AUSTRALASIAN POLITICAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Canberra, August, 1981

PUBLIC POLICY AND THE NON-GOVERNMENT WELFARE SECTOR

Adam Graycar and Ian Yates

Social Welfare Research Centre
University of New South Wales

INTRODUCTION

From the earliest days in colonial Australia "charitable organisations" have
been part of the social welfare system. Also from the earliest days these
organisations have depended, in varying degrees, on public funds. The many tens
of thousands of organisations today perform a wide variety of functions. Some
provide services to individuals; some provide material aid; some are involved
in social action; some support the state and provide their wares as a supplement;
others see themselves as opponents of the mainline functions of state welfare
and see themselves as an alternative to the state; some try to fit in between
and act as pressure groups in an attempt to have the state provide, or provide
resources, for something more/better/different.

It seems mandatory for authors of Government Inquiries and other commentators on
social welfare to open with a statement that very little is known about the non-
government welfare sector; that nobody knows how many organisations there are;
that nobody knows what they all do; that nobody knows what sorts of resources they
have; that nobody knows their accountability patterns; that nobody knows how well
they do what they do.

The Commonwealth Task Force on Co-ordination in Welfare and Health (Bailey Report,
Vol.2, p.32) estimated that there were between 15,000 and 60,000 organisations and
agencies in Australia active in welfare/health/community development. A study
presently under way involving ourselves and the Australian Council of Social Service
has tried to refine this estimate. For the purposes of this paper an estimate of
37,000 organisations will suffice. (There are between 20,000 and 30,000 agencies
in the more populous local government areas which cover 83% of the population, and
between 5,000 and 18,000 in the less populous L.G.A.s which cover 17% of the
population - a methodological paper is being prepared and this explains sampling
procedure and methods of estimation. The estimations were done on both a point
estimate and an interval estimate basis. The point estimate for the more populous
stratum is 25,266 agencies, a figure about which we are reasonably confident. The
point estimate for the less populous stratum is 11,701 a figure about which we are
less confident. If anything, the estimate of 37,000 may underestimate the total.
For the same reasons that an exact number of organisations cannot be stated,
estimates of resources similarly cover a wide range. Reasonable working estimates
are as follows:

The 37,000 organisations have in excess of 100,000 employees plus many tens of
thousands of voluntary workers. Annually they receive around $900 million. In

addition there are extensive non-cash resources, mainly goods, personnel and property. Of the cash resources, $585 million (65%) comes directly from government. $240 million (27%) comes from donations, bequests, enterprises, endowments. $75 million (8%) comes from fees and charges. Of the $585 million from government, approximately $410 million comes from the Commonwealth and $175 million from State Governments (roughly seventy per cent to thirty per cent).

It must be stressed that these figures indicate the order of magnitude, rather than aim at accuracy and precision. One reason for so large a range is the problem of definition - there is no unambiguous concept of a non-government welfare organisation. But whatever is included or excluded we are dealing with a phenomenon which is significant from a public policy perspective. Substantial public resources are widely distributed. The process is subject to interest group activity. The welfare system is a scrambled collection of services and activities which defies simple categorization into public and private. Nevertheless a number of analytical questions arise.

1. What is the boundary between statutory and non-statutory?

2. Why is the non-statutory sector so large?
   a) does it perform tasks which properly should be
      performed by government;
   b) whose responsibility is social care

3. Is service through the non-staturory sector
   - cheaper
   - better
   - more humane ?

4. How does the non-statutory sector relate to the modern
   welfare state
   - are non-statutory agencies doing the state's task
   - are they agents of the state
   - are they innovators
   - are they "outside the state" or part of the state?

5. Is the non-statutory sector treated/regarded differently
   by different political parties?

6. Is welfare pluralism the most appropriate way forward in
   our socio-economic and political system?

7. Is the existence of a large and growing number of non-government
   welfare organisations evidence of the privatization of social
   care?

8. Is the existence of a large number of NGWOs evidence of
   the privatization of social welfare policy?

9. Are non-government welfare organisations pawns in State/Federal
   relations?

These are some of the sorts of issues towards which we are directing our present
work. However this paper does not touch at all on various matters to which we
are also directing attention and which are important to a full appreciation of the
role and operation of non-government welfare organisations. These matters include
accountability issues, co-ordination, evaluation, legal issues, identification and
discussion of types of NGWOs, and the role of NGWOs as interest groups. All of
these areas will be taken up in the forthcoming paper Non-Government Welfare and the
State.

DESCRIPTIVE OVERVIEW

Several terms are frequently used to describe the phenomenon under consideration.
The most common usage is "voluntary organisation", with these organisations or
agencies comprising the "voluntary sector". While many such organisations have
considerable voluntary support, many also have paid and professional staff without
which they would not be able to perform their activities. The term "non-statutory
organisations" better describes the phenomenon, yet it is not strictly accurate
as many have statutes which govern their activities and many more receive funds
as a result of statutes. The term "non-government organisation" is preferred in
this paper. Even though many of the organisations in question perform functions
consistent with government objectives and receive funding from government, their
staffs are not government employees; the organisations are not accountable in
general practice to a Minister who in turn is accountable to Parliament for their
activities and performance. Throughout this paper the abbreviation NGWO will be
used for non-government welfare organisation.

It is often assumed that NGWOs comprise a non-government welfare sector. It would
be trite to work on the basis that the 37,000 NGWOs in Australia have sufficient in
common to form a sector. What they do have in common is that they are non-
government organisations with some commitment to improving the quality of life of
their clientele. Some have a limited and self selected clientele, some have a
wide ranging target; some provide services, some pressure other organisations to
provide services; while some charge fees for their services, others do not; some
see themselves as activists for social change, some see themselves as protecting
and enhancing the status quo; some have long traditions and endure the fluctuations
in social, economic and political conditions, others are extremely vulnerable to
change and their potential lifespan is limited; some are complex organisations
with highly structured bureaucracies, others consist of a handful of enthusiastic
activists/helpers; some are potent political forces consisting of people who are
politically well connected and who can influence the allocation of public funds,
others have no political muscle; some provide services to clients who fall through
the statutory net or to clients for whom government can receive no credit, others
provide services to the same clientele that government serves, others provide no
services; some act as agents for government; some are dreadfully paternalistic
to their clientele, others are warm and humane; some receive government funding
under one or more of the dozen funding mechanisms listed below, others receive no
funding at all.

It is difficult therefore to visualise a <u>sector</u>. Not only is there great
variety and diversity among NGWOs, there is, within some of the larger NGWOs
a mixture of most of the above. Large organisations like the Salvation Army,
the City Missions, the Brotherhood of St Laurence, the Red Cross, the St. Vincent
de Paul contain, within the one organisation a diversity of functions and services,
e.g. traditional residential services, social action activities, self help groups,
some parts act as an agent of government, others are involved in experimentation
and innovation. This mix suggests that the cohesion attributed to the sector
seldom resides even in the large organisations.

The sociological and anthropological literature abounds with definitions of
"voluntary associations". They focus on the voluntary or non-coercive nature of
membership and much of the analysis stresses members' integration into the
community by virtue of membership of the association. The emphasis on belonging
rather than on purpose and performance or outcome is not one which this paper will
examine.

The social work literature provides more of a service and performance perspective,
and elements stressed are voluntarism, independence of funds, limitations on
accountability and responsibility and separation of NGWOs and government.
These elements refer to an idealised view of the NGWOs. In reality the separation
between organisations and government is not so clear cut. Almost two thirds of
NGWO funding comes from government. While, strictly speaking NGWOs have no legal
responsibility to maintain services one could argue that the same applies to many
government services and functions. Finally it is not true to say that NGWOs are
neither responsible nor accountable to government. Funds are often provided with
strings attached, and continue only to the extent that certain conditions are met.
Many commentators wish to stress a sharp public/private dichotomy, but this is not
the story in reality.

While many service organisations receive government funds most social action agencies
do not. Or to put it another way, large organisations <u>may</u> receive government funds
for their service activities, but not for their "activism". This immediately
highlights an important distinction between two types of NGWOs. There are those
which are either part of or act as extensions of state apparatuses and there are those
which primarily seek to operate either outside or in opposition to state purposes
and control. Generally there are differences in membership structure, style,
objectives etc. A wide range of activities fits on the organisational spectrum,
a range too diverse to be covered here.

For the purposes of this paper we will confine our attention to non-government,
non-profit, formal organisations concerned with the provision of social care
and/or the development of social policy. There are organisations concerned with a
wide range of recreational activities and cultural and arts activities, and these
will not be considered. Our definition derives in part from the Wolfenden Committee
which inquired between 1974 and 1977 into the future of voluntary organisations in
the U.K.

The Wolfenden Committee identified four systems of meeting social need (1979 pp.22-2?
First there is the informal system, i.e. help and support provided by family,
friends and neighbours. This is by far the most substantial care network in our
society. Second there is the commercial system where the market, either diluted or
undiluted allocates care and determines a price to be paid. This is most common
in the health system and in child care. Third is the statutory, in Australia
identified in the service networks of the state governments. Fourth, and to some
extent by elimination, is the non-government "voluntary sector", those organisations
which are none of the above three, yet intimately involved in social care.

The social welfare system is about the allocation of three types of "benefits" -
cash, services and power. Cash is allocated primarily through the income security
mechanisms of government, but NGWOs play an important emergency relief role.
Services are provided in a mixed bag by both NGWOs and government, with the balance
tilted somewhat towards NGWOs. Increasing power, or self- determination of the
welfare clientele is rarely part of government's welfare agenda, but when it is,
it is through supportive experimental work in NGWOs that government plays its part.

More commonly this is part of NGWO activity on its own. NGWOs therefore are
concerned with the provision of material aid; services relating to personal help;
services which aim to limit deviance or play a social control function, or those
which attempt to prevent problems, decrease social isolation and alienation. Some
NGWOs aim to be involved in social action. The ways in which these activities are
performed varies with the way NGWOs see themselves.

Kramer has developed two classifications of NGWOs. In 1973 he saw four character-
istic roles - vanguard; improver; guardian of values; supplementer. Six years
later (Kramer 1979a) his further empirical work led him to suggest a more
appropriate role breakdown was specialist; advocate; consumerist; and service
provider or agent. In the latter classification many agencies try to perform all
four roles simultaneously.

First the traditional view was that NGWOs who wished, could play an innovative, experimental role because they have the flexibility in their structures and are qualified to pioneer, innovate, experiment, and develop demonstration projects which might later be picked up as models for the statutory sector. The evidence that Kramer cites is that this role is rarely played, though the rhetoric lives on. Very few services pioneered by NGWOs have become standard government operations. Instead, many services and agencies have become particularly specialized and expert in their delivery, so that it is more appropriate to call the role one of specialization than it is innovator or vanguard.

Second there was the improver role : NGWOs may serve as critic, watchdog, thorn in the side, in an attempt to bring pressure to bear on government to improve or extend services or service concepts; to some extent they may be valuable in defending government services against anti-government and anti-spending sentiments. Extending this role, Kramer argues that advocacy is a necessary part of the improver role. This was reflected particularly in those agencies dependent on government for funds not being hesitant to play an advocacy role. Agencies are heavily involved in monitoring, criticizing and prodding government and use ad hoc coalitions, citizens' committees, media outlets and a wide range of lobbying and political tactics.

Third there was the "guardian of values" role, which focused mostly on preserving voluntarism as a desirable objective. Evidence has shown that voluntarism in NGWOs is confined mostly to fund raising events and public campaigns and only rarely to person-to-person service provision. Interestingly it was the largest, most bureaucratized professionalized agencies that Kramer found to be the most extensive users of volunteers. In retrospect, Kramer argues (1979a, p.405-6) that consumerism, rather than voluntarism, evident in self-help and mutual aid are perhaps the most distinctive feature of modern NGWOs.

Fourth the supplementer role, whereby NGWOs fill the gaps left by other care systems, where their activities are often crisis oriented and hopefully transitory, has given way to a service provider role, where basically NGWOs act more like agents of government. NGWOs perform on a contract or agent basis, and for a fee (from government - to cover costs) carry out service functions that government may be unwilling or unable to perform. An NGWO may be used by government as a primary service provider, a preferred provider, an alternative to or a substitute for government service.

All of this raises ideological questions about the relationship between public and private provision; between private and public identification of issues and problems;

between private and public contributions to the development of coherent social policy. Ideological debates about whether NGWOs are "outside the state" or an integral part of the state will be examined below as will discussion about the extent to which NGWOs see themselves as extending activities and functions of the state; replacing the state in the provision of welfare; providing alternatives to state welfare services; acting as pressure groups on the state.

These arguments operate within the range of conservative and radical critiques. In simplistic terms radicals often argue that NGWOs conceal need, help perform and mask the state's repressive role, exploit members and clients - in short prop up an unsavoury welfare system which does as little as possible to remedy causes of need and poverty. Conservatives, on the other hand have usually been more enamoured of NGWOs because they believe they can reduce government expenditure, especially by relying heavily on volunteers. A strong set of NGWOs is consistent with their belief that government should <u>govern</u>, and not <u>do</u>, and hence there is hope for reprivatization. Furthermore they argue that NGWOs provide diversity of choice in services and flexibility in operation, unlike statutory monoliths.

In order to better describe and understand NGWOs in Australia and help discuss some of the analytical points raised above an extensive and detailed questionnaire has been sent to more than 1800 NGWOs. A classification system based on the United Way of America Service Information System (U.W.A.S.I.S. II) has been used and Table 1 gives the eight general classifications under which Australian NGWOs operate. The number of organisations listed in the table are those in 92 Local Government Areas sampled in an initial survey. Of the NGWOs almost half come under "family and personal well being and development" and almost one quarter under "community organisation, action and development". Preliminary analyses of funding show that the largest government expenditures go to organisations caring for aged and/or disabled persons. It is more likely that this is so because care in these fields is expensive (usually institutional) than because of a stronger commitment to aged and disabled persons (although there is no real legitimacy crisis in these areas compared, for example, with refuges or welfare rights).

The structure of non-government organisations reflects Australia's federal structure. There are very few national NGWOs, the Bailey Report (Vol.2, pp.300-3) identified 104 national organisations in 9 different categories :

General Purpose 17, Specific Disability Groups 24, Health 10, Housing 1, Aboriginals 1, Youth and Community Development 8, Veterans 3, Ethnic Organisations 31, Children and the Family 9.

(a full listing is reproduced on pages 10 and 11).

Table No. 1   PRELIMINARY CLASSIFICATION OF ORGANISATIONS IDENTIFIED IN 92 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

		No. of Organisations	
1. EMPLOYMENT & INCOME SECURITY			
1.	cash grants, loans, pensions	75	
2.	employment/unemployment	59	
3.	sheltered workshops	23	(3.1%)
4.	other	−	157
2. HEALTH − physical & mental			
1.	information, education, counselling	65	
2.	family planning	41	
3.	nursing homes	71	
4.	drug and alcohol dependence	79	
5.	rehabilitation disabled − physical	202	
6.	rehabilitation disabled − mental	77	(11.5%)
7.	other	46	581
3. BASIC MATERIAL NEEDS			
1.	general (food, clothing, furn. etc.)	30	
2.	housing, accommodation, refuges, hostels − homeless	8	
3.	" " " − aged	100	
4.	" " " − youth	19	
5.	" " " − other	87	
6.	transport	−	
7.	other	1	
8.	housing, accomdn., refuges − women	23	(5.4%)
9.	housing, accomdn., refuges − Aborigines	3	271
4. EDUCATION			
1.	preschools & Kindergartens	258	
2.	toy libraries	12	
3.	adult education	13	
4.	disabled	29	(6.6%)
5.	other	21	333
5. ENVIRONMENT			(0.9%)
1.	protection, conservation etc	43	43
6. JUSTICE. PROTECTION. SAFETY			
1.	legal aid	16	
2.	civil rights, justice, anti discrimn.	3	
3.	child protection	11	

		No. of Organisations	
4.	child protection	1	
5.	consumer protection	8	(0.9%)
6.	other	4	43
7. FAMILY & PERSONAL WELLBEING & DEVELOPMENT			
1.	general (multifunctional organisations)	316	
2.	counselling & support	109	
3.	single parent fam. suppt. & widows	151	
4.	domiciliary (home help, fam.aide etc)	119	
5.	day care − children	145	
6.	day care − aged	6	
7.	day care − disabled	2	
8.	family subst. services (adoption, f'care childrens homes & emerg. accommodation)	59	
9.	social & cultural development − children (eg. playgroups)	214	
10.	" " " − youth (eg. Scouts)	406	
11.	" " " − aged (eg. Senior Citizens)	172	
12.	" " " − ethnic groups	217	
13.	Services organisations (RSL etc.)	93	
14.	other	74	
15.	social & cultural − women	154	(46.6%)
16.	churches	102	2339
8. COMMUNITY ORGANISATION, ACTION & DEVELOPMENT			
1.	information, CABs, c'mmty resource centre	161	
2.	community education	4	
3.	advocacy	5	
4.	organisation for social & pol. action	208	
5.	fundraising	559	
6.	volunteer services (1st aid etc.)	98	
7.	research	3	
8.	coordination and/or planning	66	
9.	other	25	
10.	Aborigines − coopves, land rts, centres	8	(22.9%)
11.	Trusts	11	1148
9. OTHER			(2.1%)
1.	Main function unknown	106	106
	TOTAL	5021	5021

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

A. General Purpose

1. Australian Council of Social Service
2. Australian Council on the Ageing
3. Australian Association of Social Workers
4. Society of St Vincent de Paul
5. Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission
6. Uniting Church in Australia - Social Welfare Commission
7. Church of England in Australia
8. Australian Frontier Inc.
9. Australian Psychological Society
10. Australian Social Welfare Union
11. Dr Barnardo's in Australia
12. International Social Service (Australia)
13. Legacy Co-ordinating Council
14. Smith Family
15. Salvation Army
16. National Lifeline
17. Australian Pensioners' Federation

B. Specific Disability Groups

18. Australian Council on Rehabilitation of Disabled
19. Australian Association for the Mentally Retarded
20. Australian Association for Better Hearing
21. Australian Association for Rudolph Steiner Curative Education
22. Australian Cerebral Palsy Association
23. Australian Federation of Adult Deaf Societies
24. Australian Federation of Spdld Associations
25. Australian Orthopaedic Foundation
26. Australian Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association
27. Australian Society for Multiply Handicapped Children Inc.
28. National Association for Training the Disabled in Office Work
29. National Multiple Sclerosis Society of Australia
30. Wheelchair and Disabled Association of Australia
31. Australian Association of Welfare Workers to the Deaf
32. Australian Guild of Business and Professional Blind
33. Australian National Council for the Blind
34. Royal Guide Dogs for the Blind Association of Australia
35. Australian Federation of Blind Citizens
36. Diabetes Federation of Australia
37. National Heart Foundation
38. Australian Cancer Council
39. Australian Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation
40. Australian Kidney Foundation
41. Australian Foundation on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence

C. Health

42. Australian Medical Association
43. Australian Dental Association
44. Australian Hospitals Association
45. Red Cross
46. Australian Council of Community Nursing
47. Royal Australian Nursing Federation
48. Australian Affiliation of Voluntary Care Associations
49. National Standing Committee on Nursing Homes
50. National Standing Committee on Private Hospitals
51. Voluntary Health Insurance Association of Australia

D. Housing

52. Shelter

E.   Youth and Community Development

53.   National Youth Council of Australia
54.   Federation of Australian Sport
55.   Australian Council of Rural Youth
56.   Australian Association of Youth Clubs
57.   Confederation of Australian Youth Organisations
58.   YMCA
59.   YWCA
60.   Association of Apex Clubs

F.   Veterans

61.   Returned Services' League of Australia
62.   Australian Services Council
63.   War Widows Guild of Australia

G.   Ethnic Organisations

64.   Good Neighbour Movement of Australia
65.   Baltic Council of Australia
66.   Federal Council of Byelorussians
67.   Central Council of Croatian Associations in Australia
68.   National Federation of Cyprian Communities and
      Brotherhoods of Australia
69.   Council of Estonian Societies of Australia
70.   Australasian Federation of Finnish Societies and
      Clubs
71.   Die Brucke (Association of German Clubs)
72.   Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Aust. and N.Z.
73.   Pan-Macedonian Union of Australia
74.   Federal Council of Hungarian Associations in Australia
75.   Australian Federation of Islamic Societies
76.   Italian Catholic Federation
77.   Assemblies of God in Australia, Italian Fellowship
      of Churches
78.   Latvian Federation of Australia and New Zealand
79.   Regional Council of Lebanese Associations in
      Australia and New Zealand
80.   Federal Council of Lithuanian Organisations
81.   Lithuanian Catholic Federal Committee
82.   Australian Federation of Netherlands Organisations
83.   Federal Council of Polish Associations in Australia
84.   Polish Ex-Servicemen's Association in Australia
85.   Russian Orthodox Church (Abroad) - Australian and
      New Zealand Diocese
86.   Serbian National Defence Council of Australia
87.   The Free Serbian Orthodox Church Diocese for
      Australia and New Zealand
88.   Serbian Orthodox Church, Diocese for Australia and
      New Zealand
89.   Federation of Slovenian Associations in Australia
90.   Federated Council of Ukrainian Organisations
      in Australia
91.   Plast Ukrainian Youth Association in Australia
92.   Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church
93.   Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Autocephalic) of Australia
94.   Captive Nations Forum

H.   Children and the Family

95.   National Marriage Guidance Council
96.   Australian Association of Early Childhood Education
97.   Australian Pre-School Association
98.   Child and Family Welfare Council of Australia
99.   Australian Federation of Family Planning
      Associations
100. Parents Without Partners
101. Lone Parents Federation
102. Council for the Single Mother and her Child
103. Association for the Welfare of Children in Hospital

I.   Aboriginals

104. Federal Council for the Advancement of Aboriginals
      and Torres Strait Islanders

It is of interest to note the types of interests represented nationally.
For example there are three national organisations for veterans, four for blind
people but only one for aboriginal groups and one for housing groups. Of the
104 national organisations, seven only, received grants-in-aid from the
Commonwealth government. Others (approx. 20) received project funds and funds
under certain service legislation.

Although the Commonwealth provides somewhere in the order of $410 million to
NGWOs its entry into non-government welfare is comparatively recent. Its first
moves were in 1954 when the Aged Persons Homes Act came into existence and
subsidies were provided to NGWOs to help meet the cost of accommodation for elderly
persons. During the Menzies years there was a gradual move into other services e.g.
home nursing (1956), marriage guidance (1960), sheltered workshops and facilities
for people with disabilities (1963). It was during the McMahon and Whitlam years
that funding of NGWOs took off.

Many of the services and funding arrangements during the Whitlam years were attempts
to bypass the States and consequently much of the funding took place without
specific constitutional power. This culminated, in 1975, in the Australian
Assistance Plan Case in which the High Court ruled that provision of funds under
Section 81 of the Constitution was acceptable. NGWOs then are legal recipients
(Section 81 provides that funds may be appropriated "for the purposes of the
Commonwealth"). The rate of growth of funds to NGWOs and in programs developed by
NGWOs has slowed down considerably since the Fraser government came to power in
1975 despite the strong support expressed by the government for NGWOs.

Funding and autonomy

Non-government welfare agencies receive funding from a variety of sources. The
largest proportion in Australia comes from government. A listing of 14 different
types of government funding arrangements in Australia follows.

With such a high percentage of income (approx. 65%) coming from government it would
be natural to assume that autonomy of the agency would be severely constrained.
In his four country studies Kramer (1979b) found this not to be the case for a
variety of reasons. First, as the most common type of transfer was payment or
reimbursement for a service to an individual for whom there was a public responsi-
bility, the nature of the task was clear cut and it was essentially a business
transaction. In many cases the agencies had developed so that they had a virtual
monopoly of certain resources required by government and this helped maintain

autonomy. This together with the political power of agencies, mostly by way of influence, and their capacity to bring political pressure when necessary, comprises a second set of reasons that ensure autonomy.

Third Kramer found that while many agencies received a large proportion of funds from government, they were rarely totally funded, and as such could legitimately argue that multiple and diverse sources of funding would preclude surrendering contrc of their programs to a single sponsor. Fourth, Kramer suggested, government generally demanded a very low level of accountability, and nobody seemed keen to upse the balance. He quotes one government official as saying "if we knew more, we'd have to pay more" (1979b, p.10)

The Australian experience seems to be that funding is on a "take it or leave it" basis. One large multi-purpose agency with multiple (government) sources of funding reported that once a grant is given there is a requirement that accounting and auditing procedures be adhered to and statistical information be provided, but that none of the funding bodies required day-to-day overseeing of what the agency is doinc

Horsburgh (1980, p.26-29) has identified fourteen systems of funding which go to NGWOs in Australia. Some agencies receive funds under a variety of the methods listed. Some receive no government funding at all. Horsburgh's list is as follows.

1. Indirect subsidy e.g. remission of certain charges, rates, stamp duties, sales taxes as well as income tax relief to donors.

2. Token subsidy e.g. a small token in recognition of the agencies work.

3. Deficit financing e.g. payment by government of a deficit incurred by an agency providing an approved service in an approved manner.

4. General grant e.g. an amount to assist substantially with the running or service delivery of an agency - no strings are attached and the grant is usually more than a token effort.

5. Matched grant e.g. a grant paid in relation to other income derived by the agency.

6. Capital grant e.g. for purposes of building or equipment.

7. Matched capital grant - a combination of 5 & 6.

8. Per capita payment e.g. payment made on the basis of
   number of clients served or beds filled etc.

9. Purchase of service e.g. funding an agency to provide a
   service that government does not or will not provide such
   as marriage guidance counselling or family planning.

10. Staff employment subsidy e.g. providing funds to employ
    personnel that the agency would not otherwise employ,
    or perhaps contribute to the salary of that person.

11. Staff development subsidy e.g. payments to assist
    funding to attend courses or other forms of staff development.

12. Project subsidy e.g. a payment for part or all of a project,
    which may be a large or small part of the agencies activities.

13. Emergency subsidy e.g. a payment to help an agency through a
    crisis.

14. Total funding e.g. something usually available to QANGOs
    and rarely, on a long term basis, to NGWOs.

Some of these are general payments (the first 5),and the remainder are specific.
The pattern in Australia seems to be a preference for specific funding. At this
point in time data is not available about the relative amounts or proportions
falling under each of these headings.

(Examples of each type are given in the larger paper).

The Commonwealth government, through the Department of Social Security provides
funding in a variety of ways, under a number of Acts to a wide range of
organisations. Under the Aged or Disabled Persons Homes Act, funds are paid to
organisations as matched capital grants. Under the Handicapped Persons Assistance
Act payments are made for the purchase services, for capital grants and for staff
employment subsidy. Under the Children's Services Program, funds are paid as
capital grants, salaries, and purchase of service. Under the Homeless Persons
Assistance Act, capital, grants, salary subsidy, purchase of service and project
subsidy funds are paid. Under the Delivered Meals Subsidy Act organisations
receive funds for the purchase of service on a per capita basis with payment of
a set amount (40 cents) per meal delivered. The Personal Care Subsidy under the
Aged or Disabled Persons Homes Act is a per capita payment to organisations.
The Aged Persons Hostels Act provides for a matched capital grant.

The Department also makes a number of general grants, not under any Act, but rather out of general appropriations. National co-ordinating bodies, namely the Australian Council of Social Service, (ACOSS), the Australian Council for Rehabilitation of the Disabled (ACROD), and the Australian Council on the Ageing (ACOTA) each receive a general grant in the order of $160,000 p.a. (Some would say this is better classified as a token grant). ACOSS has also received emergency subsidy from the Department. The Australian Council of Trade Unions receives a project subsidy of $20,000 p.a. to run its welfare research unit.

Other Commonwealth Departments fund a variety of services with mixes of funding arrangements. Under the Family Law Act, the Attorney General's Department purchases a service through its funding of marriage counselling organisations as does the Department of Health through its funding of family planning organisations (not under any specific legislation). Under the Nursing Homes Assistance Act the Department of Health meets approved operating deficits. The Health Department purchases a service under the Home Nursing Subsidy Act, but in funding Women's Refuges it works on a mixture of project and capital funding. The Health Department funds the Royal Flying Doctor Service with a matched capital grant as well as a project subsidy The latter is the basis for funding the Red Cross to provide the Blood Transfusion Service. (The Commonwealth contributes approximately 30%-35% of operating costs and on a dollar for dollar basis with the States, provides a capital grant).

From these very general examples it can be seen that a great variety of funding patterns exists. No attempt was made to provide examples of all types, or a comprehensive listing. The many patterns raise many questions about objectives, purposes, and operational matters. No attempt has been made to deal with State Government funding. This will be done in a subsequent research paper.

In addition to government funding, agencies receive funds through a variety of philanthropic means, appeals, telethons, button days etc. While some theorists who have studied social exchange argue that a norm of reciprocity always exists and that exchanges are always bilateral, others argue that philanthropy, by its very definition is always a unilateral gift. Philanthropy, according to Frank Dickinson (quoted in Terrell, 1981, p.397) is "giving money or its equivalent away to persons and institutions without a definite or immediate quid pro quo for purposes traditionally considered philanthropic". Of course, tax deductability which accompanies gifts benefits the donor, but this could not be said to affect the unilateral nature of the transfer.

Although Kramer argues that government funding does not affect, in an adverse manner, the autonomy of the agency, it can be argued that funding in the programs listed above is not simply a collection of free gifts as one would find in a philanthropic situation, but rather a set of outlays designed to serve public purposes. When a grant is given by government there is usually some stipulation in respect of the nature of the service to be provided, and some conditions attaching to the funds. In many cases government has found itself in a position in which it supports a particular type of service and finds itself politically unable to not support the service. At the same time, by funding an agency for the service it can avoid costly infrastructure outlays.

On the other hand there is some evidence to suggest that executive initiative has developed visions of services needed in a community, and compliant agencies are funded to put the vision into reality. Testing of these thoughts is a matter for subsequent empirical study, together with testing the propositions that government funding of NGWOs is a cost-effective, means of service provision that it is ideologically consistent with government's outlook.

PUBLIC POLICY AND NGWOs

What passes as "policy" takes place at many levels of abstraction. At one
level policy refers to some basic goal, a set of broad principles based on
ideology. At another level policy is more like a course of action, the
operational and/or expedient part of a program. At a third level policy may
be seen as some activity within a program. A reasonable working definition
might be that a policy is "a course of action or intended action conceived
or deliberately adopted, after a review of possible alternatives, and pursued
or intended to be pursued". (Tropman 1976 p.xiii). The range of activities
of NGWOs and the extent of public funding would tend to indicate that NGWOs
fit into some vision of public policy. After all, many services, one would
assume, would have to be provided by government if NGWOs did not perform
them, and consequently public funding, often underscored by legislation, is
allocated to private organisations which provide a service which is not subject
to conditions of the market.

Of course there is argument about whether any service is necessary and whether
there is an obligation on government to provide it. It would be prohibitively
expensive for government to develop the infrastructure for it to undertake
activities for which it now funds NGWOs. Second, NGWOs are assumed to have
greater flexibility in providing services, so if government is concerned to
ensure the best delivery to the population, NGWOs may be an appropriate avenue.
Third, it may be politically expedient for government to utilize NGWOs. Govern-
ment can distinguish itself as provider and the NGWO as receiver, as well as
deliverer. It can both accept the appreciation of the public when the services
are popular and also distance itself a little when they are more controversial,
pointing nevertheless to the obvious existence of community support/need
evidenced by the fact that its grant only meets part of the costs. (an example
is women's shelters) Government will be more popular for supporting an NGWO,
usually, than for extending the bureacracy. Furthermore, as many NGWOs have
strong community supports it may be difficult to bypass them without electoral
damage.

This may not add up to coherent public policy, but it establishes the base for
analysis and establishes the possibility of joint endeavours to achieve mutually
agreed upon goals and objectives. However, it would be a false impression if
one were to assume that government does everything possible to facilitate the
work of NGWOs, especially those working in conjunction with government. The
day-to-day reality is more fragmented, haphazard and characterised by struggles

on both sides. Within government this often has to do with (i) normal
problems of operating a bureacracy which as an organisational form is more
suited to limitation than achievement (ii) the low priority and restrictions
(especially financial) on welfare in general - not just on NGWOs.

To what extent are government and NGWOs partners in the formulation of coherent
policy? why do governments fund NGWOs? what is expected in return? who wins
and who loses? Within what sort of legal and political context does this
activity operate? Conventional wisdom would assume that priorities in resource
allocation identify a government's values and indicate its style and strategy
in social policy. The funding process and resultant performances do not usually
bear this out.

To the extent that public policy is a coherent, intentional activity, government
will provide funds to NGWOs in order to (i) purchase certain services or
activities from the NGWO as supplier or (ii) to promote the existence, extension
or improvement of certain services or activities which NGWOs are currently
carrying out, or can do so in the immediate future.

Government may see NGWOs as either primary; preferred; alternative (supplementary);
or substitute service providers. (Kramer 1979 a). While it is possible to
describe each of these manifestations, it is not now possible to explore reasons
for government holding one, rather than another of these views.

Distinctions are sometimes fuzzy. For example in the aged persons housing field,
NGWOs (with government funds) are the primary service providers. In some areas
where government may be able to undertake activities NGWOs are preferred, such
as in emergency relief or NGWOs in family planning. In other cases government
may fund NGWOs to provide alternative services to those already provided by
government, especially when organizations are working in ethnic communities,
or where there are religious or cultural issues at state. At times government
funds NGWOs to provide a substitute service for one which government would
otherwise be expected to provide, for example residential care alternatives for
delinquent youngsters or the Red Cross Blood transfusion service.

While NGWOs provide welfare services with government assistance it is of interest
to try to track where the policy initiative originated. Initiatives comes
sometimes from government departments, sometimes from political parties, ministers,
backbenchers, from one or more NGWOs, or from recommendations of inquiries, expert
advisers, etc. It is not always clear whether the Government of the day has
accepted a recommendation, or pressure, to ensure that a particular service is

provided within the community - and may then choose to use NGWOs as a sole or primary or an alternative avenue of implementation; or whether Government adopted the two decisions (service and NGWO provision) as one. Examples of the latter could include funding of the Royal Flying Doctor Services and the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service.

In the 1950's and 1960's government tended to establish programs for funding the provision of certain services (e.g. accommodation for the aged), establish certain basic standards, consistent with ensuring funded services were as intended, and then leave the actual provision fairly open to developments "in the community" - principally by the activity of religious bodies, and of charitable and benevolent bodies.

Although this principle seemed to continue into the 1970's in the areas in which it was established, there was increasing attention to the question of whether Government objectives were being met by the legislation and its manner of implementation. In other areas the 1970's, especially the last few years, has seen much more purposive Government action directed to provision of funds to "purchase" or "promote" specific types of services in the community. Examples of this would include CALFRIC*, CYSS groups, children's care (State Government) and certain programs under the Children's Services Program.

This shift could be characterised, perhaps too simply, as a change from a "you hatch it, we'll match it" attitude to greater use of a "take it or leave it" approach. The real situation is more complex than this, in many ways. However, it is clear that at both Commonwealth and several State levels (e.g. NSW, Victoria and SA at least) a much more purposive role has been played by Government in its funding of NGWOs.

But what of the role of NGWOs in this service provision role? Are they giving leadership to publicize policy, pioneering new modes of service or services in new areas? Are they developing new, more humane and empowering relationships between clients and providers and between clients and 'society'?) These are issues which have not received close and detailed attention in Australia. Much is said about pioneering, about more efficient and better value-for-money, about the provisions of choice, promotion and encouragement of self-help, and mobilisation of volunteered community resources. However, we need to examine these oft-repeated sayings and explore their likely veracity, why they are said, whose interests are/are not served by the current distribution of services, etc.

---

* Committee for the Allocation of Loan Funds to Refugees from Indo-China.

A role of caution is required about seeking a totally coherent and consistent explanation of the role played by NGWOs in public policy. While there may indeed be such within an overall framework looking at the role of welfare services within the modern state and society (see next section), at the operational level we have to take into account a variety of factors such as political opportunism, pragmatism, levels of skills and competence, and organisational capacities. These are, of course, important variables to take into account but in practical terms they often "muddy the waters" of explanatory theory focussed primarily on questions of purpose and interests.

We need to be clear that what is at issue is whether NGWOs are more 'innovative' or 'pioneering' than government, and if so in what ways, and why? Precisely what is meant by an 'innovation' is also not always clear as in earlier discussion. It would seem that we should be looking for developments that are new to the field, and that tend to result in adoption of similar activity by either or both government and other NGWOs. It is worth mentioning that we should expect that if the NGWO "sector" is innovative that a certain proportion of pioneering developments will fail, and another proportion may have outcomes which while they benefit from the pioneering innovation do not reproduce its form at all, which may have proved inappropriate.

Kramer has found that pioneering or innovator roles had been over-emphasised, and were no more prevalent in NGWOs than in government. However Kramer also distinguishes two other important points : (i) that what is usually called innovation by NGWOs "has consisted of the 'discovery' of small groups of previously over-looked unserved or underserved persons .. (and that).. authentic social inventions ... are the exception", and (ii) "voluntary organisations are more likely to be innovative in their early stages before institutionalisation sets in" (Kramer 1979 c pp. 477-485).

Historically it is true that NGWOs have provided services both to particular population groups, and of particular type, in advance of government acceptance of responsibility either for provision of the service or funding for its provision by the NGWO. Examples of population groups receiving services include almost all categories, from abondoned children, to deserted wives, to aged persons, and disabled persons, to the unemployed and to single mothers, and homeless women and youth in more recent times. Examples of service provision range from institutional facilities to cash relief (historically called 'outdoor relief').

This picture however is not clear. In South Australia, for example, there was from commencement of settlement an accepted claim on government for relief by the destitute and disadvantaged. In other States (e.g. NSW from the early nineteenth century) there was a continuous history of substantial government funding of many services. From the 1890's onwards for several decades (and earlier in some cases) government took primary initiative in deciding what services and activities it would provide directly, which it would fund NGWOs to undertake, and in which it wished to have no involvement.

Australian historical analysis provides no clear basis for NGWOs claiming a distinctly innovative or intrinsically pioneering role. From the earliest days governments have funded NGWOs and have had certain performance expectations. Most of the tasks performed by NGWOs were of a "relief" nature and innovation was rare. Of course there are exceptions, especially in fields of aged care, community organisation and welfare consumerism. An equally significant number of pioneering ventures have come from government, most notably in child care and the Australian Assistance Plan.

One of the possible characteristics of NGWOs that distinguishes them from government agencies, and gives an 'innovative' flavour to their role, is that of greater flexibility. It is suggested that government is restricted by bureaucratic procedures, regulations, audit and financial control mechanisms, and cannot move quickly, not adaptively in situations which require this. On the other hand NGWOs are said to suffer less from bureaucratic restrictions and other procedural requirements. Closer examination is unlikely to support this proposition either. When necessary, government has shown the capacity of its services to move both quickly and adaptively (examples could range from the response to Darwin's Cyclone Tracy to the launching of the D.U.R.D. by the Labor Government in 1973, to the manner in which the Children's Services Program crises have been handled as June 30 approaches in recent years). Similarly while many examples of NGWO flexibility certainly exist - so do cases of inflexibility and slowness to act.

Another interpretation of the "pioneer" thesis can be suggested. When new developments in welfare are called for, when "new needs" are being articulated or "new populations" demand the right to claim upon the state, the movements or developments find their first expression outside government. They may find their expression through the creation of new NGWOs - such as self-help groups, women's shelters, playgroups etc. (This is hardly an argument for the pioneering role of existing NGWOs which initially often oppose and are opposed by such groups). They may, however, also find their expression within existing organ-isations or find support among NGWOs in presenting their claim for inclusion on

the public policy agenda.

This raises the 'advocacy' role of NGWOs in relation to public policy (or 'pressure-group' or what Kramer calls the 'improver' role). This is probably also closely related (or aspects of it are) to the 'vanguard' or 'pioneer' image - NGWOs are in advance of government in recognising and identifying emergent social issues and disadvantaged groups. However, rather than seeking to improve the lot of such groups by service activity to demonstrate what should be done, representation is made to government to either take direct action, or to fund a program of assistance to NGWOs to tackle the issue. In the areas of unemployment and child care we find two recent examples of this type of 'advocacy-pioneering'. The pressure to 'do something' or something different came from outside government, and sunstantially from NGWOs (individually and/or jointly). The resulting programs have been designed, initiated, almost totally funded and significantly controlled by government - but they have been implemented either by NGWOs or by NGWO-type (or 'quango') bodies such as CYSS groups.

There is reason to believe that government values and is prepared to support the advocacy role of NGWOs. Within limits "the social change functions of the improver role - advocacy, monitoring, criticising, and prodding government" (Kramer 1979 a p. 403) have an important role to play in government's control over public policy. Therefore 'improver' functions are encouraged from service-delivery NGWOs, financial support is given to bodies which exist to a substantial degree for just this purpose (e.g. ACOSS), and government establishes organisations for this purpose, especially at the regional or local level - such as Community Councils for Social Development in South Australia amd Family and Childrens Services Regional Committees in Victoria.

The reason these advocate or 'improver' functions receive government support is that the NGWOs are able to able to set as 'social sensors' for government, alerting it to potential problem issues, providing feedback on its programs (even criticism of things which are government intentions are a measurable indicator of the success or otherwise of the policy), and perhaps most importantly of all - NGWOs organise and set priorities of new issues, and direct these and their proponents into the "proper channels" of public policy processes.

One interesting proposition might be that in providing small amounts of funding to a great variety of NGWOs (as does the N.S.W. government, for example), government is "purchasing" an information network. It is not providing major resourcing to many of these groups, but it is ensuring that it receives from

them (via funding submissions, and probably as first port-of-call for policy comment)a regular supply of information.

This proposition does not seem far-fetched when placed alongside the major investments in welfare information service and planning data systems made by the Commonwealth, Victorian and NSW governments during the last five years, and the growth of their corporate planning sections and techniques which consume quantitative and qualitative information(and require it for control purposes) from both within and outside department frameworks.

Government looks to NGWOs, by and large, as a means of extending its purposes, its programs or activities designed to achieve its public policy objectives. There are two modes of extension, or two variations of purpose within which fall other sub-reasons for government use of NGWOs. First government seeks to utilise them in an active initiating way. It wants to see something done - either because it is responding (in its decided method) to public pressure about an issue, or it has a commitment to a particular public policy intervention to achieve certain goals consistent with its social vision.

In this case government uses financial incentive to attract existing NGWOs, or to encourage the establishment of new ones (which often develop from, and have overlapping membership with existing ones). It usually backs up its financial incentive with skilled personnel resources who will negotiate with interested existing organisations, assist the formation and submission processes of new groups, and generally promote the initiative. Government's resource contribution thus consists both of funds and the time of its personnel.

Second, government also seeks, again to extend its purposes, to fund NGWOs because they are there, active in the community, have resources and have community support. This is not to say it funds NGWOs just because they exist. But if existing resources and directions can be harnessed within the government's policy framework it is likely to try to do so. This is a two-way relationship - it involves government accepting some of the goals and methods of an NGWO which it might not set out to purchase; but which are consistent with government goals and which it would rather have working in co-operation with it than in competition, or opposition, or an ongoing active unsatisfied claimant.

Problems arise in shifting between a "you hatch it, we'll match it" and a "take it or leave it" approach. In the former, the chances of coherent social policy developing are quite slim, but any hatched programs will be justified on the basis that they reflect local need and that development offers chances of diversity

One could argue that this is quite consistent with current federalism practices. In a "take it or leave it" approach, there is an attempt at coherence, but the price paid is a severe constraint on organisations. If for example, an organisation is skilled at producing services A & B in, say, care for disabled people, but funds are available, on a take it or leave it basis for programs C & D, the chances are that the organisation will take it. When the main purchaser in the market is government, and when the product on offer is not what the purchaser wants, then the chances of policy coherence are slim. A disjunction occurs from the situation in which government, as major resource provider is faced with NGWOs wishing to provide services which are not those which government necessarily wishes to resource.

Nevertheless government does purchase services from NGWOs, it does promote services of NGWOs and it does support activities of NGWOs. It does so for a number of discernible possible reasons, among which are

    (i)   it is cheaper and saves taxpayer dollars;

    (ii)   it is logistically easier for NGWOs to perform and deliver;

    (iii)   there are opportunities for greater flexibility;

    (iv)   it may be politically or ideologically expedient.

These are difficult issues to deal with briefly, and will be examined in detail in the larger report.

NGWOs, THE STATE, AND THE WELFARE STATE

The relationship between NGWOs and the state is emerging as the dominant
issue concerning the future of 'non-government' welfare in our society.
We note again that this discussion usually commences from the concept of a
'non government welfare sector'. We have already suggested that this
term is not an accurate description of a range of organisations which differ
dramatically in nature, form, purpose, constituency, and method of
operation.

The nature of the state has become the subject of increasing attention over
the last decade from the full spectrum of political interests — conservative,
reformist and structuralist. Without, in this paper, going into a detailed
analysis and discussion of different approaches a number of key features of
the state which have important implications for the role of the
welfare system, and the NGWO sector within that, have been identified.

At its most obvious level the state consists of a set of institutions, or
apparatuses such as government executive, parliament, bureaucracy, statutory
authorities and enterprises, judiciary, police and prison system, army etc.
These institutions or apparatuses possess and exercise state power in relation
to the size of their recognised or enforceable authority. The degree to
which that power is distributed between the different institutions is not
fixed, and can change between different states and different periods of
time.

However the state is more than a set of institutions and apparatuses. Recent
political theory discusses the state as the "material condensation" of a
relationship of forces between classes and among class fractions in society,
(Poulantzas 1980 p.128), or as the concrete expression, at any point in
time, of the struggle within the complex social relations of modern
capitalist society.

The state is clearly the instrument of political domination within society.
It may be seen as the instrument of a particular class (or even class
faction), or of coalitions of 'elites' or 'establishments' or 'vested
interests'. Its precise description is important, but not critical to the
points made here. The state is not a set of netural institutions, but

exercises power primarily on behalf of interests which have a major or determining role in the current socio-economic structure of our society.

Four summary points need to be made :

(i) The modern welfare state provides essential preconditions and infrastructure for economic activity, including crucially that required for the efficient reproduction of labor.

(ii) The state's provision of the general conditions for reproduction of labor, while required for the efficient functioning of capital, is also, simultaneously the social wage of its citizens. This contradictory nature of public social policy is reflected in many aspects of state relations, in this case with NGWOs.

(iii) It is important to analyse and understand not only what the state does but how it performs its functions and the types of relationships it produces and reproduces.

(iv) The role of the state has expanded so that the possibility of being "outside the state" is remote.

The state's growth is due to both the increased requirement of state action to reproduce the conditions of production and capital accumulation (to manage a healthy economy) and the articulated demands of more and more sectors of the population for a share in the distribution of social wealth and protection against the continually privatised risks of costs of a productive system whose own reproduction is increasingly collectivised.

A distinction must be made between the function of acting <u>for</u> the state or of <u>extending</u> the influence of the state ; and of being a part of the state. This is an important distinction, for the state generates power through a variety of modes. These include the structuring of relationships among organisations, and fostering ideology through institutions (which are not part of the state itself) such as the family, church, and welfare organisations.

The "welfare state" defies easy definition. The concept, wrote Offe (1972 p.479) is "perhaps vague enough to allow everyone his own definition of it".

A concern with social welfare is motivated either by a concern for social
change or social control ; for expanding equality as social justice (or
decreasing inequality and injustice), as with reproduction of the social
order with change allowable only within clear limits or conditions
(Graycar 1979, pp.15-20). While the welfare state and the social welfare
system reflect the contradiction or tension between these concerns,
"the logic of the welfare state (as presently constituted} is not
the realisation of some intrinsically valuable human goal, but rather the
prevention of a potentially disastrous social problem" (Offe 1972 p.485).

The current "crisis" of the welfare state reflects this situation. At a
time of substantial restructuring of capital, and regearing of the rate
of capital accumulation there is immense pressure to reduce the costs of
capital accumulation and of production — both in the form of direct wages
and in the form of social expenses, such as many welfare programs,
and even in the cost of social capital which, while indirectly contributing
to profitability, does not quickly return a high profit.

What then is the relationship of NGWOs to this situation — to the state
at this time ? What role(s) do they play ? What role(s) might they play ?
Why and how ? Some of the identifiable ways in which many NGWOs do act
to extend the role of the State would include :

(i) extension of services, in the form designed and desired
by the state, further into society than would be possible
by state services alone, including a penetration into
the fabric of the informal sector

(ii) acceptance of the framework in which the social welfare
system is developed by the state, which includes :

(a) separation of client groups into different categories
such as aged, disabled, single-parents, youth,
homeless, etc which are not related to the causes of
the poverty and disadvantage common to all and
symptomatic of structural inequality in the socio-
economic system.

    (b)   a focus upon service reponses to the consequences
of social problems, or to attempted prevention or
diversion of consequences ; rather than also
developing a focus on the causes of these problems and
alternative patterns and structures for society which
might eliminate or at least modify these causes.

    (c)   participation in the funding process established by
the state which is based on competition, fragmentation,
delegation of control to experts, and state definition
of categories of need and of appropriate service
responses.

(iii)   act as a communication network to identify social issues and
focus them upon appropriate state institutions as posited
avenues of resolution of those issues ; which involves
representation of those issues within the ideologised frame-
work acceptable to the state, and interaction with government
and bureaucracy and other state institutions in organisational
patterns determined by the state.

(iv)   offer "alternative" services to those provided by the state
in ways which are restricted and in practice cosmetic
as regards the causes of the issues being tackled and the
alternative courses of action being offered to the clientele.

This analysis is elaborated in the larger paper (<u>Non-Government Welfare</u>
<u>and the State</u>). Some reasons for NGWOs acting as extensions of state
apparatus seem perfectly understandable when one considers

    (a)   participants in NGWOs are probably no different politically
than the population at large ;

    (b)   motivation to belong assumes a commitment to caring and the
urgency of dealing with real need takes priority and
consumes so much time that broader political action is
pushed into the background ;

    (c)   there is a high level of consent in our society about
dominant welfare state activities.

    (d)   Many who operate in NGWOs are society's winners, not losers
and they have no interest in radical change, but a
commitment to limited change. Very often their activity
stems from "Christian duty" or role conformity.

(e) Many NGWOs owe this existence to state initiative as
early support, and some loyalty is felt.

One therefore asks :

- to what degree and in what ways are/can NGWOs be 'oppositional'
  to the purposes and function of the state (a) in the context
  of the state's welfare system's contribution to these ;
  (b) in general ?

- to what degree and in what ways do/can NGWOs at least ameliorate
  and moderate (mediate positively (?)) the purposes and functions
  of the state welfare system in a way which might provide the
  groundwork for more substantive change-oriented activity ?

- to what degree and in what ways do/can NGWOs be a major force
  for 'transformation' of the welfare state and the
  prevailing social system (a) by themselves (b) in alliance,
  or co-operation with others — and whom ?

A starting point in dealing with these questions involves noting the great
growth in NGWOs in the past decade. Many of these new NGWOs have been
sponsored by or directly encouraged by government (both QANGOs and specific
purpose service organisations). Another major feature, has been the
development of "self-help" or "consumer" organisations, and a surge in
activist community organisations such as tenants unions, welfare rights
groups and low-income people's organisations.

Advocacy and consumerism, it was pointed out above are primary functions
of NGWOs. Self-help, consumer and low-income groups place priority on
issues such as power over information, mutual aid and assistance, personal
and political development of members and supporters, advocacy of welfare
and consumer rights (to both government and to traditional NGWOs such as
emergency relief agencies), deprofessionalisation and increased accessibility
to welfare services, and similar directions.

However self-help and consumerist organisations, while employing advocacy
as a major function, do not, it has been argued, necessarily challenge
either the way the welfare system operates or the broader functions
of the state and the structure of the social system. They can just be seeking

better access to the social system for their population category (or even just
their membership), or even just better access to the social welfare system!
Or, not unlike many traditional agencies, they may even functionally locate
the problem in themselves, rather than in the social system or the welfare
system (Alcoholics Anonymous has aspects of this approach).

Another development during the 1970's has been an increased role for what are
commonly known as "co-ordinating bodies" - national peak NGWOs, and State-level
counterparts. The most prominent of these is the Australian Council of Social
Service (ACOSS) and the network of State and Territory Councils of Social Service,
but others include the Youth Affairs Council of Australia (incorporating the
National Youth Affairs Council), the Ethnic Communities Councils at State and
now national level, and ACROD, ACOTA, Australian Early Childhood Association (AECA)
and Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA).
These organisations have increased in size of staff, membership, scope of
public policy concern, and range of strategies. The Councils of Social Service
in particular have become active and successful participants in the Federal
and State parliamentary and bureaucratic arenas, and have developed a significant
mass media presence especially on issues such as unemployment, income security,
invalid pensions, health insurance, housing and poverty. They frequently form
the "dissenting voice" before governmental and parliamentary inquiries into
issues ranging from family law to evaluation to freedom of information to
domestic satellites to the Australian financial system. They have built links
with the business community, trade unions, bureaucracies, universities and a
wide variety of activist groups. However, the Council of Social Service and,
therefore, by implication, the other co-ordinating bodies (which are not so active
in these ways) recently came in for bitter criticism as being "active in con-
junction with government, in carrying out five key state functions" (Mowbray
1980, p. 53).

These observations point to the need to identify what it means to be
"oppositional" or "mediating" or "transforming", what strategies, methods and
tactics would be utilised in being such, and what criteria we might use to
measure these things.

Matheisen (1980) proposes a number of characteristics for the development of a
movement of organisations which could pose a significant alternative to the
prevailing social system, including the state. He proposes two basic, essential
features

      (i)   the organisation must be in a relationship of <u>contradiction</u>
              to the basic premises of the prevailing system and not be

restricted by the boundaries of thought and action
dictated by the 'system logic' of the current order,
developed upon those basic premises.

(ii)   the organisation must stand in a relationship of
competition to the prevailing system in order to
attract support and to expand. Whereas contradiction
is an objective and material issue, "competition is a
relationship which must be developed in the direction
of the subjective experience of the participants; the
question is how to persuade those who participate in
the system".   (Matheisen 1980:229).

(A longer discussion of these issues and their ramifications
is taken up in the larger paper).

Several propositions require further discussion and examination but it is
necessary to note two features which stand out

(i)   NGWOs do have a primary focus on human need and individual
and collective well-being (though in some cases 'collective'
may be limited). This focus, if consistently maintained and
developed does stand in contrast to, or potentially in
opposition to, the primary focus/foci of the state and the
socio-economic system.

(ii)   NGWOs (or the overwhelming majority of them) operate with
two primary interfaces - the state, particularly the bureaucratic
apparatus, but also others, and the poor/disadvantaged/minority/
marginalised sectors of the population. That is a significant
structural location in a society in which the state is
increasingly powerful and pervasive, and the numbers of poor,
etc. are also increasing and experiencing greater absolute and
relative degrees of deprivation.

Against these two background features we suggest that among the means by
which NGWOs can have an impact _for_ structural change toward a more equitable
and just society, the following are likely to be important, and necessary
(though not sufficient).

-     by promoting an alternative understanding of the nature of
of poverty and disadvantage and of the people who suffer
from these.   i.e. challenging the existing interpretation of

social reality and postulating one or more alternative
scenarios.

- by changing the ways in which they interface/relate
with people experiencing poverty/disadvantage, in order
to ensure that they are not reinforcing existing patterns
and structures of inequality but are in fact assisting people
to question, challenge and conceive alternatives to the
current situation. The relationship should be enabling of that
process.

- continually examining the structure and implications of their
relationship with various state apparatus, with three related
intentions (i) to work in co-operation with "centres of
opposition" (Poulantzas 1980:142) within state apparatuses
(ii) to challenge/extend existing limits/propose alternatives,
to the nature and requirements of state contractual arrangements
with NGWOs, in the direction of weakening state control, to
allow development of alternative (experimental) types of
relationship (iii) to be advocates for, and enablers of the
advocacy of people in poverty, disadvantage with regard to the
practices of the State apparatus.

- building coalitions, or networks of alliances between NGWOs
involved in different issue-areas, with different population
groups, and in different geographic areas and at different
levels of society.

- building linkages and alliances between NGWOs, their clientele,
and other sectors of society, especially sections of the labor
movement, co-operative organisations, professionals, etc.

These are the kinds of measures which need to be explored in more detailed,
and related both to a theoretical framework for the role of NGWOs and to
empirical findings about what NGWOs do, and how they go about what they do.
A more comprehensive approach to such an analysis will be found in our
forthcoming paper Non-Government Welfare and the State.

The contribution which NGWOs make to many aspects of the functioning of the
modern welfare state is significant. It is important that the nature,
dimensions, variety, depth, limitations, interdependence, and alternative
future options of that contribution be better understood, more widely discussed
and more thoroughly addressed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

{BAILEY, P.} (1978), Task Force on Co-ordination in Welfare and Health, Second Report : Consultative Arrangements and the Co-ordination of Social Policy Development. (Canberra : A.G.P.S.)

GRAYCAR, A. (1979), Welfare Politics in Australia : A Study in Policy Analysis. (Melbourne : Macmillan).

HORSBURGH, M. (1980), 'Relationship between government and voluntary organizations in social welfare' in F. Pavlin (et al.) (eds.) Perspectives in Australian Social Work (Bundoora, Victoria : P.I.T. Press), 17-34.

KRAMER, R. (1973), 'Future of the voluntary service organisation', Social Work, 18(6):59-69.

KRAMER, R. (1979 a), 'Voluntary agencies in four welfare states', Administration in Social Work 3(4) : 397-407.

KRAMER, R. (1979 b) 'Voluntary agencies in the welfare state : an analysis of the vanguard role' Journal of Social Policy 8 (4): 473-488.

KRAMER, R. (1979 c), 'Public fiscal policy in welfare states', Social Service Review, 53(1) : 1-14.

MATHIESEN, T. (1980), Law, Society and Political Action (London. Academic Press).

MOWBRAY, M. (1980), 'Non-government welfare : state roles of the Councils of Social Service', The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 16(3) : 52-60

OFFE, C. (1972), 'Advanced capitalism and the welfare state' Politics and Society : 2 (4) : 479-488.

POULANTZAS, N. (1980), State, Power, Socialism. (London:Verso).

TERRELL, P. (1981). 'Financing social welfare services' in N.Gilbert and H. Specht (eds.) Handbook of the Social Services. (Englewood Cliffs : Prentice Hall), 380-410.

TROPMAN, J. (et al.) (eds.) (1976), Strategic Perspectives in Social Policy. (New York : Pergamon Press).

WOLFENDEN, J. (1978), The Future of Voluntary Organizations (London : Croom Helm).