the Chairperson asks each member to consult with relevant colleagues, including the Regional President, to identify not more than 5 possibly suitable nominees. Each member's nominees can come from any Region. The Committee member gains directly from each of the possible nominees that person's own brief account of her or his contribution to social work education at an international level, and also names of at least 2 people willing to write a testimonial about that contribution if asked to do so.
- 5. The Chairperson of the Candidate Selection Committee provides a notice for the IASSW Newsletter in the second half of 1994, which describes the nomination process and encourages readers to suggest suitable names to members of the Committee.
- 6. When the names, statements of relevant experience and brief supporting comments by the Committee member have been provided to the Chairperson, not later than the end of February, 1995, the Chairperson consolidates the data and the 5 members of the Candidate Selection Committee are then asked by the Chairperson to rank at least 5 of the names on the basis of the data before them.
- 7. Not later than July, 1995, the Chairperson sends to the President a short list of 5 names derived from the rankings of the Committee, and a second list of an additional 5 names. A full curriculum vitae plus testimonials, at least for those on the short list and possibly some on the second list, is then sought by the President's office in preparation for the final decision by the Executive Committee at its meeting in late February, 1996.⁴⁸⁹

On 25 November, I wrote to Herman Stein:

I was delighted to hear that you had been awarded the 1994 Katherine Kendall Award for your outstanding contribution to social work education at the international level. Warmest congratulations! Yours has been a long, distinguished career consistently in pursuit of values which our contemporary world desperately needs.

Many people around the world will have their particular cluster of Herman Stein memories, which they will recall with both pleasure and enlightenment. Mine include: your firmly-held view, which I shared, that the IASSW should not give undue recognition to the Inter-University Consortium on Social Development; your work when IASSW President to make the South African Schools report on action to combat apartheid (I recall your explosive comment to me – 'He's a bloody liar!');

⁴⁸⁹ Letter, John Lawrence to Ralph Garber, 7/4/94.

when I was sitting next to you at an IASSW Executive Board meeting and the SA spokesperson was clearly not giving a frank report to the Board.); that splendid lecture series on world trends which you organised, saying you were cashing in a lot of chips with many colleagues to make it possible (I attended it when I was a visiting professor at SAS in Cleveland in 1983); your astute comment to me in Montreal in 1984 after you had read my Younghusband Memorial Lecture that I was a rum fellow (I was arguing the case for a reflective universal morality) – and so on. Katherine once told me about your capacity for vaudeville. I would have enjoyed that. We do tend to have been too inflexibly serious in social work, although the reasons are not hard to find!

I have formally retired from the University of New South Wales, but remain as an Emeritus Professor and continue to Chair the Management Board of the University's Social Policy Research Centre, which is a national centre directly funded by the Federal Government. I am pressing ahead with a general book on ethics and professional conduct. The scope is intimidating, but I can't easily limit it without losing what I think needs saying. ...⁴⁹⁰

Herman wrote in response on 5 December:

Thank you ever so much for your letter. It gives me an opportunity to be in touch with you, it alerts me to the fact that there must have been some announcement of the Katherine Kendall Award to me, and of course, I welcome your kind thoughts.

... Katherine and I mutually agreed that if either of us was able to go to Hong Kong the other would be there as well in 1996, Lord willing.

Your recall of our conversations is truly amazing. As I remember you at IASSW meetings you were astute, calm and clear-headed about the issues, qualities which were not in always great supply. Some of those meetings were exciting and fortunately there were cool heads to count on to lower the temperature. ...

I note that you are happily selective at your university and persevering in your study of ethics. Good luck on the book!

I do hope we meet again and in any event, thank you once more for your very kind letter.⁴⁹¹

490 Letter, John Lawrence to Herman Stein, 25/11/94.

491 Letter, Herman Stein to John Lawrence, 5/12/94.

Chapter 30

International Social Work – A Joint Journal

It will be recalled that in 1982, a joint committee chaired by Terry Hokenstad recommended that the three organisations who sponsored *International Social Work* (IASSW, ICSW, and IFSW), should reaffirm their commitment to the journal, contingent upon acceptance of major changes in its organisation and operation, and the committee was asked to implement the recommendations.⁴⁹²

International Social Work was under new editorial and publishing auspices effective with the January 1986 issue. The three sponsoring organisations had signed an agreement with SAGE Publications Ltd in London who would be responsible for marketing and publishing of the journal. Terry Hokenstad, the editor-in-chief, worked with an editorial policy committee of one representative from each of the three organisations. The 'mission statement' read:

International Social Work is a scholarly journal designed to extend knowledge and promote communication in the fields of social development, social welfare and human services. The major focus is on international themes in the delivery of services, the functions of social work professionals, and the education of social workers. Social policy and social service provision provide the context for this focus.

The Journal places particular emphasis on articles concerned with comparative analysis and cross-national research. Attention is given to trends and issues in social welfare policy and social work practice with a scope extending beyond any one nation. Consideration also is given to new developments in the training of social work professionals and their roles in social development and social service programs. Occasional thematic issues of the Journal focus on specific international developments in these fields.

The editorial board had major responsibility for the content of the journal.⁴⁹³ I was initially invited to be a member until December 1988, but in fact continued as a member for the next ten years regularly reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication. It was a thankless and often rather depressing task,

⁴⁹² See p. 291.

⁴⁹³ Letter, Terry Hokenstad to John Lawrence, 8/8/85.

when they were of poor quality and dubious relevance. My fat archives of submitted manuscripts indicate hardly any being returned with a recommendation to publish without any revision. Whenever it was warranted, I provided constructive written feedback to the anonymous author for suggested revisions. (I recall Terry telling me that he wished he could have published some of my critiques of manuscripts!) The process always involved another reviewer with the final judgement being in the hands of the editor-in-chief. Terry Hokenstad and his early successor Frank Turner were very able, conscientious editors-in-chief during my period on the editorial board.

Elizabeth Jackson, a British social work colleague in Swansea, was the book review editor for *ISW* in the transition to the revised journal. During a visit to UNSW in the first half of 1985 when I was acting head of school in Tony Vinson's absence, she asked me to review Kathleen Jones's biography of Eileen Younghusband for the journal. I took the liberty of making the review longer than usual because of the international significance of the subject and also because I thought a shorter version would be far less comprehensible for non-British readers. The new editor-in-chief Terry Hokenstad accepted it as 'an essay review of article length'.⁴⁹⁴

What We Can Learn From Biography: A Case in Point

Kathleen Jones, *Eileen Younghusband: A Biography*, Bedford Square Press, 1984.

The art and science of biography are especially apt for social work. Whatever our culture, the living of a human life is the touchstone of our work – not seen in isolation from others, or in single dimensions of time or interest, but in the full intricate web of historical process. We may become fascinated by broad social structures and processes, or by esoteric intra-psychic theories, but we as social workers always need to ask how these and other phenomena affect the living of specific human lives. By making an individual human life the focus, biography fits our concerns and shares our problems of trying to pay due regard to the person as a unique phenomenon, but inevitably also as a cultural phenomenon in interaction with other people, events and places. Autobiography, the person telling their own story would seem especially important to us, as a matter of both justice and accuracy, yet to assess an individual life in human terms we cannot settle only for autobiography.

The contribution to social work understanding that can come from both autobiography and biography – of members of actual and potential 'client' groups and of members of the social work profession – is massive and badly needed. In one sense, every person's story, or stories (for there will usually be no one definitive version), is worth telling if we value each human being. However, the lives of some human beings have been of especial interest because of their power and influence, their notable achievements, and/or their unusual character.

All of these elements were present in the life of Eileen Younghusband, an acknowledged social work leader not only in her native Britain, but in many other countries. We are very much in Kathleen Jones' debt for persuading her subject to

494 John Lawrence, 'Book Review', *International Social Work*, SAGE, London, Beverley Hills & New Delhi, Vol. 30 (1987), pp. 199–203.

make extensive tape-recordings reviewing the ideas and influences on her life, and for using these, as well as her own research, as a basis for this first biography written on Eileen Younghusband. The result is a thoroughly good read – an unusual story told with finesse and verve. The author hopes that Eileen's friends will find it 'a fair likeness', a nice play on the word 'fair', for while basically sympathetic, the account is honestly told even if not bolstered by the scholarly convention of citing specific sources.

Although this does not claim to be a full, definitive biography of the life and times of Eileen Younghusband, the publishing format is still disappointing. The book is rather oddly located in a series of Occasional Papers on Social Administration, but more important, the print (or rather reduced typing) is tiny, the cover is unattractive, and there is no index.

Eileen's was literally a 20th century life. Born in London in 1902, she died in a car accident in the United States in 1981. Her grandfather was a general in the Indian Army. Her father, Francis, a soldier, explorer and mystic, while on leave from India married in 1895 her mother Helen, daughter of a member of the British Parliament and grand-daughter of an Irish earl. Eileen was born again in a period of leave. On Francis' return to India, his friend Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, appointed him as Resident of the state of Indore. From there in 1903, he was sent on his celebrated mission to Tibet, where exceeding his brief, he virtually annexed Tibet for Britain. His heroic record of achievement was to be one of the formative influences on Eileen's life.

After 'a season of Edwardian brilliance', the Younghusbands returned to India in 1907, first to Indore and then to Kashmir whose mountains made lasting impact on the young Eileen. Busy as he was as Resident, Francis became his daughter's teacher and companion, she had no formal lessons

In 1909, the family returned permanently to England, with Francis in young retirement because he had exceeded the Government's orders in Tibet. They had neither inherited wealth nor property. For three years, they stayed with friends and relatives, with Eileen receiving little companionship from her parents, especially her mother with whom she had 'a complex and uneasy relationship'. When the family finally settled in London in 1912, Eileen went to school, but her father at first remained her mentor.

Eileen spent the war years 'in intellectual and emotional suspension', acutely lonely. Then came some friendships, and Dick Sheppard's Christian preaching at St Martin-in-the-Fields on social reform, pacifism and good human relations. Her good mind began to be stirred to look for a way out of the alien shallow world of London 'society' in which her mother insisted she should belong. In 1924, her growing idealism found an outlet as a voluntary worker for a school Care Committee in the East End of London and the following year she move into a Settlement House living on a pittance. Her years of 'empty existence' were over, but the transition was gradual and she continued to live virtually two lives.

Feeling the need for formal education, Eileen gained entry in 1926 to the 2-year London University Certificate in Social Studies run by the London School of Economics (LSE). Despite a late start caused by a serious illness with poliomyelitis, she gained a distinction on her first year's work and again in the 1-year University Diploma of Sociology which she undertook after the Certificate.

Four years as a temporary part-time tutor led to a full-time teaching appointment in the LSE Social Science Department. Her work as a juvenile court magistrate, on which she continued to place great store, began in the 1930s and continued until her retirement in 1967.

In the late 1930s, she became involved with the resettlement of Jewish refugees, and then on the outbreak of war, with the evacuation of children from the British cities. When LSE moved to its war-time home in Cambridge, Eileen stayed put in London with much work to do. She set up one of the first Citizen Advice Bureaux; helped to set up a national network of clubs for young people away from home; acted as a fire warden; reported on food and rest centres for the homeless; drafted a report for the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust on training for youth work; ran brief social work courses for 'allied women' in preparation for their return to their devastated countries; and finally, as a temporary civil servant surveyed the welfare functions of the Assistance Board which broadened her knowledge of the conditions of poverty and of the civil service.

With teaching still her first love, despite the stretching professional experiences of the war years, Eileen returned to LSE in 1945. Her fascination with policy-making now had free reign, however, in her survey of social work employment and training for the Carnegie Trust – done for a pittance on unpaid leave from LSE. In her 1947 report she identified from amongst what were apparently disparate fields and occupations, a social work core, 'as yet only occupied by scattered encampments of trained workers ... (The) untrained, semi-trained and otherwise trained probably form(ed) the bulk of the population'. She considered both sexes ought to be fully involved in social work and receive the same training. The university social science courses lacked practical training; literature and research were almost entirely absent. She proposed an experimental, university-based Carnegie School of Social Work to help to rectify the quality problem, but the training was not to be generic despite being based on certain core subjects.

Eileen's 1951 Carnegie Report, while mainly a factual supplement to the 1947 report, was obviously moving towards seeing social work as a single profession with a generic training. She noted, 'all the specialised divisions of social work begin to look so artificial when any detailed analysis is made of the needs which people bring to social workers'. She insisted that her plan of training followed from her analysis of what was needed, not from any slavish following of the American pattern. She explicitly rejected five limiting attitudes to social work training – the technological answer, the liberal answer, the psychoanalytic answer, the communist answer, and the religious answer. Instead, she prescribed 'helping students to relate means to ends and to bring to their work an attitude of intellectual and moral integrity, and that profound respect and compassion for humanity without which no one has the right to be a social worker'.

Eileen's original idea of a new School of Social Work attracted only sufficient financial Carnegie support for a new social work course inside Richard Titmuss' Department of Social Science and Administration LSE. Titmuss, new to academic life and to social work politics, invited Eileen to run the course. In preparation, she toured Social Work Schools in the United States; was impressed by their comparative development in education and practice, especially their focus on group work and community organisation, as well as casework; and persuaded Charlotte Towle of the

Chicago School to spend a sabbatical year (in 1955) helping to set up the LSE course. The two existing specialised casework courses (in mental health and in child care) had eventually to be merged in some way with the Carnegie course under the one director. Eileen and her supporters saw her as eminently qualified for this particular post by her years of effort for generic social work, her work as juvenile court magistrate, her seniority in age over the psychiatric social work teacher who was rival for the position, her international social work standing, and her appointment in 1955 as chairman of the Ministry of Health Working Party on Social Workers in the Local Health Authority Health and Welfare Services. After a long, stressful process, Eileen was not appointed the Lecturer in Charge; she was not seen as a qualified social worker, especially by those whose own professional qualifications she had brought into question. She resigned from LSE in 1957, severing a 30-year connection.

Kay Jones' account of 'the LSE affair', as it came to be known in British social work circles helpfully complements David Donnison's study of it as a case of organisational conflict (in *Social Administration Revisited*, George Allen and Unwin, 1965). For Eileen, the whole episode was deeply hurtful.

Eileen's Ministry of Health Working Party worked for four years to produce a report which became the Government's blue-print for development in the next ten years. It recommended three grades of worker – welfare assistants with systematic in-service training, 'general purpose social workers' with a two-year national certificate training outside the universities, and university-trained social workers with social science and professional qualifications. The second group became the main body of social workers in the entire field, a difficult development for those concerned about developing a united, well-educated profession.

Despite her work commitments and the national eminence that came from the Younghusband Report, from 1957 to 1961 Eileen had no earned income. 'The woman who had mapped out a national organisation for a whole profession could find no place for herself in it'. Then came her appointment from 1961 to 1967 as a highly influential consultant in the National Institute of Social Work, a social work staff college proposed by the Younghusband Report. Her friend Robin Huws Jones was the Institute's Principal. A pension, and the gift of a half-time secretary marked her reluctant retirement from the Institute at the age of 65. Three years earlier in recognition of her contribution to social work, she had been made a Dame of the British Empire.

Present readers will be particularly interested in Kay Jones' chapter on 'International Social Work'. Eileen's international involvements began after the Second World War. With her Indian background and her deep sense of social justice, international social work gave her a new outlet for her idealism and energies, especially since 'rejection of the West still lay some way in the future'. For more than two decades from about 1950 she 'commonly made four or five trips a year to different parts of the world, attending international meetings, visiting Schools of Social Work, impressing on officials the importance of social work education, attending official functions, writing seemingly endless reports, and making friends'.

Eileen felt especially at home in the United States and was highly regarded by 'the powerful group of American social workers who staffed the United Nations agencies in New York and the IASSW'. She was responsible for the Third U.N. International

Survey on Training for Social Work. Written between 1956 and 1959, this was a courageous attempt to define 'a basic body of knowledge and skills' relevant for all countries. For eight years from 1961, Eileen was President of the IASSW, working in close association with its distinguished Secretary Katherine Kendall, encouraging especially the new Schools in Africa, Asia, the West Indies and South America. She continued on with the IASSW as Honorary President for life. In 1976 she received international social work's highest award, the Renee Sand award.

Eileen chaired the group which produced the 1968 Gulbenkian Report on Community Work in Britain, an attempt to put community work on its feet. What eventuated 'never looked remotely like the endeavour Eileen had planned', and after about ten years 'the great Community Work bubble burst'. Eileen was not a member of the Seebom Committee, but the Committee's chairman acknowledged that it was the earlier 'Younghusband' developments which made possible the setting up of local authority Social Services Departments based on 'generic social work' assumptions. Eileen's final contribution to British social work was her detailed, self-effacing, two-volume history, published in 1978, covering the period 1950 to 1975.

Kay Jones gives a moving account of Eileen's final years – the dying one by one of her great friends, her need to travel, concern for the loneliness of others living alone, the shift from doing to being, the implacable will turning to coping with her own living, the sense of identity that came from reviewing each stage of her long and eventful life, and her tentative hopes of the survival of human personality through deterioration and beyond death.

Eileen Younghusband's life cannot be understood separate from the growth and development of the social work profession, not only in Britain, but more generally, and in turn the profession's history cannot be understood apart from the people like her who made it what it is. Hopefully Kathleen Jones' example of insight and understanding that can come from good biography will stimulate social work scholars throughout the world to turn more to this art form.

In November 1985, Terry Hokenstad asked if I would consider making a contribution to the 'International Perspectives' series (essays of 1,000 to 1500 words with emphasis on ideas or trends as differentiated from the longer articles concerned with analysis or research). 'Perhaps something on the universal morality theme of the Younghusband lecture or on a current social policy issue would be appropriate'.⁴⁹⁵ I was in Adelaide with Trish and not certain when we would be able to return to Sydney. Trish's father Dean had kidney failure and would not be with us much longer. Also the health of Trish's aged aunt (Margaret Berry), who had been looking after Dean was very uncertain and we needed to help her make suitable arrangements for her future. I had brought some work with me, but obviously it was not easy to give it concentrated attention at this time.⁴⁹⁶ In early January 1986, I wrote to Terry. We had just recently returned from an extended period in Adelaide where we eventually had managed to get Trish's father and her aunt into a very satisfactory comprehensive care situation with the Helping Hand run by the Uniting Church,

495 Letter, Terry Hokenstad to John Lawrence, 1/11/85.

496 Letter, John Lawrence to Terry Hokenstad, 22/11/85.

and also to sell the old, family home, 'Wingfield'. Dean Berry's kidneys had packed up so had not long to live, but his sister's prognosis was now good and she should have many years ahead of her in an independent unit in her new environment. I promised to send Terry the international perspectives essay by 1 March,⁴⁹⁷ a deadline which I met.

Terry had sent me a copy of the initial perspectives essay by Chuck Guzzetta – on the current status and future potential of social work practice and education in Eastern Europe, to appear in the January 1986 issue.⁴⁹⁸ It concluded with this exhortation from Chuck:

The world social work community should be prepared to extend encouragement and practical help to its comrades in eastern Europe. And the growing cadre of social workers and social work education programmes located there have much to share with their counterparts elsewhere. The opportunities for open, collaborative efforts now are greater than ever before. The sincerity, sensitivity, practicality and dispatch with which world social work approaches its potential friends in eastern Europe at this time may well determine the nature of the relationship, if any, well into the twenty-first century.

A Guest Editorial

When Terry read my international perspectives essay, he thought it would be very suitable to use immediately as a guest editorial, and not delay its publication in the perspectives series for which he already had other material.

Universal Perspectives on Knowledge and Ethics

With a theme of 'Survival and Development', it was not surprising that the 1984 Montreal international social work meetings produced papers on 'Universal Values Which Underlie Social Work Practice and Education' (by Jack Otis) and 'The Necessity of a Universal Value Base for Social Work' (by Moya Duplica and James Herrick). I chose as the first Younghusband Memorial Lecturer to discuss humankind's urgent need for a reflective *universal* morality. Again, an assumption of common values and common cause underlies Charles Guzzetta's call for social work representation from socialist countries of Eastern Europe in the world social work bodies (International perspectives – *International Social Work*, January 1986).

The quest for universal knowledge and values in terms of which we can order our relationships with each other, not just locally but globally, takes on a practical urgency in an increasingly interdependent, dangerous, unjust, and uncertain world. Massive political, economic and social problems confronting the present and future generations of humankind will not begin to be solved without dramatic shifts in the understanding and values of humankind. These include the exploding world population concentrated in countries least able to sustain it, the exploitation of the Earth's natural resources and pollution of the human environment mainly by the wealthy countries, the growing but inequitable and inefficient world economy,

497 Letter, John Lawrence to Terry Hokenstad, 7/1/86.

498 Letter, Terry Hokenstad to John Lawrence, 11/12/86.

the arms race and the threat and use of violence, biological experimentation which threatens to get out of hand especially if done for commercial profit and the clashes of closed political and religious thought systems.

We make sense of, and give order and purpose to our world through our norms and values, which are both cultural and personal products. These are not in our genes. Our genius and vulnerability as a species lies in each generation's capacity for learning, thinking and evaluation. We urgently need, in this generation, for our ways of thinking to be relevant to the kind of world we will be facing.

In a nutshell, the present human generation needs to make a massive shift to a universal perspective for both knowledge-development reasons and ethical reasons. As both epistemologists and moral philosophers have indicated, human reason pushes us in this direction anyway.

Thanks especially to the work of cultural anthropologists, we are now far more aware of how value-laden and culture-influenced are our knowledge claims, especially in the social and behavioural sciences. But it still makes sense to strive to understand the uniformities in our world – not just to assuage our curiosity about how our world works but to understand how we are affected by it and how we can act effectively on it. Trying to confirm and explain a knowledge claim requires careful handling of ideas, concepts, hypotheses, predictions and evidence, both within and across specific cultures.

Of special importance to world social work and social welfare is the growing interest in comparative study of social policy. It is only through such study that what is generally true can be distinguished from what is unique and specifically true to any situation. Despite the methodological problems, no general explanations can be developed without it. A further important benefit claimed is that through such study a wide range of policy options for tackling particular problems can become known and understood.

This leads to the question – on what moral basis 'ought' policy choices be made? Ethical relativists argue that there are no overall or universal standards of right and wrong or good and bad. What is actually right and wrong or good or bad depends on the social group of which you are a member. Taken as a moral prescription, this can be seen as contradictory for it implies a universal principle of freedom for each group to determine its own ethical standards. Apart from this, there are other obvious problems. Reasons are seldom given for the position; it is just asserted as right. Yet moral evaluation calls for giving reasons. Further, what group is the ethical relativist talking about? Every person has membership of different groups and the norms of different groups may clash. Which norm, then, should the person follow? Again, how many people in a group must think something wrong before it really is wrong? In any case, both majorities and minorities can be wrong, and may subsequently decide they were mistake. Finally, how can you ever achieve moral improvement if what the majority of a group approves is *ipso facto* right? See John Hospers (1969), *Human Conduct*, pp. 36–8. London: Hart-Davis.

For these various reasons, ethical relativism does not make sense. Seeking justificatory criteria for human choice, which is the very stuff of reflective morality or ethics, inevitably leads us to universal frameworks which include all human beings (and, some would argue, at least some other sentient creatures as well). Is it reasonable to stop short and not recognise the moral claims of all other rational, sentient beings?

Both the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declare the dignity of the human person as a fundamental value, and the two Covenants on human rights (on Civil and Political Rights, and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), and other more specialised UN conventions on rights are attempts to locate values which every human being ought to experience. Given the cultural diversity of the peoples of the world the task is obviously formidable. Yet without such efforts to determine shared standards of behaviour between interacting and interdependent peoples, there can be no sense of legitimacy or justification in human actions. The so-called 'realist' school of international law sees international relations primarily in power terms, in contrast to the 'normative' school which argues that there are overriding common purposes and values. At the very least there is a common concern for survival, but increasingly there are other shared concerns as well which can encourage us to think in terms of world society regulated by a universal system of morality.

Social work's historic mission of working with politically weak, disadvantaged and vulnerable people has inevitably raised moral or social justice issues. Although some may cringe at the description, it is a profession trying to take seriously the concept of 'doing good' in our complicated modern societies. It is heavily reliant on the justice of its cause being recognised by the society in which it works. Moral suasion is its most powerful weapon in the face of vested societal interests with other forms of power far exceeding anything the profession and its clients typically can wield.⁴⁹⁹

If social work and social welfare institutions can quickly come to terms with our urgent need for a universal perspective on both knowledge development and ethical judgements, they are a valuable human resource. If, however, they remain embedded in local, relativistic thinking, they are part of humankind's serious current problems.⁵⁰⁰

A Change of Editor-in Chief from 1987

The first meeting of the editorial board of *ISW* was held in Tokyo on Saturday, 30 August, 1986, at the time of the international meetings there. Ten members attended. Terry Hokenstad reported that 93 manuscripts had been received between July of 1985 and August of 1986. Of these, 20 had been accepted for publication during 1986 and another 9 were being reviewed by the editorial board at the time of the meeting. Special effort had been given to requesting manuscripts from countries in the developing world, but few articles had been received from Africa, South America and many parts of Asia. Current subscriptions were about 900, compared with about 600 when it was published in Bombay. The goal was 1500 in the next two years.

Terry informed us that he had recently been elected to a 3-year term as president of the USA Council on Social Work Education, which meant he had to resign as editor-in-chief effective 1 January, 1987. He regretted the decision, but time did not permit him to carry both of these voluntary responsibilities as

499 See, p. 365.

500 John Lawrence, 'Universal perspective on knowledge and ethics' – Guest Editorial, *International Social Work*, SAGE, London, Beverly Hills and New Delhi, Vol. 29, No. 3, July 1986, pp.195–198.

the same time. We had considerable discussion on the content of the journal. It was recommended to the editorial policy committee that Professor Charles Guzzetta of Hunter College in New York City be asked to assume the role of editor-in-chief. Should he be unable to accept this responsibility, the board recommended Professor Francis Turner in Canada as a capable alternate.⁵⁰¹ I believed either of these would be good appointments and said so at the meeting of the editorial board.

In September 1986, when sending me another manuscript for review, Terry told me that Chuck was seriously considering the editorship and would most likely take it on if he could receive some support from the School of Social Work at Hunter. 'You have been most helpful in your review of manuscripts and your contributions have helped to uphold the quality of the Journal'. It was, in fact, Frank Turner who succeeded Terry as editor-in-chief, I assumed because Chuck had not received the needed support from Hunter.

As already mentioned, Trish and I were entertained in the home of Frank and Joanne Turner when we were living in Waterloo in Canada when I was on a Commonwealth Canadian fellowship at Wilfrid Laurier University at the beginning of 1990. (Frank had been the dean there.) In 1992, we were able to return the hospitality when they visited Australia. I very much appreciated talking with him about our shared concerns for the social work profession. We still exchange Christmas cards with the Turners.

My 'Somewhat Troubling Piece', 1996

In his editorial of the October issue in 1996, Frank Turner wrote:

This issue begins with a very scholarly and, indeed, somewhat troubling piece by Dr John Lawrence, for which I wish to thank him. He has been invited to write a piece on the occasion of his stepping down as a long-standing member of the Editorial Board and as one who knew the Journal well and has served it admirably over its many developmental stages. Dr Lawrence challenges us in a variety of ways and we need to ponder carefully in the months ahead on the issues he raises. ...

Discussion article:

International Social Work: Reflections on the Journal and its Future

Our esteemed editor has invited me to write a farewell piece on my resignation from the editorial board after a decade of reviewing manuscripts for the Journal. He suggested I might 'do something both retrospective and prospective as to the role of a journal such as ours'.

International Social Work was started in 1958 as a joint venture of the International Conference of Social Work (ICSW) and the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW). By 1960, the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) had become the Journal's third sponsor. In 1967, the ICSW changed its name to International Council on Social Welfare to signify a distinction between social work and social welfare, but stayed as a joint sponsor of the Journal. The first review of the Journal, in 1968, resulted in new editorial arrangements and

⁵⁰¹ Terry Hokenstad to *ISW* Editorial Board, 'Report on Tokyo Meeting of Editorial Board, 1/10/86.

a 'larger investment of resources to improve the quality and appearance of the Journal' (Kendall, 1969:1). However, a 1985 cri de coeur from the then Editor-in-Chief protested that the sponsors, with more pressing issues to settle, had let *International Social Work* remain a low priority. The policy-making body met rarely and the editorial committee even less so, but 'drifting' was 'better than halting and floating better than sinking' (Dave, 1985).

A second review of the Journal resulted, in 1986, in fresh editorial arrangements, and the Journal took on its present format, with the publishing in the hands of Sage Publications. It remained a quarterly, and the book review section was expanded. A significant new feature was the translation into French and Spanish of the abstracts of the articles, which was at least a move in the direction of recognising the limitations and bias of international communication just in the one language. The first five issues in the new format contained a new section, 'International Perspectives', short essays on current trends and issues in social welfare and social work, but it disappeared with the early change of editor when Terry Hokenstad resigned to take on the presidency of the US Council on Social Work Education.

The Journal is now visually a quality publication, although each of the two reviews has led to a reduction in its page format, and the type size of all but the text of the articles is now very small. The size, I presume, is related to cost and ease of transmission, but it does look as if someone pressed the reduction button of a photocopier. Apart from people perhaps not being encouraged to read the small print, there is a general impression of meanness and modesty which the layout and content do not warrant.

The current editor has periodically encouraged contributions from all corners of the globe, especially from 'practitioners', and in response to issues of international concern such as refugees, drug addiction and the persistence of wars. It is not apparent that he gets much response from such exhortation, and he would know as well as any of us why this should be the case. From about 1988, the Journal attracted a sufficient number of manuscripts for the Editor to be concerned about the inevitable delays in their processing (Turner, 1988: 163).

I have two more specific comments to make before moving on to the rationale and future direction of the Journal. First, *International Social Work* is noticeably weak in its historical content. This is understandable given the constant pressure in social work of current and future concerns. However, without historical knowledge, contemporary understanding can be superficial and limited in its awareness of practice options. Second, a content analysis, published in the Journal from time to time, would help to give us a realistic understanding of the actual coverage of the countries, populations and cultures of the world.

The 'Information for Contributors' has remained unchanged since 1986, except for a revision in 1991 which reduced the expected wordage of articles, one response to the increased flow of articles submitted. The first paragraph, which presumably serves as a mission statement for the Journal, is, frankly, a conceptual dog's breakfast – perhaps inevitably, in an attempt to increase the number of contributors and readers from both the social welfare and the social work constituencies provided by the three sponsoring bodies, and to keep the Journal's mixed sponsorship happy.

International Social Work is described as 'a scholarly journal'. That is certainly appropriate for IASSW concerns, but scholarly virtues such as critical thinking,

clarity of communication, openness to new ideas and new evidence, imagination, intellectual honesty, intellectual humility, intellectual integrity, concern for accuracy to the extent the subject will allow, and respect for and acknowledgement of the work of others, should obviously not be confined to academics. These attributes are necessary for anyone trying to seriously understand themselves and some aspect of the world we live in.

International Social Work is said to be 'designed to extend knowledge and promote communication in the fields of social development, social welfare and human services'. This certainly seems appropriate for the ICSW, although the vague term 'field' glosses over what is actually being referred to here. Each of these general overlapping terms, 'social development', 'social welfare' and 'human services' has, in fact, tended to become captured and pre-empted by sectional interests. Human well-being can only be attained through living in groups. A universal social welfare concept must be concerned with all of the various social arrangements used by humans to attain their valued ends, which means the full gamut of families and other primary groups, government activities, commercial activities, and community non-government activities. It must be concerned with what constitutes well-being for human beings, and with how they can achieve it, and in the interdependent modern world it cannot be other than international in its scope. The ICSW historically has been strongly associated with the voluntary welfare sector, and the social work profession, although it has certainly attempted to lay claim to a much broader social welfare concept. The ICSW tends not to be strongly linked with the education, health, housing and social security sectors, which a more European rather than North American definition of social welfare would demand.

Trying to achieve a societal or community frame of reference for the various value-attainment arrangements in societies at various stages of 'development' is a vast, complicated task, which requires cooperative endeavour from all of the main value-attainment sectors, including the professions, far beyond anything achieved by the ICSW. Such an endeavour calls for a scholarly journal which would explicitly adopt a universal social welfare concept, and would solicit contributions not only from each of the main value-attainment sectors, but also deal explicitly with the structural and coordination questions which inevitably arise if one takes a serious interest in social welfare. The resultant *International Social Welfare Journal* would need to establish itself in relation to a more specialised scholarly publishing network which deals with each of the most significant parts of the over-all value-attainment system. If the ICSW wants to stay primarily associated with those agency activities which are explicitly focused on the well-being of the most vulnerable members of human communities, it might still provide leadership to bring into existence the comprehensive social welfare publishing venture. If it stays with its welfare agency mandate and focus, it could then make a particular contribution to the broader international debate about social welfare. However, whatever is the perceived scope of social welfare adopted by the ICSW, it should have its own scholarly journal, and not confuse many issues by being a joint sponsor of a social work journal.

Returning to the present Journal, it is apparent to me that it is in fact primarily what it is called. Careful reading of the editorials indicates regular reference to the profession, its responsibilities, practice and education. It serves as the international journal of the social work profession, but its mission has been confused by the

very important social welfare concerns to which I have been referring. Despite the initial unqualified social welfare mission at the beginning of the Journal's mission statement, the very next sentence states that 'the major focus is on international themes in the delivery of services, the functions of social work professionals, and the education of social workers'. This is scarcely an adequate mission statement for the flagship international journal of the social work profession. A socially responsible and socially responsive profession needs an international scholarly journal to help it understand how it contributes, and how it might contribute to human well-being and in particular where it fits into the value-attainment arrangements of the societies in which it is operating. This requires explicit attention to its occupational identity, organisation and education. The 'work' in 'social work' is as important as the 'social'

In my view, then, the Journal is due for its third major review, no doubt a nervous prospect for many who have been associated with it and helped it become securely established in its present form. Social workers claim sophistication in social structural matters, but it is not always evident in the way they themselves are organised as an occupation. I believe the time has come for *International Social Work* to become quite explicitly the international professional journal of social work, with the ICSW disengaging from sponsorship, but accepting the responsibility of establishing its own publishing scholarly international flagship. In this way I believe both the social work profession and the ICSW will make more effective contributions to human well-being. I am fully aware of the extensive literature on professionalism and its advantages and disadvantages for that well-being. Social work, like every occupation which claims professional standing, needs constant scholarly writing from its practitioners and educators, as well as from others in the community, to make its case for respect, support and influence.

It is especially important for social work educators and social work practitioners to continue to be associated in the one international journal. Other more specialised publications are obviously necessary, in addition to the flagship journal of the profession, but they cannot perform its overall coordinating intellectual function. *International Social Work* has a central role in helping the occupation of social work to achieve coherence as an international profession, and to reach a greater understanding of its international responsibilities and the universal and culture-specific components of social work practice. With the new technological forms of communication, professional journals may become an endangered species; I believe, however, that for the foreseeable future they continue to make a distinctive and accessible contribution to the professional enterprise, and at the same time provide an invaluable permanent historical record.

References

- Dave, Chandra (1985) 'Editorial', *International Social Work* XXXVIII (4).
Kendall, Katherine A. (1969) 'Editorial Note', *International Social Work* XII (1), 1–2.
Turner, Frank (1988) 'Editorial', *International Social Work* 31(1), 163–4.

Chapter 31

Designated 'A Faithful Angel'

In 1994, a book by Harry Specht and Mark Courtney was called *Unfaithful Angels: How Social Work Has Abandoned its Mission*. They claimed that social work in the USA, and implicitly elsewhere, had increasingly forsaken the underprivileged and social service to meet their needs, for private psychotherapeutic practice to the middle-class. A book titled *Faithful Angels: Portraits of International Social Work Notables* 'counterpoised' their theme. It was eventually published by NASW Press in New York in 2002, delayed by the untimely death of its initiator and editor, James Billups (1930–1999). I was one of the so-called 'faithful angels' he interviewed for the project. Jim Billups dedicated the book to:

... the 'faithful angels' represented here, other 'faithful angels' not represented, and those in the process of becoming 'faithful angels', all of whom illustrate through their life stories the laudable purposes and goals of social work, including concern for both private troubles and public issues, personal service and social change.

Jim Billups, a faculty member of the Ohio State University College of Social Work with a deep commitment to the universality of social work, had two terms as president of the Inter-University Consortium for International Social Development. His first stimulus for this international book came in the mid-1960s from studying the inspirational lives of early social work pioneers in the USA. As the years went by, he became increasingly aware of other, more recent inspirational social workers from many parts of the world, 'making noteworthy contributions both to the profession and to human well-being'. However, relatively few of his contemporaries seemed to know of these colleagues or the examples they were setting. '... detailed biographical history of the modern social worker of note was the exception rather than the rule.' Fortunately, in 1995, he had an interview with Katherine Kendall for a special international issue of a new journal. He found this 'highly inspirational, as well as unusually informative'. The more he thought about it, the more he 'realized that the interview procedure might serve as the vehicle for capturing and collecting the reflections not only of this one remarkable individual but

of a group of distinguished social workers around the world who have made noteworthy achievements in the past 50 or so years.'

An advisory panel of six social workers, with expertise in international social work and ready familiarity with 'notable social workers from around the globe', was asked to use a 'reputational' model, employing three criteria to identify members of the profession that they rated most highly.

The first and most important criterion was that individuals nominated must have made exceptional professional contributions to social work and to people's well-being in their own country *and beyond* during the major part of the second half of the twentieth century. Notables meeting this criterion, it turned out, were generally well known by the reputations they had gained through the philosophies they espoused, the professional responsibilities they assumed, the initiatives they undertook, and the public recognitions they received. Second, the nominees were to have reached retirement age in their own societies by the time of the interview. Third, the nominees were to have formally retired from their principal full-time positions (although not necessarily from all facets of their career activity) by the time the interviews were completed.

Nearly 40 names were submitted. Based on those individuals who were nominated with greatest frequency the pool of candidates was narrowed to 15. The group came from all continents and was almost evenly divided by country of residence and location of principal professional practice, between countries generally identified as the Global South and the Global North.

All of the 15 agreed to be interviewed, and provided the requested professional resume; most sent other documentary background material. From this material, Jim Billups sent each participant 'an individualised set of core questions', although the questions all followed a somewhat similar format. Participants could modify the questions if they wished. The aim was to allow these recognised leaders 'to share freely and fully as possible their professional perspectives, concerns, approaches and reflections on their major lifework'. The interviews were usually held in the home country of the person being interviewed. They usually took three or four sittings extending over two or three days. Transcripts of the audio tapes went through a process of revision until there was an agreed manuscript ready for the publisher.

In my own case, I was thankful I had kept a well-organised curriculum vitae, and could use this to structure in advance the responses I would give to Jim Billups's questions. It was obviously intended to be a serious attempt at biography, but had the inevitable limitations imposed by the interview format, however modified in each case. I think because I had the opportunity to prepare my responses and did not rely on material emerging in interaction with the interviewer, my recorded material in fact needed little revision, although this was apparently not the case with other participants. The process of producing the book became protracted, and then delayed further with Jim's unexpected death.

When Jim and his feisty social work wife Maria, visited us in Sydney, they came to Pearl Beach with us at the week-end, after my 'interview'. It was a joyous occasion – a barbecue, a lot of lively talk, and a walk on the rocks at Patonga – although a sobering incident occurred on the drive back to Sydney.

On the approach to Mooney Mooney Bridge, I suddenly found the car sliding to the left. Fortunately I managed to brake slowly to regain control before we reached the bridge. Jim assured me that was the right thing to do, but it was certainly a scary moment for all of us. (We later heard there had been an oil spill on the highway at that spot!)

In a preface to the book, Jim Billups explained its origins, the selection of those chosen for inclusion, and the process which produced the material for the book. A photo and an introductory biographical sketch preceded each interview.⁵⁰² My nutshell biography read:

Born in 1931, John Lawrence is a graduate of the Universities of Adelaide and Oxford and of the Australian National University. Australia's first professor of social work, Dr Lawrence headed the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales for 14 years (1968–1982), chaired the university's Faculty of Professional Studies, was a member of the University Council, and was central to the development of the university's Social Policy Research Centre, a national centre directly funded by the Australian government. He taught social policy for 30 years, with special interest in the ethical justification of policy and professional intervention. He is a former president of the Australian Association of Social Workers and served on its National Ethics Committee.

For eight years, Dr Lawrence was elected to the executive board of the International Association of Schools of Social Work. He has held positions in the governing bodies of community agencies, including the vice presidency of the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS). A firm advocate of international experience, he spent almost seven years away from Australia studying, researching, teaching, and acting as a consultant in England, the United States, Canada, Thailand, and Sweden. Among his achievements were a Rhodes Scholarship, Fulbright Senior Awards, the Moses Distinguished Professorship at Hunter College in New York, and a Canadian Commonwealth Fellowship. He is a member of the Order of Australia. He is married and the father of two sons and a daughter.

A foreword for the book, was provided by a professional historian, Clarke Chambers. (He had founded (1963) and directed the social welfare history archives at the University of Minnesota, and had 'convinced the social work profession of the importance of understanding its history and preserving the records through which it can be studied.)⁵⁰³ Chambers provided ongoing support during this international project and read all of the interview transcripts.

From 13 nations, 15 individuals diverse in family circumstances (some privileged, many pressed to survive), eight women and seven men, reflect on the varied circumstances in their lives. Each narrative has its own authentic integrity. Educated in schools of wide variety and quality, these professionals followed life courses influenced as often by chance as by design. Eventually, all of them, after diverse career experiences, engaged their talents and energies in international enterprises that carried them far beyond their native provinces.

502 An account of my interview is provided, Vol. 6, pp.37–51.

503 See on the internet, 'Clarke A. Chambers', NASW Social Work Pioneers. 'A series of his papers had a lasting effect in legitimising the place of history in the social work curriculum'.

... Whatever the career path, it is clear that family played a crucial role in every case, and one finds in these accounts a moving affirmation of the centrality of family in human affairs.

Amidst all the diversity, some recurring themes occurred often enough to justify cautious generalisations. First, however, he dwelt briefly on some of the differences in the family backgrounds of the participants:

- Jona Rosenfeld came from a well-to-do Jewish family of Zionist visions in southern Germany, a family that had the resources, the will, and the wit to escape Nazism in the early 1930s by immigrating to Haifa.
- Seno Cornely, oldest of a family of nine boys and four girls, enjoyed the security (and hard labour) of a small farm in Brazil.
- Armaity Desai's parents were both professionals in India's social work system.
- Sattareh Farman-Farmaian's father claimed royal status and substantial wealth; 36 children born of eight wives all received a university education.
- Gloria Abate, daughter of an Italian immigrant in Peru, a self-made man of some success, was encouraged by her father in independent and self-reliant habits.
- Richard Splane, youngest of six children, came from the solid working class of rural Canada.
- Angelina C. Almanzor was born into an affluent business family in the Philippines whose substance was devastated by Japanese occupation in World War 11, in which she lost her husband.
- In Australia, John Lawrence's father was a banker whose three children became academics.
- Aida Gindy's family (she was the youngest of five children) was soundly established and all the children followed a family tradition of service to the community.
- Herman Stein, born into a lower-middle-class immigrant family in New York, made his way up and out through the city's open educational system.
- Katherine Kendall, the other United States citizen in this anthology, had the resources and family encouragement for higher education.
- The Swedish Harriet Jakobsson, as a youth, had hoped to become a medical doctor but was persuaded by her prudent father to take up social work as a profession appropriate for girls.
- Meher Nanavatty came from an upper-middle-class family. As such, he says, 'I was torn between a pro-British atmosphere at home and an (Indian) nationalist influence at school'.
- Robin Huws Jones was reared by his father, 'a very financially poor draper'; he spoke his native Welsh, only learning English at age six.
- Esinet Mapondera of Zimbabwe came from one of the poorest families; her husband was imprisoned by his activism as a leader of the African Mine Workers Union.

Clearly, no pattern emerges from these diverse family backgrounds that reflected all sorts and conditions of human kind.

Chambers observed 'a recurring and persisting excitement' with the study of humanistic and social science disciplines, and speculated that 'this wide-ranging intellectual curiosity, shared so broadly although experienced in different educational settings, was an important source in their later careers of a responsive versatility, a capacity to move easily through different institutions and agencies, a skill at innovating programs and policies, and, among the educators, an eagerness to initiate programs that were interdisciplinary.' All had been introduced to human service as volunteers. Some had taught in elementary or secondary schools on their way to social work. 'Most striking of all, they all seemed to find their unique way towards community development as their chief mode of practice'.

I read with great interest and respect each person's account of their career, grateful for Jim Billups's enterprise. The work high-lighted the importance of biographical writing in historical research, and in particular in social work and social welfare history. It was a privilege to be amongst such people. I was very much aware that although my own career path had obviously not been trouble-free, it was relatively so compared with the circumstance experienced by so many of these colleagues in other countries. I did not know Sattarah Farman-Farmaian, Gloria Abate, or Esinet Mapondera, but I did know the rest from my own international work, some of them well. The focus was not, however, just on a person's international work, but on their career as a whole.

In 1996, my international contribution was described in these terms by Katherine Kendall:⁵⁰⁴

It is a privilege and my personal pleasure to be able to support without any reservation the nomination of Dr John Lawrence for an award in the Order of Australia. His record of achievement spans local, national, and international boundaries, demonstrates excellence in all his endeavors, and reflects commitment to the highest values and aspirations of the social work profession. Others will speak of his accomplishments in Australia. I shall concentrate on his international contributions.

As former Secretary-General of the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW), I have known and worked closely with Dr Lawrence for almost thirty years. Our first meeting occurred in 1970 when he participated in the biennial conferences of both the IASSW and the International Conference of Social Welfare. His keen intelligence, his scholarly approach to questions at issue, and his obvious ability as a leader marked him as a rising star on the international scene. In 1974 he was elected to the Executive Board of the IASSW, where, in the years ahead, his vision as an educator helped to shape programs of social work education around the world. To this day, he is recognized by his international colleagues as an infallible source of expert knowledge on the teaching of social administration, social policy and planning, moral philosophy and professional ethics.

His curriculum vitae lists the many universities in North America and Europe that have called upon him as a lecturer or visiting professor. He is the only educator from abroad to have occupied the prestigious Henry and Lucy Moses Chair of Social Work Professorship at Hunter College of the University of the City of New York.

504 Letter, Katherine K. Kendall to Mrs Lorraine Walter, Government House, Canberra ACT, 18/3/96.

This was prompted, in part, by the response to a brilliant paper he delivered at the International Congress of Schools of Social Work held in Montreal in 1984. The occasion was the first memorial lecture in honor of Dame Eileen Younghusband, an eminent British social work educator and former president of the IASSW. His time at Hunter was devoted to continuation of the scholarly work on ethics and moral philosophy that he presented at the Congress and which, when completed, is certain to have a strong influence on the future preparation of social workers. While in New York, Dr Lawrence also represented the IASSW at the United Nations as an NGO consultant on questions of social policy and various branches of the social services.

The international activities undertaken by Dr Lawrence have by no means been limited to his work with the IASSW. His interests are broad, encompassing the many and different facets of social welfare and social work practice. He has worked with UNICEF on child welfare policies and programs, with U.N. and regional bodies in Asia to promote research in the social field, and with Asian schools of social work to improve social work education, particularly in relation to meeting personnel needs for social development. He has had close association with the International Council on Social Welfare and International Federation of Social Workers. He has been much in demand as a speaker at countless faculty gatherings in the countries where he visited as well as at seminars, expert groups and international conferences. As a member of the editorial boards of a number of international journals, he has influenced the quality of professional literature.

John Lawrence has unquestionably excelled in developing the social work profession and social work education in Australia. Beyond that, however, he has had a marked influence on the social work profession around the world through his scholarly contributions to social work education. In bringing honor to the profession world-wide, he has brought honor to Australia. Dr Lawrence richly deserves the most favourable consideration for an award in the Order of Australia.

Katherine K. Kendall, PhD
Honorary President, International
Association of Schools of Social Work

Index

A Cumulative Index for the autobiography is at the end of Volume 6 and is also available on-line.

A

Abate, G., 418, 419
'The Assessment of Overseas Social Work Qualifications in Australia' (Lewis and Browne) (1982), 273–7
Acton, N., 36–40, 55, 57, 61, 69
Akanya, M., 301
Aldaba-Lim, E., 118, 124–5
Alexander, C., 288, 290
Almanzor, A., 90, 143, 156, 258, 418
Andrews, G., 205
Ankrah, M., 147, 393, 394, 396
Armstrong, K., 50, 55–6, 61, 62
Arnold, L., 211, 259
Asian Regional Association for Social Work Education (ARASWE)
meeting, Hong Kong (1980), 259–60
Atkinson, C., 60
Australian Association for Social Work Education (AASWE)
IASSW membership, 231
Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled (ACROD), 35
Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS)
Australian National Committee, (ICSW), 8

B

Baetz, R., 77
Baker, R., 179, 198, 223, 231, 241, 242, 243, 258, 283
Barnes, S., 211
Baume, P., 356
Berglind, H., 380–1

Berry, Dean (father-in-law), 357, 406, 407
Berry, Margaret 'Margie' (Trish's aunt), 406, 407
Billups, J., 415–16, 417, 419
Bisno, H., 231, 258–9
Bjelke-Petersen, J., 60
Bjelke-Petersen government, 52
Blackey, E., 180, 185
Bloom, M., 381
Boehm, W., 251, 289
Breeding, C., 320
Brennan, A., 205
Brettschneider, G., 278
Briggs, A., 287
Brigham, T., 107
Broinowski, J., 36, 40, 45, 57, 337
Brown, J., 18, 40, 42, 83
Browne, E., 272
Bundey, C., 380
Burniston, G., 36, 38
Butler, C., 60

C

Cairns, J., 124
Caldicott, H., 336–7
Cantor, M., 289
Capobres, T., 18
Carey, G., 317
Carola de Ruza, E., 18
Carpenter, D., 46
Cass, A., 107
Chamberlain, E., 52, 155, 156, 159, 179, 183, 246–7, 320, 325, 326, 372, 379
Chambers, C., 417, 419
Chan, A., 56

Chandra, K., 18
 Chapman, V., 78
 Chi, D., 193
 Chow, N., 259
 Clements, J., 18
 Collins, J., 56
 Colliver, S., 35, 40, 42, 43, 52, 53, 62, 89, 106, 123, 124
 Cornely, S., 163, 190, 252, 281, 290, 393, 418
 Courtney, M., 415
 Cowan, Z., 52, 215
 Cox, D., 259, 287, 378, 397fn
 Crawley, J., 287
 Crisp, J., 203, 204
 Crocker, W., 357

D

Daniels, K., 192
 Darwish, Y., 88, 93, 108, 109, 118–19, 122
 das Dores Costa, M., 194
 Dasgupta, S., 118, 212, 214, 218, 219
 De Almeda, C., 18
 de Graft-Johnson, K. E., 169, 194, 201
 de Jongh, J., 197, 260
 de Joya, P., 18
 de Leon, C., 211
 Desai, A., 91fn, 126, 141, 144, 180, 190, 211, 259, 378, 394, 395, 418
 Dinerman, M., 288
 Dissanake, D., 252
 Dixon, J., 246
 Donnison, D., 78, 156, 186–9, 309, 405
 Doron, A., 169, 182, 252, 278
 Dow, B., 179
 Drucker, D., 88, 89–90, 107, 193, 259
 Drummond, S., 36, 38
 Dubey, S., 192, 193, 194
 Dumpson, J., 47–52, 57, 58, 59, 60, 69, 180, 249, 250, 251
 Dunster, J., 211
 Dyson, W., 245, 250

E

ECAFE/UNICEF – Developmental Aspects of Social Work Training Curricula Seminar, Bangkok (1972), 87–91
 participants, 91–2
 report on, 92–106
Eileen Younghusband: A Biography (Jones), book review (RJL), 402–6
 Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture, 305, 306, 325

1984 Montreal
 Kendall on Eileen Younghusband, 338–9
 RJL lecture and responses, 336, 339–58
 Emery, G. M., 18
 English, D., 356
 English, H., 381
 Esnard, M., 13, 14, 15
 Estes, R., 285
 'The Ethics of Social Work Education', RJL (1986), 361–5
 Evans, G., 372, 373
 Eyden, J., 14, 18, 131, 132

F

Faithful Angels: Portraits of International Social Work Notables (Billups), 415–18
 Farman-Farmaian, S., 418, 419
 Fattahipour, A., 125, 126, 127, 128–9
 Florendo, S., 18, 150
 Floro, C., 18
 Fox, M., 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 28, 53
 Frank, V., 377–8
 Freire, P., 150, 381

G

Gabor, H., 326
 Garber, R., 371, 373, 374, 375, 378, 390, 391, 393, 394–5, 396
 Garside, J., 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 46, 60–1
 Gelin, B., 287
 George, J., 390, 396
 George, K. N., 192
 Gibson, D., 380
 Gindy, A., 18, 29, 143, 278, 285, 288, 326, 370, 394, 418
 Gokhale, S. D., 13, 18
 Golding, R., 211
 Goldstein, H., 356
 Gordon, Anne (née Berry) (sister-in-law), 14
 Gordon, Murray (brother-in-law), 14
 Grassby, A., 215
 Guthrie, D., 53
 Guthrie, R., 180, 194
 Guzzetta, C., 319, 320, 321, 325, 326, 378, 407, 410

H

Haber, L., 49–50, 52
 Hafeli, C., 194

- Hall, D., 56
 Hamilton, Bernice, 387
 Hamilton, L. Bruce, 60
 Hanhart, D., 144, 152, 162
 Hart, P., 54
 Hawke, H., 180–1
 Hawke, R. 'Bob', 180, 181
 Hayden, B., 57, 123, 124, 372, 373
 Healey, L., 378
 Henderson, J., 74, 227
 Henderson, P., 28, 122
 Hendry, L., 40, 41, 43, 46
 Henriks, G., 245, 250
 Hishon, F., 309, 310
 Ho Kam Fai, 258
 Hobson, R., 18
 Hodge, P., 91fn, 118, 120, 248fn, 258, 259
 Hoey, J., 195
 Hokenstad, M. 'Terry', 197, 223, 251, 253fn, 265, 285, 288, 291, 378, 394, 401, 402, 406, 407, 409, 410, 411
 Homji, H. B. M., 93–4, 107–8, 109, 110, 115–16, 119
 Hong Kong, 242–3
 Horsburgh, M., 287
 Hougham, G., 152
 Howe, B., 371, 372, 373, 375
 Hu, P., 18
 Hui, Y. F., 201
 Hulett, N., 18
Human Well-Being: The Challenge of Continuity and Change (ICSW), 168–76, 199
 Hunter College, IASSW/Hunter International Seminar (1984), 319–30
 Huntington, J., 287
 Huws Jones, R., 133, 152, 158, 159, 163, 164, 165, 180, 197, 198, 223, 259, 260, 261, 263, 285, 289, 369, 418
- I**
 IFSW-Asia/ARASWE regional joint seminar (1979)
 contributions, 212–20
 planning committee, 211
 Inter-University Consortium for International Social Development
 Brighton conference (1982), 283–6
 International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW), 131. *see also* Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture
 1970 Congress, Manila, 131–2
 1972 Congress, The Hague, 132
 1974 Congress, Nairobi, RJI background paper, 134–41
 1976 Congress, Puerto Rico, 158–9
 1978 Congress, Jerusalem
 Kendall address and send-off, 195–6, 197–8
 meetings, 184–5
 planning, 147–8, 150–7
 preludes and sessions, 185, 186–94
 social activities, 179–83
 Younghusband toast, 196–7
 1980 Congress, Hong Kong, 255–9, 260–3
 planning, 223–5
 1982 Congress, Brighton, 271, 287–9
 1984 Congress, Montreal, 333–7
 1986 Congress, Tokyo, 361–7
 1988 Congress, Vienna, 377–9
 Advisory Committee on Discrimination
 in Member Schools, 233–8
 association name change discussion, 252–3
 Board membership (1978), 184–5
 Browndale European Foundation, 'joint venture' funding proposal, 145–6
 directory of member schools (1981), 268–9
 equivalence of qualifications, 271–8
 Hunter College International Seminar (1984), 319–21, 325–6
 recommendations to IASSW Board, 329
 social work education in US (Katz), 322–5
 social work education (Kendall), 321–2
 summary of influences on education, 327–8
 ICWS, 3 year conference proposal, 146–7
 meetings
 Brighton (1982), 283–6, 290–2
 Hong Kong (1980), 233, 241, 252–3, 259–60
 Jerusalem (1978), 226
 Nairobi (1974), 143–5
 New York (1977), 159–60
 Paris (1975), 148–50
 Trondheim (1973), 141–2
 Vienna (1977), 161–3
 membership
 dues, 133–4, 265
 non-discrimination criterion, 142–3, 228–9, 252
 School of Social Work, UNSW, 132–3, 134

- Secretary-General
 Marguerite Mathieu's appointment (1978), 163–4
 Vera Mehta's appointment (1984), 358
 social work research seminar, Hong Kong (1980), 253–4
 South African JUC issue, 142
 statement of issues and RJL's response (1980), 265–7
World Guide to Social Work Education, 266, 267–8, 321
- International Council on Social Welfare (ICSW)
 ACOSS, Australian National Committee, 8
 activities, 6–7
 Committee on Objectives of International Conferences (1973), 77–84
 conferences
 Brighton (1982), 295, 296–301
 The Hague (1972), 73–4
 Hong Kong (1980), 244–51
 Jerusalem (1978), 199–202
 Manila (1970) (*see below* World Conference, Manila (1970))
 overview, 7–8
 three year cycle proposal, 146–7
 history, 5–6
Human Well-Being, 50th anniversary monograph (1978), 167–76, 199
 joint meetings
 IASSW, Brighton (1982), 293
 IASSW and IFSW, Jerusalem (1979), 226
 president, Grace Vaughan (1982–84), 293
 purpose, 6
 World Conference, Manila (1970), 11
ICSW Newsletter, report on, 26–7
 Pre-Conference Working Party, 11–13, 18–19, 28–30
 report of Working Party – an Address, 19–26, 29
 theme, 14–18
World Report, Brighton Conference (1982), 295, 296–9
- International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW)
 IFSW-Asia/ARASWE regional joint seminar (1979) contributions, 212–20
 joint meeting Jerusalem (1978), 226
 Symposium, Stockholm (1988), 377, 380–1
- International Federation on Ageing (IFA), 203–5
- International Social Work* (journal), 291, 340, 401–2, 406, 409–10
 'International Social Work: Reflections on the Journal and its Future', RJL article (1996), 410–13
- J**
- Jackson, E., 402
 Jakobsson, H., 233, 236, 237, 252, 258, 356, 393, 418
 Jayasuriya, L., 212
 Jenkins, K., 36, 38
 Jennings, K., 125
 Joint Universities Committee on Social Work of South Africa (JUC South Africa), 142
 Jones, K., 337, 340, 402–3, 406
 Junqueira, H., 18
- K**
- Kahn, A., 16, 45, 47, 58, 137
 Kajima, Y., 378
 Kamayana, I. G., 109–10, 245
 Katherine Kendall Award (1996), 393–9
 Katski, K., 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 73, 77, 168
 Katz, A., 233, 236, 237, 278, 289, 322–6
 Katz, I., 186, 197
 Kendall, K., 132, 133, 134, 135, 143, 144, 147, 149, 151, 152, 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 165, 180, 193, 226, 252, 253, 268, 278, 292, 305–6, 319, 321, 325, 326, 329, 338, 340, 377, 394, 395, 415, 418
 'The IASSW 1928–1978: A Journey of Remembrance' (1978), 195–6
 report on UN Commission for Social Development (1979), 227–8
 send-off, 197–8
 tribute by RJL, 165
 tribute to RJL, 419–20
- Kerrigan, B., 203–4, 205
 Kewley, T., 51
 Kimberley, D., 278
 Koenig, F., 379
 Kolberg, J., 380
 Kulkarni, P. D., 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 53, 116, 117, 122–3, 258, 298
- L**
- Langohr, R., 18
 Langshaw, W. C., 40, 42, 56
 Lasan, D., 108, 110, 118, 132
 Lavan, A., 301

- Lawrence, David (son), 315, 317
- Lawrence, John
- ACOSS
 - International Committee, co-convenor (1978), 200
 - ACTR/SWD, retainer scholars list, 125–6 (*see also* SWDCAP under Lawrence))
 - Australian Council on the Ageing (ACOTA), representative IFA meetings (1978), 203
 - conferences and seminars
 - ‘The Ethics of Social Work Education’ (1986), 361–5
 - ‘The Concept of Social Justice’, IFSW-Asia/ARASWE (1979), 212–20
 - ECAFE/UNICEF Consultancy, Bangkok (1972), 87–111
 - Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture
 - Human Survival and Development: Our Urgent Need for a Reflective Universal Morality* (1984) lecture and responses, 339–58
 - Faithful Angels: Portraits of International Social Work Notables* (Billups), designation, 416–17, 418
 - Hayden, Bill, letter to, 373–4
 - IASSW
 - Advisory Committee on Discrimination in Member Schools, member (1980–81), 233–8
 - Board meeting, Jerusalem (1978), 184–5
 - Congress attendance (1988), 377–9
 - equivalence of qualifications, committee member, 271–3, 278
 - executive board, mistaken re-nomination (1982), 281
 - executive board member (1974–82), 141, 157–8, 252, 281, 290, 293–4
 - Jerusalem Congress, proposal (1978), 147–8
 - Jerusalem Congress, social engagement (1978), 180–3
 - Katherine Kendall Award, chair, selection committee (1996), 393–9
 - presidency (1988–92), nomination, 369–75
 - presidency (1992–94), nomination, 389, 390–1
 - response to Browndale European Foundation ‘joint venture’, 145–6
 - statement of issues and response (1980), 265–7
 - steering committee Congress (1978), 148
 - ICSW
 - Committee on Objectives of International Conferences, member (1973), 77–84
 - Conference, The Hague, program committee member (1972), 73–4
 - ‘Human Well-Being and Human Rights’ (1978), 170–6
 - Pre-Conference Working Party, Chairman (1970), 11–13, 29
 - three year conference cycle, opinion (1975), 146–7
 - IFSW, Conference attendance (1988), 380–1
 - IFSW-Asia/ARASWE regional joint seminar
 - planning committee (1979), 211
 - ‘The Concept of Social Justice’ paper (1979), 212–20
 - International Social Work* (journal)
 - member editorial board (1986–96), 401–2, 410
 - Kendall, Katherine
 - letter of appreciation by RJL, 165
 - tribute to RJL, 419–20
 - publications, reports, statements
 - ‘Human Well-Being and Human Rights’ (1978), 170–6
 - ‘*International Social Work: Reflections on the Journal and its Future*’ (1996), 410–13
 - ‘Teaching Social Policy and Planning’ (IASSW background paper, 1974), 135, 136–41
 - ‘Universal Perspectives on Knowledge and Ethics’ (1986), 407–9
 - ‘What We Can Learn From Biography’, book review of Jones’s Younghusband biography, 402–6
 - Rehabilitation International (RI), Social Commission World Seminar, chairman, 36, 39, 40, 60–1
 - Stein, Herman
 - letter of appreciation, 157
 - tribute, 195
 - SWDCAP
 - advisory committee membership possibility (1978–80), 126
 - advocacy for Centre, 123
 - Experts’ Preparatory Workshop, Manila (1972), member, 117–22
 - travel
 - Ireland (1984), 309–12
 - Oxford (1984), 315–17

Lawrence, Patricia 'Trish' (née Berry) (wife)
 Sir Walter Crocker's letter to, 357
 Lawrence, Ruth (daughter), 284
 Leaper, R. A., 170, 199–200, 201, 295
 Learner, E., 149
 Lewis, H., 272, 321, 325, 358
 Lewis, M., 272
 Liffmann, M., 374
 Lindquist, B., 380
 Lippmann, W., 233, 258
 Little, V., 141, 150, 151, 289
 Lodge, R., 152
 Loewenberg, F., 156, 189–90, 198
 Lorenz, W., 310

M

Maas, H., 190–2
 Macarov, D., 161, 180, 358
 MacIntyre, A., 341, 362, 363
 MacKellar, M., 215
 MacKenzie, N., 287
 Maguire, J., 310
 Malherbe, M., 272, 273
 Mamak, A., 126
 Mapondera, E., 418, 419
 Maramis, J. B. P., 125
 Marcos, F., 28, 125
 Marcos, I., 122, 125
 Martin, N., 301
 Mathieu, M., 150, 152, 157, 159, 164, 190,
 223, 226, 231, 233, 265, 267, 268, 272,
 273, 278, 281, 292, 294, 306, 326
 Matsdorf, H., 180
 Matsdorf, W., 180
 McCall, G., 126
 McDonald, D., 378
 McKendrick, B., 325
 Mehl, L., 169, 181, 201
 Mehta, V., 258, 326, 358, 369, 370, 371, 374,
 389
 Merriam, I., 52
 Mia, A., 118
 Midgley, J., 118, 283
 Millar, S., 194
 Mills, M., 40, 56
 Mishra, R., 380
 Moltzer, M. J. A., 195
 Montan, K., 56
 Motta, E., 301
 Mowbray, M., 242, 390
 Myer, R., 374
 Myers, R., 88, 108

N

Nakamura, N., 118, 170
 Nanavatty, M., 127, 418
 Nann, R., 292, 305, 306, 357
 Neipris, J., 141, 144, 150, 152, 159, 161
 Niemi, V., 69
 Nolan, L., 40, 42
 Nowotny, H., 152–3
 Nusberg, C., 203
 Nyirenda, V., 233, 236, 237, 238
 Nyun, U., 93

O

O'Collins, M., 92fn, 180, 190
 Ohtani, D., 118, 170
 Okada, T., 18
 Otis, J., 356, 407
 Owens, J. K., 73, 77, 83–4
 Ozanne, E., 287, 378, 379

P

Paiva, F., 118, 283
 Palme, L., 380
 Pangalangan, E., 192
 Papaflessa, D., 292
 Park, L., 61
 Parkinson, S., 60
 Parsloe, P., 211, 325, 373–4, 380
 Pathak, S. H., 118
 Pavlin, F., 246
 Peccei, A., 342
 Perez-Olea, M., 201
 Pernell, R., 194
 Picton, C., 205
 Prefontaine, N., 181
 Presber, W., 61
 Pusic, E., 158, 170, 233, 236, 237, 252

R

Race, W., 55, 61
 Rao, M., 285
 Rao, V., 267, 268
 Rashid, R., 88, 89, 90, 118
 Rees, S., 283, 287, 379
 Regniers, J., 39
*Rehabilitation Guidelines for the Future in the
 Medical, Vocational, Educational and Social
 Fields* (Rehabilitation International), 62
 Rehabilitation International 12th World
 Rehabilitation Congress, Sydney (1972),
 35
 seminars, 36, 37, 38–9

- Social Commission World Seminar, 40–7
 ‘Guidelines for the Future in Social Rehabilitation’, 63–9
 ‘Issues in social planning for the physically and mentally disabled’ (Dumpston), 57–8
Rehabilitation in Australia, summary account, 58–9
 speakers, 47–55
 subject matter statement, 43–5
 social program, 60
- Rehabilitation International (RI)
 chairman IR Social Commission, Keith Armstrong, 55–6
 ‘Guidelines for the Future in Social Rehabilitation’, 63–9
 history, 35–6
 mission statement, 36
 secretary-general, Norman Acton, 36–7, 61
- Reid, W., 262
- René Sand Award, 201, 245, 249, 250, 406
- Rennison, A., 27, 132, 133
- Roberts, P., 278
- Rooney, N. K., 255–8
- Rooney, Prof., 252
- Rosamond, Ruth (daughter-in-law), 317
- Rosenberg, M., 288
- Rosenfeld, J., 152, 158, 356, 378, 418
- Rozen, P., 159–60
- S**
- Safilios-Rothschild, C., 55, 56, 62
- Salomon, A., 195
- Sand, R., 5, 195, 260
- Sanders, D., 258, 259, 289
- Saunders, D., 251, 284
- Sax, S., 205
- Schiff, Y., 55
- Schiller, H., 162, 233, 252, 281, 284–5, 288, 292, 294, 306, 326, 369, 370, 374, 375, 393–4
- Schlesinger, B., 357
- School of Social Work, UNSW
 ‘The Assessment of Overseas Social Work Qualifications in Australia’ (report for IASSW) (1982), 273–7
 IASSW membership, 132–3, 134
- Schottland, C., 8, 11, 12, 27, 28, 29, 80, 180, 201
- Scott, D., 180, 182, 201–2, 295–6, 301
- Sharpe, L., 183, 287
- Shawky, A., 233, 236, 237, 258
- Simon, M., 160
- Smith, D., 18
- Smith, N., 287
- social development, change, internationally, 160–1
- social welfare, change, internationally, 160–1
- Social Welfare and Development Centre for Asia and the Pacific (SWDCAP), 115
 goals and objectives, 121–2
 inauguration, 125
 preparatory workshop, 117–22
 UNDP/ESCAP Task Force, 128
- social work education, Asian and Pacific region, seminar (1972), 87–111
- Specht, H., 415
- Splane, R., 18, 132, 141, 147, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 180, 181, 193, 198, 272, 285, 291, 292, 294, 336, 356, 395, 396, 418
- Spratt, Mr, 123
- Stein, H., 132, 143, 144, 145, 146, 149, 152, 157, 158–9, 180, 197, 252, 260, 326, 356, 394, 396, 397, 398–9, 418
- Stout, D., 316
- Sucgang, R. ‘Bert’, 53, 54–5
- T**
- Teram, E., 379
- Theory and Practice of Social Planning* (Kahn), 16
- Thomas, J., 288, 337
- Titmuss, R., 26, 82, 107, 137, 142, 191, 253, 404
- Turner, F., 325, 402, 410, 411
- Turner, J., 167, 168–9
- Tuxen, J., 40, 41, 43, 56
- U**
- Unfaithful Angels: How Social Work Has Abandoned its Mission* (Specht and Courtney), 415
- United Nations (UN), social development, 227
- V**
- Van Royen, Prof., 325
- Vaughan, G., 293, 337
- Vigilante, J., 325
- Viloria, E., 118, 132, 211, 223, 225, 255, 259, 292
- Vowels, R., 241

W

- Waldheim, K., 346, 353
Warms, D., 37
Watson, D., 380
Wentworth, W. C. 'Bill', 57
Westergaard, K., 301
Wetzel, J., 378
Wichit, S., 118
Williams, B., 317
Wilson, I., 205
Woodsworth, D., 393, 395
World Guide to Social Work Education
(IASSW), 266, 267–8, 321
Worswick, D., 316
Wright, B., 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 108
Wright, S., 317
Wryell, M., 40, 42, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 56, 123

Y

- Yasas, F., 53–4, 87, 88–9, 109, 128
Yates, I., 127, 200
Yelaja, S., 378
Young, P., 278
Younghusband, E., 143, 180, 187, 196, 197,
253, 260, 288, 289, 291, 306, 337, 338–9,
357, 420
biography (book review), 402–6
Younghusband Memorial Lecture. *see* Eileen
Younghusband Memorial Lecture

Z

- Zieff, M., 181, 182, 183
Zubrzycki, G., 215

In pursuit of social good, the author worked with international social welfare and social work bodies – additional to the periods of living and working overseas covered in the previous volume. Chairing the Preconference Working Party in Manila in 1970 for the international social welfare body proved to be a catalyst for this international work. The present volume provides an account of his subsequent work with the International Council on Social Welfare and the International Association of Schools of Social Work, the global social welfare and social work education bodies, and with more specialised bodies like Rehabilitation International, ECAFE/UNICEF, the Social Welfare Development Centre for Asia and the Pacific, and the International Federation on the Ageing. A career highlight was the first Eileen Younghusband Memorial Lecture in 1984, arguing an urgent need for a reflective universal morality.



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.