

*Peter Herrmann*

**Care Services – Core of Sustainable Empowering Welfare Systems. An  
Integrated Approach Towards a New Care Framework**

*Presentation for The Fourth Annual East Asian Social Policy Research Network (EASP) International  
Conference in Tokyo, October 2007:*

*Restructuring Care Responsibility: Dynamics of Welfare Mix in East Asia*

European  
social  
organisational  
science  
consultancy

---

Dr. Peter Herrmann  
The Jasnaja Poljana  
Aghabullogue  
Clonmoyle  
Co. Cork  
[www.esosc.eu](http://www.esosc.eu)

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Prolegomenon .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The framework .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Framing Social Quality .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Historisation of Social Policy .....	4
The Systematic Framework of Social Policy – A Regulationist Approach .....	5
<b>The Determining the Role of Social Services .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Dimensions of Social Services.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>European and Asian Perspectives on Social Services – Tentative Suggestions.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Approaching the Asian World.....	9
Approaching the World of the Institutionalised Europe .....	11
<b>Excursus: Normative and Religious System – Do Traditional Values Matter in Modernity? .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>An Integrated Approach Towards a New Care Framework – Outlook.....</b>	<b>18</b>

---

## Care Services – Core of Sustainable Empowering Welfare Systems – An Integrated Approach Towards a New Care Framework<sup>ii</sup>

### Prolegomenon

Care services, social services, social intervention, social policy – many terms could be added and – taking the mainstream debate as point of reference, all of them have one thing in common. The terminology used follows very much convention, little consideration is spent on the complex social and societal framework in which the debate of relevant issues is placed. Even approaches that place for instance the debate of social policy in a framework that is fundamentally critical about the existing society and with this towards the functionally affirmative and integrative role social policy tends to play (see for instance the contributions by James O'Connor and Claus Offe in Pierson, Christopher/Castles, Francis G. (Eds.): *The Welfare State. A Reader*; Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), starts from a fundamentally conventional approach, looking at given societies rather than developing an understanding of the social of which the concrete societies are only a very specific occurrence. In other words, they disregard that

*[t]he concrete is concrete because it is a synthesis of many determinations, thus a unity of the diverse.*

*(Marx, Karl: Economic Manuscripts of 1957-58; in: Karl Marx. Frederick Engels. Collected Works; Volume 28: Karl Marx: 1857-61: London: Lawrence&Wishart; 1986: 38)*

– And care services are, of course, concrete. Taking a different approach, the following remarks will bring another approach forward. Rather than taking methodologically a positivist approach and following the stance of methodological individualism, it is suggested to start with a definition of the social. From there it will be possible to look at (issues of) social policy in a different way, namely in the perspective of

*a relational, integrated and complex state. The state is relational in that it is perceived not as a substance defining an intrinsic essence by disjunction, but rather through a conjunction of phenomena indicating strong patterns., It is integrated in the sense that nowhere is there a duality between the state seen only as structure in contrast to a state seen only as actor. All in all we are faced with the ubiquity and multiple nature of the state, and the theory accounts for this. In that sense the state is certainly a complex category, which suggests that the market economy perceived more as a composite than in terms of a state-market coupling.*

*(Delorme, Robert: The State as Relational, Integrated and Complex. L'état relationnel intégré complexe (ERIC); in: Eds.: Robert Boyer/Yves Saillard; London/New York: Routledge, 1995: 114-121: here: 121)*

However, as important as such an orientation is – not least as today's societies are strongly state centred and in addition social policy is to a large extent state policy in one or another way – we have to strive first for wider understanding, starting from a wide definition of the social and moving on from there developing an understanding of what actually social policy, and more concrete: social services are about, beyond a state-centred understanding.

### The Framework – Starting with the Social, rather than with Social Problems

Many debates on care services lack a proper methodological approach, due to falling short in two dimensions:

\* social policy – and with this the issue of caring and caring responsibility – is centrally seen as compensatory issue, 'adjusting failed socialisation'

Social policy emerges as departmentalised, segmented area. The link to other policies is then defined

- ex ante by financial conditions, available resources, etc.
- its productive potential
- ex post by its ability to compensate for shortcomings caused by the focusing on economic aspects of the social, but as well other systems/policies

\* in consequence, traditional welfare policies tend to be by definition residual

This means not least that there is no genuine understanding of 'the social'; or: as far as there is such an understanding, it is a matter derived from and defined by natural law in some form.

In other words, they are caught in the shortcomings of welfare regime analysis. On the one hand, the analysis of care services and their quality leaves frequently the 'welfare regime' dimension aside; on the other hand, the welfare regime analysis in the tradition of *Wilensky/Lebeaux*, *Titmuss*, *Esping-Andersen* and others is caught in institutionalist perspectives. Taking stance against such limited institutionalist approach, it is suggested to put social services – their definition, their assessment and their development – into a positive and self-referential framework, namely to see them in the context of socialisation.

The proposed presentation looks at care services in a different light, namely seeing them in a positive way as part of a broader and general process of socialisation. For this, it is suggested to start with answering the question what we actually mean when we are talking about the social.

For this purpose – and with reference to the work of the European Foundation on Social Quality – the social is understood as the outcome of the interaction between people (constituted as actors) and their constructed and natural environment. With this in mind its subject matter refers to people's productive and reproductive relationships. In other words

- \* the constitutive interdependency between processes of self-realisation and processes of the formation of collective identities
- \* is a condition for 'the social', realised by the interactions of
  - actors, being – with their self-referential capacity – competent to act
  - and their framing structure, which translates immediately into the context of human relationships.

From here we can gain a clearer understanding as well of what society actually is in the sense of a complex relationship, being concerned with

- \* relational issues
- \* being grounded in processes of interaction and human practice
- \* and thus changing over time.

This goes beyond the standard understanding of a society as institutionalised system within which individual actors behave according to specific framing conditions. Rather, society is constituted by the interaction of human beings in their ongoing daily practice. This means as well that the analysis has to consider two basic dialectical tensions that actually express and condition the social: The vertical axis spans between biographical development and societal development. The horizontal axis spans between the social relations amongst peers, controlled by the immediacy and traditionality of relations and the manifestation of relationships in institutions that are in part – at least in the phenomenological perspective – detached from human interaction. It is within this framework, that social quality can be defined as being concerned with the means and processes and relations necessary for people to be capable of actively participating in social relations and actively influencing the immediate and more distant social and physical environment.

So far it is of fundamental importance that the social is not approached as a pure issue of relations; rather it is the manifestation of a productive tension between structure and action. The reference to the productive tension makes it as well possible to go beyond analysing social policy as a purely functional mechanism within a given political entity. Instead, social policy is, despite having a strong functional dimension, a constitutive process. In other words, it is part of the permanent production and reproduction of socialisation. We can say as well that the social – and social policy – is a matter of ongoing and reflexive socialisation.

As such, it depends on a set of revolving interaction of four conditional, four constitutional and four normative factors, as presented in the following.

CONDITIONAL FACTORS	CONSTITUTIONAL FACTORS	NORMATIVE FACTORS
socio-economic security social cohesion social inclusion social empowerment	personal security social recognition social responsiveness personal capacity	social justice (equity) solidarity democratic based citizenship human dignity

Social policy in general and social services in particular are very much about finding a concrete definition – and balance of these factors within societies of which the economic system is based on the division of the producer from the means of production. Taking it from here, social policy and the provision of social services is very much about social empowerment of individuals – a process that is not least concerned with establishing congruence between social production and individual appropriation. In other words, social policy is a means of redistributing power within the given capitalist system by socialising at least part of the reproduction. Historically we can see this as extending rights, the factual transformation of the extremely limited rights of the slave to the system of mutual ‘personal obligation’, that shaped the relationship between client and patron, to the ‘welfare system’ of the modern state.

*Inasmuch as the human beings are as individual's recipients of statutory remuneration their opportunities to act and their individual mobility increase; the emancipation of the individual vita from traditional collective contexts is pushed further. The institutions of the welfare state promote and favour 'on the basis of stabilised expectations of income and continuing provision of services of general interests' [Daseinsfuersorge] (Mayer/Mueller 1989: 47) individualisation. (Ebers, Nicola: Individualisierung. Georg Simmel-Norbert Elias-Ulrich Beck; Wuerzburg: Koenigshausen&Neumann, 1995: 245; with reference to Mayer, Karl Ulrich/Mueller, Walter: Lebensverlaeuft im Wohlfahrtsstaat; in: Weymann, Ansgar (ed.): Handlungsspielraeume. Untersuchungen zur Individualisierung und Institutionalisierung von Lebenslaeufen in der Moderne; Stuttgart 1989: 41-60; own translation - PH)*

From here we can look at the social quality approach as dealing with the two fundamental dialectical tensions. The one is the tension between biographical and societal development, the other is concerned with the tension between communities and systems. It has to be emphasised that the tension is a dialectical one. In other words, we are not speaking of antagonisms, nor are we talking about relationships of ‘independent moments’, of which the relationship is the one of externalities. Only by looking at the different aspects in their mutuality the social can be grasped

- \* in its relational terms
- \* in terms of its processuality (a matter of past and future) and
- \* in terms of the dimension of action.

Socio-political action as means of socialisation finds exactly here its position as bridging the extremes – as longer the chains of interdependence are, as more complex are socio-political activities.

It is important to understand this architecture as methodological challenge enabling us to deal with the complexity of any given constellation, resulting in developing concrete politics and policies. That means as well that developing social services has to go far beyond developing concepts of professionalised interpersonal relationships in order to solve specific and definable 'social problems'. Rather, we are actually dealing with the design of complex processes of socialisation and mechanisms that can compensate for specific difficulties that occur during processes of socialisation.

Summarising so far, we can say that following dimensions are of particular importance:

- \* collective identities – as objective dimension
- \* defined as result of the practice and process of the dialectical tension between
  - biographical and societal development
  - status and contractual regulation
- \* referring to three dimensions, namely conditional, normative and constitutional factors.

As such, the approach is

- a) self-referential
- b) developmental/processual
- c) relational.

### **Framing Social Quality**

However, especially for accessing social policy interventions and instruments in a global framework it is necessary to elaborate (a) a historical perspective and (b) to present the issue of social quality in the framework of a sound societal analysis that takes structural economic issues into account.

#### *Historisation of Social Policy*

A fundamental shortcoming of institutionalist approaches is that they tend to fade out history. Of course, at first glance such statement must appear being questionable. Many debates on the welfare state and its institutions are explicitly researching concrete historical settings, and as well investigating how they emerged historically (e.g. Pierson, Christoph: *Beyond the Welfare State? The New Political Economy of Welfare*; Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991). We see the same when looking at research that is dealing with specific institutions as for instance organisations of the so-called Third Sector (see for instance Salamon, Lester M./Anheier, Helmut K.: *The Emerging Nonprofit Sector. An Overview*; Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1996; Archambault, Edith: *Le Secteur Sans But Lucratif. Associations et Fondations en France*; Paris: Economica; 1996). However, stating that fading out history is a general shortcoming refers to the fact that the historical perspective itself is reduced on institutions. If we take the social quality quadrangle, as presented in the previous graph, the said approaches remain on the tangent spanning between societal development and systems/institutions – the one spanning on the top left. These are seen as affecting every day's life, but every day's life itself is barely seen as part and parcel of the process of social policy. This is already problematic on the general level of social policy; however, it is even more problematic when it comes to social services.

The critique that is brought forward here is driven by the fact that all these approaches are limited by their structuralist orientation – fading history out actually means fading out the actors and as well the contradictions. This cannot be further developed here (see as well Herrmann, Peter: *Rethinking Precarity in a Global-Historical Perspective*; William Thompson Working Paper, 9; forthcoming). What is important here is that fading out the actor has two crucial implications:

First it means separating social policy and social care from other policy areas. Despite many different problems with this, the most relevant problem is that it leads to the privatisation of social services insofar that it takes them out of being primarily a public issues. Terms as personal social services, service users, clients, customers etc. point into this direction. As far as they are thought of in a societal context, they are designed as matter of market relationships – relationships in which the actor is entirely individualised, regulation is organised on grounds of the contract principle, demanding the free decision-maker, free in the double sense, that as a free man s/he can make decisions in his or her own right, and that on the other hand s/he has no other means of surviving than making a decision among formally equals. Contract regulation is then defined by the following four elements:

- \* an agreement based on free will between two free and formally equal parties
- \* mutual obligations

- \* mutual benefits
- \* strictly limited on the obligations expressed in the contract («*GreetingLine*», Lotti: *Legal Technics. A structure of legal rationalities. Presentation University College of Cork, Department of Applied Social Studies; 15.1.2007*).

In other words, institutionalist policy-design reduces actors on the role of contractors. However, by fading out crucial preconditions, contractual equality means factual inequality.

Second, this leads on to the other limitation of the structuralist approach, namely the fact that socialisation is itself privatised – rather than seeing social services as part of socialisation they are seen as matter of integrating individuals into an existing society. If we take again the social quality quadrangle from above, they remain on the tangent now spanning between biographical development and systems and institutions – here the one spanning on the bottom left.

### *The Systematic Framework of Social Policy – A Regulationist Approach*

All these orientations are lacking the consideration of a fundamental aspect of concrete societies. All societies find the social as it had been defined in general terms above, concretised in a specific formation that captures

*regulatory mechanisms, i.e. institutional forms, societal norms and patterns of strategic conduct which successfully expressed and regulated these conflicts until the inevitable build-up of tensions and disparities among the various regulatory forms reached crisis point. When this occurred there would be an experimental period from which a new accumulation regime and a corresponding mode of regulation might – or might not – emerge.*

*(Jessop, Bob: State Theory. Putting Capitalist States in their Place; Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell, 1990: 308)*

In this context the accumulation regime is defined as

*a particular combination of production and consumption which can be reproduced over time despite conflictual tendencies*  
(*ibid.*)

and goes hand in hand with a specific mode of regulation, i.e.

*an institutional ensemble and complex of norms which can secure capitalist reproduction pro tempore despite the antagonistic character of capitalist social relations*  
(*ibid.*)

From here we gain a foundation that allows us to see

*the limits of rational calculation in creating the relations that define the positions of agents: as soon as radical uncertainty prevails and groups of agents adopt strategic behaviour, the unintended effects and paradoxes of composition destabilise the expectations of even the most well endowed agents. Agents can orient themselves only through constraints, common references, procedures and patterns that transmit or support collective arrangements of rules, conventions and organisations (Orléan, 1994). These arrangements are not governed by pure economic logic; rather they arise from the construction and maintenance of a social bond. Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that individuals reduced to pure economic rationality would be incapable of resolving the simplest problems, for example the question of co-ordination.*

*(Boyer, Robert/Saillard, Yves: A Summary of Régulation Theory; in: Boyer, Robert/Saillard, Yves [eds.]: Régulation Theory. The State of the Art; London/New York: Routledge, 1995: 36-44; here: 36 f.; reference made to Orléan, André [ed.]: Analyse économique des conventions; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994)*

### **The Determining the Role of Social Services**

It is exactly here where social services – as social policy in general – have to be considered as intermediaries of complex processes of socialisation. We are dealing with a space of specific social

action that creates social spaces, aiming on integration, defining and defending interests and values, developing social personalities and spaces for interaction. This is just another formulation of the commonly used distinction of the role and function of voluntary organisations, in the formulation for instance of *Ralph M. Kramer*, who sees four functions, namely

*(1) As vanguard, the purpose of the voluntary agency is to innovate, pioneer, experiment, and demonstrate programs, some of which may eventually be taken over by government. (2) As improver or advocate, the agency is expected to serve as a critic, watchdog, or gadfly as it pressures a governmental body to extend, improve, or establish needed services. (3) As value guardian of voluntaristic, particularistic, and sectarian values, a voluntary agency is expected to promote citizen participation, to develop leadership, and to protect the special interests of social, religious, cultural, or other minority groups. (4) As service provider, the voluntary agency delivers certain services it has selected, some of which may be a public responsibility that governments is unable, is unwilling, or prefers not to assume directly or fully.*

*(Kramer, Ralph M.: Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State; Berkley u.a.: 1981: 9)*

However, a fundamental difference of the suggestion made here is that these services are not attributed to any ex ante specified organisations or institutions. Rather, although at the end we have to define special ‘providers’, of course, the point of departure is the process of socialisation as relational action of people in their every day life – from here we can make reference again to the definition of the social as it can be found at the beginning of this text. This means as well that we can analyse social services – as matter of public concern – in the framework of the conditional, constitutional and normative factors as suggested by the social quality approach. It is then getting clear as well that the provision of social services is not simply a matter of general standards that have to be guaranteed by the state. What has to be guaranteed by the state is

- a) the validity of fundamental human rights and
- b) mechanisms that guarantee these rights in actual practice
  - according to the concrete conditions of the given society and
  - according to the situation of the individuals for whom the services are put into place.

One can say as well social services are the actual bridge between the degree and shape of socialisation of any given accumulation regime and concrete every day’s life. As such they are part of the life regime and bridge also the two tangents on the right: at the bottom between biographical conditions and communities and on the top between communities and societal development. With this, social services are nothing else than means of developing and maintaining citizenship.

Summarising the aspects mentioned so far two dimensions are of special importance when we take social services – including specifically care services – as matter of the process of socialisation.

First, the specific dimension of understanding services as matter of socialisation, i.e. the shift of responsibility from the self-caring individual to the reflexive individual: the individual that ‘depends’ in his/her well-being directly and consciously on society.

Second, and taking it from here, the general aspect of social services as matter of socialisation, i.e., the self-realisation of individuals by immediate interaction.

The fundamental assumption is that any human activity – as social activity – is finally aiming on enhancing social quality. However, such social orientation has to prevail against isolationist tendencies that arise from the separation of the actual producer from the means of production.

Furthermore, the statement of a general strive for enhancing social quality, seen together with the said separation of producer and means of production is at least in tendency a contradictory process. With the fundamental tension between the poles of the two axes, the problem of power goes hand in hand. As social quality is very much a theory of practice we face the challenge of power. Social quality is very much a matter of appropriation, i.e. appropriateness and making property. This means that the ‘balance’ between the two axial points is not least a matter of competing powers. We can say as well that there is – from the individual perspective – a potential trade-off point between individual well-being and socio-individual social quality at least as long as the given society follows the regulative principle of contract regulation. Another formulation of the same issue has to do with the fact that power is based on a paradox: in a way, power can only be increased under the condition of allowing others to increase their power. However, allowing others to increase their power counteracts of course at the same time the increase of own individual power: The employer depends on somewhat powerful employees; service-providers depend on ‘service users’ that have some power left – even if it is only

the power chose them ... (see Herrmann, Peter: *Empowerment – Processing the Processed; in: Conditions for Social Quality in Europe and related indicators; forthcoming*).

### Dimensions of Social Services

Looking from here at social services we find three crucial dimensions:

1) As factors of socialisation they are first and foremost a matter of ‘general interest’ – although we have to consider here that the concept of general interest is only an expression for something that actually disguises the contradictions of a concrete society. Still, it exists insofar as we can see the general interest as an expression of a concrete historically given power structure in terms of a ‘historical compromise’ or basic consensus in its validity within a given society. In *Antonio Gramsci’s* terms we can speak of the hegemony.

Keeping this in mind, we can say that social services are **condition for social quality** insofar as they empower people – in tendency – to take part in society.

2) Social services are as well an important moment in terms of opening a space for action for individuals. This means that services are crucial in **constituting social quality**.

3) They are finally **expressing social quality** – this being to some extent a descriptive dimension.

This can be summarised in the following table.

Social services can provide/contribute to social quality	Social services as condition for SQ	Analytical	Constitutional factors
Social services are condition for social quality	Social services as constituting SQ	Processual	Normative factors
Social services are social quality	Social services as expression of SQ	Descriptive	Conditional factors

It may seem paradox that the social quality factors (*column 4*) are seemingly not matching the ‘service function’ (*column 2*). The reason for this is simple: social services, seen as condition for social quality require ‘being activated’, this being a matter that is described by constitutional factors; the activation, i.e. the constitution of social quality by means of social services is – not least – lead by norms. And the expression of social quality via provision of services is not least a matter of the conditions.

Such perspective means as well that the traditional consideration of a hierarchical hiatus between providers and users cannot be retained. Instead, if we start from a definition of the social and attribute social services to the process of socialisation the most useful definition sees them as any activity that is undertaken

- \* to enhance individuals’ well-being and
- \* that is based on human and social rights,
- \* that contributes to the cohesion of the community and wider social relationships
- \* and at the same time enables or empowers the individuals concerned.

As such,

- \* they are
  - person-oriented and at the very same time
  - social in their orientation.
- \* Furthermore they orient on
  - serving and
  - being and taking part in social and personal life.
- \* And they are dealing with the orientation on
  - the general interest and
  - the personal course.

Consequently, being a matter of socialisation, social services cannot be considered as activities following a top-down principle of delivering and having only one beneficiary. It is better to see them as provisions for citizens – in general and for citizens in social situations that require specific support mechanisms to guarantee their inclusion into the overall process of socialisation. If – for the lack of an appropriate terminological alternative – we maintain the user-terminology, the following dimensions have to be considered:

\* *Society at large as user*

As much as services are person-oriented endeavours they serve certain wider and general interests of society although – as said – the term of a general interest is surely problematic. Still, there are some very general needs and wants as for instance security, lack of (considerate) regulation of conflicts. Sure, the concrete meaning may still be contested but it seems to be reasonable to say that society at large gains from the provision of social services if coherence as condition and equity and dignity as norms are accepted as having some general meaning – at least in dealing with challenges that are relevant for any social entity.

\* *State as user*

The state is a special institution, representing and ‘managing’ the needs and will of a given society.

*Marx traced the origin of the state, as he did with other social institutions, to the division of labour.. He saw the state as in contradiction to the real interests of all members of society. It was an ‘illusionary community serving as a screen for the real struggles waged by classes against each other’. [reference: Per McLellan: the Thought of Karl Marx (1971): 182]] At each stage of production in history there was a political organisation which corresponded to that stage and which supported the interests of the then dominant class. ‘The state’, Marx wrote, ‘acts as an intermediary in the formation of all communal institutions and gives them a political form. Hence there is the illusion that law is based on will, that is, on will divorced from its real basis, on the free will’. [reference: Grundrisse: 48] (Freeman, M.D.A.: Lloyd’s Introduction to Jurisprudence; London: Sweet&Maxwell, 2001<sup>7</sup>: 369)*

Though the relationship between society and state is of course a complex one and is primarily a matter of power and securing power of minorities, we can get a good idea by pointing on systems-theory which suggests that the state is one institution amongst others that is differentiated part of a wider system though the state is at the same time a distinct institution, standing outside of (civil) society and being an expression of alienation (*see Marx, Karl: On the Jewish Question [1843/44]; in: Karl Marx. Frederick Engels. Collected Works. Volume 3. Marx and Engels 1843-1844; London: Lawrence&Wishart, 1975: 146-174*). In other words, it is in any case part of society as such, and society is the reference point of the state. This has to be emphasised as we find in current debates in many cases the underlying contradicting idea of the ‘state’ being the society.

It is important as well that the state – as a ‘differentiated institution’ – pays the largest part of the bill via contributions to the social protection system, via social benefits and other monies. This makes clear that the state is very much a managerial instrument. The question, then, is of course in which way the general interest, which has to be managed, is defined.

Furthermore, the state is user insofar as it is itself expression of the proposed process of socialisation. So, any disintegration is a matter of failed socialisation that falls back on the state’s reputation – the other way round: needs to be answered to maintain the functioning of the state.

\* *The ‘client’ as user*

It is some time now that the term client – going back to the medieval relationship between patron and dependent – had been exchanged. Now we are used to speak of users or customers. And although considering them as people with rights, seeing them as citizens, a fundamental gap remains. Perhaps it is premature for a farewell to all these terms as client, user and customer. However, we have to push for a mental shift, considering the people we are talking about as the citizenry of the organisation, or service.

However, it is important to acknowledge the fact that this citizenry has at the same time to cope with specific difficulties. Being excluded, going through difficult phases of their individual biography, facing specific hardship of any kind, the people in question are in one or another way deprived of full power of decision-making – and subsequently rights. They lack the money to choose services from different market providers, they are under mental or psychological threat and make decisions under the pressure of looking for ‘quick and simple solutions’, they want special spiritual company which adds to the simple provision in the sense of a delivery act – and other such special conditions could be added.

## European and Asian Perspectives on Social Services – Tentative Suggestions<sup>1</sup>

Any kind of service provision is – besides the pure ‘political’ framing – depending

- a) on the accumulation regime and its reflection in the mode of regulation and
- b) to some extent linked with this, the normative system that stands in the background and/or is influenced by the regulative mechanisms.

Although we can speak since a long time of a global and globalising capitalism, reaching distinct shape in different countries, we can see today a far-reaching adaptation, leading to prevailing similarities of certain ground patterns of societal organisation and institutionalisation. The following remarks may point on some important aspects to allow further fruitful analysis. For such preliminary remarks I will – on the one hand – make general reference to Asia and Europe and – on the other hand – refer to Taiwan on the one side and examples from different European countries.

### *Approaching the Asian World*

The situation of the Asian nations is more complex as in many mainstream debates reflected – in his highly informative work *Giovanni Arrighi* debates these developmental aspects (*Arrighi, Giovanni: Adam Smith in Beijing. Lineages of the Twenty-First Century; London/New York: Verso, 2007*). Rather than being simply ‘developing countries’ or – at best – latecomers as many do suggest, the Asian countries – with China at their centre – are nations of extremely high cultural standards. Actually, until more or less recently in particular China had been much more advanced in its cultural and as well economic development than the European region and only since then the development had been delayed and fell back behind that of the West. Since some years now we find another turn and shift of power: Today, the Asian region is rapidly catching up. *Gilbert Rozman* writes

*East Asia is a great region of the past, having been in the forefront of world development for at least two thousand years, until the sixteenth, seventeenth, or even the eighteenth century, ...*

*(Rozman, Gilbert: The East Asian Region: Confucian Heritage and its Modern Adaptation; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991: 6)*

It is most interesting (*see numerous works by Andre Gunder Frank*) and needs further debate that the historical break appears with the emergence of capitalism in the Western world.

Today’s renaissance of the Asian countries brings together the own traditions of a highly developed, by and large pre-capitalist normative system and the reductionist system of a halved modernity. *Yeun-Wen Ku* describes this with reference to *Maurice Dobb* (*Dobb, Maurice: Studies in the Development of Capitalism; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963: 5*) in the following words:

*Capitalism, as a spirit, is described as an attitude which seeks profit both rationally and systematically. The capitalist, if we go beyond the man who conceives of economic activity as simply catering for his natural wants, sees the amassing of capital as the dominant motive of economic activity. It is an attitude of sober rationality and uses the method of precise quantitative calculation to subordinate everything in life to this end.*

*(Ku, Yeun-Wen: Welfare Capitalism in Taiwan. State, Economy and Social Policy; Houndsmills et alera: Macmillan, 1997: 78)*

This is insofar of special importance as any traditional or previous ideological and value system is never entirely abolished; instead, we are confronted with a dialectical process of maintaining and transforming specific elements into the new accumulation regime. An additional factor is that the Asian region, at least temporarily and for a long time at periphery of the world system, is in itself by no means a unified or unifying block. Although some centrifugal moments can be made out, these are more on the level of a synchronisation of economic developments rather than being a political process.

With regard to concrete capitalism and now looking specifically at Taiwan, we are dealing with one of the so-called ‘tiger economies’. However, as successful as they seem to be when looked at from the outside the situation is not as clear when undertaking a more systematic analysis. Only the following few points have to do suffice:

---

<sup>1</sup> See for the following as well *Herrmann, Peter: Social Quality and Global Social Policy; Hong Kong/Taipei: Casa Verde (in preparation)*

- 1) The country – and this is influential as well with respect to the economic development – is torn between various ‘identities’ and political cultures. At least the indigenous people, the early Chinese invaders (from the 1600s), the Japanese, colonising the island from 1895 until 1945, the KMT-Chinese, arriving in 1945 and in the meantime the late-born Chinese-Taiwanese (second and third generation KMT-Chinese) play each a specific role in determining today’s socio-economic culture.
- 2) An aspect that could be added under the first point but also deserves more specific attention, has to be seen in the role of the United States of America. Not politically recognising the country at first hand, they misused the country exactly on this basis of non-recognition in a global context as spearhead against the PRC. Besides the political meaning, it was here where a gateway had been firmly established
  - to develop an ideological bulwark against communism
  - and equally to develop an economic stronghold in the region.
- 3) Economically this meant the difficult balance act between
  - autarky (combating potential or as ‘impending’ perceived dependence from the ‘mother country’)
  - overcoming traditional economy dominated by agriculture
  - the emerging real dependence from the global economy that paradoxically allowed for the first time in modern history<sup>2</sup> of the island nation to gain its independence.
- 4) Taken together, the socio-political and the economic constellation make a general political outline likely of which actually many features can be found up to the current days:
  - Any economic actor, even global players, have to take into consideration that the production is largely bound to the principles of private production – family enterprises still play an important role.
  - Even where these are not prevailing as such, the normative system is very much based on the patriarchal structures with the obvious role of hierarchical patterns.
  - Thus the conflict between formal accountability, hierarchical subordination, obedience and respect are much more distinct or at least visible and drastic as they would be either in the traditional family setting itself or in the modern Fordist and Taylorist setting. Due to the amalgamation of the two – traditionalist norms and capitalist principles of calculability – the principles gain an even sharper form.
- 5) In this constellation and with this tradition the development of both, democratic structures and a non-paternalist public social policy is difficult, especially with regard to care services. The challenge is given by the predominance of authoritarian political structures on the one hand and the prevalence of traditional values. This can be well illustrated by looking at *Confucianism with a Liberal Face*, as (though not with view on Taiwan) undertaken by L.H.M. Ling and Chih-yu Shih who quote Clark D. Neher. Although the understanding of liberalism is questionable, the following is interesting:
 

*One response from within Asia to the demands of democratization is a call for an ‘Asian-style democracy’ [reference is made: Foremost among its advocates are political leaders in the region like Lee Kuan Yew Yew of Singapore, Mahathier Mohammad of Malaysia, Suharto of Indonesia, and Roh Tae Woo of South Korea]. Clark Neher, a critic of this local approach, associates it with ‘patron-client communitarism, personalism, deference to authority, dominant political parties, and strong interventionist states.’ [reference, Neher, C.D.: Asian Style Democracy; Asian Survey 34(1994): 961]*

*(Ling, L.H.M./Shih, Chih-yu: Confucianism with a Liberal Face: The Meaning of Democratic Politics in Postcolonial Taiwan; in: The Review of Politics; 1998: 60/1: 61)*

It is of special interest in which way this political regime translates immediately for instance into Community care, analysed by John Harris and Yueh-Ching Chou who state:

*The strong element of continuity in this community development tradition can be seen in the ‘Social Welfare Communitization’ (1996) programme, enacted by the Ministry of the Interior, which emphasized the use of community development methods in building resource networks with volunteers and non-governmental organizations, not the granting of rights to service users [reference to: Chou, Y.C.: The relationship between persons with disabilities, families, and*

---

<sup>2</sup> During the time when Taiwan, then called Formosa, was dominated by the indigenous people and as well the early Chinese migrants (the Dutch and Portuguese colonial role is somewhat negligible) one can probably say that a kind of economic independence had been given.

*community: from perspective of deinstitutionalization welfare services model; paper presented at the Conference of Family Welfare and Family Policy; Soochow University, Taipei; 1997]. Because community care is delivered by non-governmental agencies, and welfare communitization provides a central government focus on community resource networks, there is a tendency for the two terms ('community care' and 'welfare communitization') to be used interchangeably by practitioners and academics [reference to Leu, B.C.: Reflections on Community Care in Taiwan, from the development of community care in Britain; paper presented at the Conference on Social Welfare Development in Taiwan: Past, Present and Future; Taiwan: April 1998] Harris, John/Chou, Yueh-Ching: Globalization or Glocalization? Community Care in Taiwan and Britain; in: European Journal of Social Work; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001; 4/2: 161-172; here: 167)*

The authors draw as well attention to the close link that exists to traditional Confucian values.

- 6) Finally, the changes of the social structures in Taiwan are irrefutable; of special interest are
- the demographic changes, including the migration with the subsequent disintegration of traditional family structures
  - the demand of a healthy, qualified and reliable workforce
  - the increasing availability of professional carers
  - the emergence of the consciousness of rights – civil, political and increasingly social rights – as relevant issues and the question of to reconcile Confucian traditions and Western-style rights-based approaches in daily life and politics alike.

It can be left open in which respect we are actually facing a fundamentally different developmental pattern if compared with the Western hemisphere. *Giovanni Arrighi* points on many parallels. It is as well interesting that the principle formational settings of capitalist development seem to be more important than the differences with regards of Asian specificities (*despite the largely positivist approach see e.g. for several Asian countries Hort, Sven Olsson/Kuhnle, Stein: The Coming of the East and South-East Asian Welfare States; in: Journal of European Social Policy; issue 2/2000: 162-184; with view especially on Japan: Kasza, Gregory J.: One World of Welfare. Japan in Comparative Perspective; Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 2006*).

Tentatively it is proposed that the question of enlightenment is of crucial importance. Paradoxically, the late Western enlightenment and its direct coupling with the development of capitalism and industrialism had been very much linked with theism at its origin and the move to deism, challenging people to reclaim power: power in terms of ability to act and care. On the other hand, the predominance of inner-enlightenment as it is typical for the Asian world, was not geared to reclaim at least part of divine almightiness. Instead, worldliness, striving for appropriation of the external world and goods was only accepted as far as it had been a mere necessity. Power as ability to act and care is very much grounded in control of the self (shamanism, inner enlightenment) and in the actual interlacement into networks, the embeddedness into relationships (*see in this context as well Tao, J./Drover, G.: Chinese and Western Notions of Need; Critical Social Policy, 17/1977: 5-26*).

In other words – and to employ the little knowledge of Chinese language – 社會 (society) and 社會的 (social), nominatum and adjectum (solely expressed by the ending 的) are nearly identical, the individual gains his/her genuine and own value only while entirely retiring from the environment.

#### *Approaching the World of the Institutionalised Europe*

Although it is largely forgotten that Asian countries had been as well hugely affected by post-war traumas and large-scale demolition after the Pacific War (*see for instance Gold, Thomas, B.: State and Society in the Taiwan Miracle; Armonk, N.Y. : M.E. Sharpe, 1986*), it is probably nevertheless true that the consequences of the war years had been much more devastating in Europe. One reason for this is that the war hit a region that was at the time industrially more advanced – thus infrastructure and industrial equipment that could be destroyed was further developed. Another reason has to be seen in the fact that WW-II was 'home made' – it had been German imperialism that caused WW-I and WW-II, a state in the middle of the warfare. The situation had been different if compared with the circumstances in the Asian region: here the war was in some way a 'foreign war'; furthermore, the

entire region was affected especially after WW-II/the Pacific War by regional and local conflicts<sup>3</sup> – especially the situation in Korea and Vietnam speaks volumes. The cold war was pushing into two directions – on the one hand tearing the continent apart with the capitalist West and the socialist East; on the other hand welding together the formerly adversarial countries of the West: against the East on the other hand, but leaving it as well in a schizophrenic position towards the US.<sup>4</sup>

In any case, all this meant that three forces had been very strong in Western Europe, namely

- \* centrifugal forces, unifying the divergent trends and aspiring to establish as well a common economic area;
- \* developmental forces in order to rebuild the economy – being able to connect to the high standard of developed capitalist economies from before the war and being forced to connect to such a standard as there was hardly any alternative economic possibility, not least due to the rules of competition and as the given situation actually allowed rebuilding the industry on higher standards
- \* finally, not least the geo-political position and the specific political situation of the post-war period necessitated some kind of statutory social policy – continuing pre-war traditions as for instance in Germany, being based on anti-war traditions as the Folkhemmet in Sweden or being concerned with what can be seen as crisis management as the establishment of the Beveridgean system in the UK.

All this was as well strongly knit into

*[c]apitalism, as a spirit*

as it had been mentioned earlier with reference to *Yeun-Wen Ku*; however, in the European case we find an additional turn by the rooting of capitalism in the movement of late enlightenment – and even the most open form of capitalism – the English system with for instance *Adam Smith*, *David Locke* and *Jeremy Bentham* as their mentors – had a strong foundation in humanism and the declaration of fundamental human rights, concerned with very general issues, in Wikipedia characterised by the words:

*The modern human rights movement originates in World War II, but the concept can be identified in all major religions, cultures and philosophies. Ancient Hindu law (Manu Smriti), Confucianism, the Qu'ran and the Ten Commandments all outline some of the rights now included in the UDHR. The concept of natural law, guaranteeing natural rights despite varying human laws and customs, can be traced back to Ancient Greek philosophers, while Enlightenment philosophers suggest a social contract between the rulers and the ruled. The African concept of ubuntu is a cultural view of what it is to be human. Modern human rights thinking is descended from these many traditions of human values and beliefs.*

*([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human\\_rights](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_rights) - 2/1/08 - 13:33; see for the ideologies behind European welfare regimes Herrmann, Peter: *Social Professional Activities and the State*; New York: Nova Publishers, 2007).*

What remains a fundamentally open question is in which way humanism and fundamental social rights are in their actual interpretation in Western countries bound to capitalism. *Hartley Dean* reminds us that

*[t]hough human right are often regarded as a class of natural or pre-legal rights, Clarke (1996: 119) points out that 'human' is no less a social and political construct than 'citizen' and, historically speaking, it is a term of more recent provenance. Citizen rights, Clarke contends, provide the model for human rights and not the other way round.*

*(Dean, Hartley: *Welfare Rights and Social Policy*; Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2002: 11; reference is made to: Clarke, P. Barry: *Deep Citizenship*; London: Pluto Press, 1996)*

Leaving this question aside, now and more specifically two countries deserve some attention – the one as case standing systematically against the Taiwanese system, the other showing several parallels to Taiwan. The one is Germany, the other Ireland and the individual points presented will follow the same pattern as applied before with regard to Taiwan.

---

<sup>3</sup> Though Western imperialist forces played an important role there.

<sup>4</sup> The Asian region did not play a major role in the framework of the confrontations of the different systems.

	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Ireland</b>
1	<p>Germany arose already relatively early – in the late middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century – as unified power. Despite the difficulties of the heritage of the ‘<i>Kleinstaaterei</i>’ (the small principedoms) there had been two unifying and identity-building forces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the establishment of a federal system which left strong powers to the <i>Laender</i> (which continued in specific terms the tradition of the principedoms)</li> <li>* the Bismarckian policy of sticks and carrots, leading to the establishment of social insurance systems, hugely contributing as well to the emerging national identity and even a kind of solidarity.</li> </ul> <p>Two other factors play a specific role in addition: despite the in part existing national integrity, the working class was ready and able to build a ‘state within the state’; though aiming on destabilising the German imperialism, this social democratic strategy finally contributed to its stability.</p> <p>Furthermore – though later – especially WW-I contributed in a sad way to the national unification – captured and confirmed in the words of emperor Wilhelm II, saying in the Reichstag ‘<i>Ich kenne keine Parteien mehr, kenne nur noch Deutsche</i>’ (From now on, I do not know any parties, I only know Germans), the foundation of the ‘<i>Burgfriedenspolitik</i>’ of the social democrats.</p>	<p>Ireland’s identity building is extremely torn in contradictions: Throughout the history, the island nation had been subject to occupation: by Spanish, French and of course not least the English. Whereas the first two left at one stage, the latter still is occupying part of the island and it had been the issue of the English occupation that coined very much the identity issue in Ireland. What is important, however, is the fact that much of the national question had been – and still is – embellished as religious question – the protestant/British/North standing against the catholic/Irish/South.</p> <p>In consequence the Catholic church could gain and maintain a strong power; in the predominantly agricultural setting a working class could hardly develop. The centralised state of the small country was entirely ‘occupied’ by the church – despite the formal independence. This meant not least that this kind of identity meant to a large extent a withdrawal of the state from social policy.</p>
2	<p>Although the United States of North America played as well a role as target for emigrants in earlier years, the US gained importance only in the post-WW-II years. Help coming from the European Recovery Program/Marshall-Plan played a crucial role in promoting Germany’s re-mergence as global power.</p>	<p>The US in particular had been for a long time a collecting pond for many emigrants from Ireland, not least during and after the years of the famine in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is from here that strong bonds developed. It is important to mention that this relationship was by no means one-sided. Although the material aspect can probably be seen as one-sided – people leaving to the US, and being granted asylum for economic reasons there is another side to it: despite the Irish strive for autarky, Ireland had already in the fifties been considered as valuable country for US-investment (<i>see Herrmann, Peter: It is the text Tiogar Ceilteach – An Enlargement Country of the 70s as Showcase?; <a href="http://www.ucc.ie/en/socialpolicy/WilliamThompsonWorkingPapers/DocumentFile,37827,en.pdf">http://www.ucc.ie/en/socialpolicy/WilliamThompsonWorkingPapers/DocumentFile,37827,en.pdf</a></i>).</p> <p><i>Capitalism, as a spirit</i> meant in this case as well the partial digress from the enlightenment and humanist European tradition, allowing strong American influences to succeed.</p>

3	<p>The country managed from an early stage to develop a strong industrial standing, not least due to the strong traditions in heavy industries, later developed by an internationally distinguished light industries (in particular chemistry, important as well pharmaceutical industries); although being strongly developed as war industries (heavy industries before and leading to WW-II, light industries catching up towards the end of WW-II, hugely gaining from the policies in the concentration camps), the devastation after the war could actually managed in a beneficial way. The need to develop the country from the scratch, the integration into internationally rather favourable conditions (European integration, Marshall Plan, assignation of the eastern part of the country, which had been the most destroyed part of the country, and with this as well the externalisation of the poor agricultural regions and of reparation costs<sup>5</sup>) allowed the country actually to gain an advantageous position if compared with other Western European countries. – Rather than retaining the country within close boundaries, the international constellation favoured the re-emergence of a strong imperialist power.</p>	<p>The dependency from England over a long time and the role of the country as agricultural <i>hinterland</i> kept the country in an ongoing reliance even after the declaration of independence. Economically this meant that, despite the aspired autarky a strong dependency determined the development at least until the late fifties. Paradoxically, the opening of the economy allowed developing a relative independence – relative, as it allowed to establish now a strong links especially between Ireland and the US, but increasingly as well with other European countries.</p>
4	<p>Although – as at least in all European countries – there is a dominance of SMEs, the economic structure is strongly characterised by large enterprises, for a relatively long time remaining under German control (i.e. national dominance of the economy). However, though the production had been for a long time (and still is to a relevant degree) under national control, there is since long time a strong dependency on external markets not least for exports of goods whereas on the other hand an import of capital has to be mentioned.</p> <p>Although this is a factor overemphasised in many statements especially by the employers organisations as factor limiting free entrepreneurship, the bureaucracy and the proverbial sense for law and order surely plays a role in the German entrepreneurship. It is a kind of perverse ‘cunning of reason’ that exactly those who complain about bureaucracy etc. are for themselves claiming a patriarchal ruling; and at the same time they apply in many cases arbitrary methods of governing.</p> <p>Finally an important factor is that managerialism in the sense of a separation of property and administration of capital took place at a relatively early stage – amongst others expression of the high degree of socialised production (large role for instance of stock market enterprises).</p>	<p>The industrial development of the country, if there was one at all, took place at a very late stage. Actually it is more appropriate to say that Ireland’s economic development skipped to a large degree the industrial phase, immediately entering a path from an agricultural economy to a service industry. What is important, however, is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* that this development is barely based on indigenous forces and</li> <li>* that such development is problematic in terms of sustainability.</li> </ul> <p>The enterprise structure in terms of governance is a strange mixture between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* clientelist</li> <li>* paternalist and</li> <li>* “post-modern” patterns.</li> </ul>
5	<p>The governance structure as it is developed today is a weird amalgam,</p>	<p>The governance structure as it is developed today is a weird amalgam,</p>

<sup>5</sup> Eastern Germany had to pay reparation costs to the USSR, where as Western Germany received money from the USA

	<p>consisting of four main elements, namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* regulated subsidiarity and corporatism</li> <li>* bureaucracy and juridification</li> <li>* hierarchy and finally</li> <li>* civic engagement.</li> </ul>	<p>consisting of four main elements, namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* unregulated subsidiarity and corporatism</li> <li>* bureaucracy, clientelism and red tape</li> <li>* hierarchy and finally</li> <li>* civic engagement.</li> </ul> <p>With regard to the latter it can be stated that the pattern of civic engagement is actually very similar to what had been said above with regard to community development approaches in Taiwan.</p>
6	<p>The social structure is marked by a massive broadening of the middle class for some time of the post-WW-II years. The polarisation in the context of the students movement in the late sixties paradoxically fostered this development. However, over the last years an increasing polarisation can be seen, leading to increasing precarity.</p> <p>The family structure had been for a long time ‘moderate’ – although frequently mention is made of a process of ‘overaging’, problems are not really arising from this side.</p>	<p>There are some major changes in the social structure, going beyond the secular trends or playing at least a specific role insofar they meet a previously distinct developmental pattern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* a rather harsh decline of the fertility rate</li> <li>* the re-immigration of Irish nationals who left the country mainly for economic reasons</li> <li>* immigration by three groups, namely <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ asylum seekers</li> <li>➤ workforce from the new member states of the EU, especially from Poland and Lithuania</li> <li>➤ highly qualified and specialised ‘green card holders’</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>At the same time we find a capital emigration in the recent years: large-scale investment by the nouveau riche and also small-scale investment by private households (especially house property).</p> <p>From a country in which poverty had been very widespread, Ireland developed in the recent years to a country with huge disparities.</p>

## Excursus: Normative and Religious System – Do Traditional Values Matter in Modernity?

Going far back – and for the reader obviously going a detour – it is interesting to look at artwork in the Chinese tradition. Although the following pieces are randomly chosen, they seem to be characteristic for a tradition that marks much of the traditional view on what the character and role of the human being is thought to be – arts usually being a reflection of the societal being (folk arts is rarely the major heritage). 'Early Spring' by Kuo Hsi (1072), 'Autumn Colours on the Ch'iao and Hua Mountains' by Chao Meng-fu (1296) 'T'ao Ku Presenting a Lyric' by T'ang Yin (Ming Dynasty) and others, all are typical in as they reflect a very specific secularity that can be seen as characteristic. Although the following needs further backing by in depth research, it is flamboyant that arts and religion are oriented towards the human being and especially the human being in (usually) his inner relatedness with nature. Flamboyant is as well the dominance of nature – it is left to the observer if the human being delves into nature or if it is the other way round: the nature providing a space in which the human is able to develop, to unfold and to find a true being.

Finally, it is an interesting feature that

*after traditional Chinese painting had developed for some time that text in the form of colophons and inscriptions were added, opening up a whole new field for the art. In terms of such textual additions, no set standard was used. ... The artist and any associate, viewer, or collector can take part and give full vent to their emotions on a work of art. The artist's inscription was most often written on the surface of the painting itself, being viewed as a key element of the work. ... Collectors and viewers sometimes go one step further and use space beyond the painting surface itself, such as added pieces of paper, the mounting, a frontispiece or an endpiece, to present text after text of comments and exposition. (Wang, Yao-t'ing/Feng, Ming-chu [editor-in-chief]: *Marvelous Sparks of the Brush. Painting & Calligraphy, Books & Documents*; Taipei: National Palace Museum, 2007: 53)*

– Of course, this is very much an amateur view. However, it may be of some inspirational meaning in order to develop an understanding of social service settings in a social quality perspective and their dimension of empowerment. All these explorations as well as a look at traditional Chinese religious systems point into one direction: that the view of the human being had been very much secular, concerned with the actual being. However, it seems to be another pattern than the one used in Western traditions. Much can be said about the values – and in many debates we find the debate of the meaning of Confucianism, trying to answer the question if and to which extent the Confucian values play a role making the Asian system distinct if compared with Western systems (*see as one for many: Walker, Alan/Wong, Chack-kie [eds.]: East Asian Welfare Regimes in Transition. From Confucianism to Globalisation*; Bristol: Polity Press, 2005). However, the values usually stated as distinct are probably best expressed by pointing on the 11<sup>th</sup> of Confucius' Analects in book XII, reading as follows:

*Duke Ching of Ch'i asked Confucius about government. Confucius answered, 'Let the ruler be a ruler, the subject a subject, the father a father, the son a son.' The Duke said, 'Splendid! Truly, if the ruler be not a ruler, the subject not a subject, the father not a father, the son not a son, then even if there be grain, would I get to eat it?'*

*(Confucius: The Analects. Book XII. 24; Translated with an Introduction by D.C. Lau; London: Penguin Books, 1979: 115)*

If taken as core principle, it is this that expresses the main idea of social harmony. If compared with the general Western tradition, however, we have to say that many of the concrete values can also be seen as part of the standard repertoire of European or Western thinking. Going back to the ancient traditions, looking at Christian teaching etc. – the 'commandments' seem to be rather similar. And still, there seems to be a difference that cannot be simply taken from the differences in the current modes of production, accumulation regimes and modes of regulation, distinct features that are not mere ideological differences, as we usually understand them in terms of modern political ideologies. The thesis is – and it is taken from many first-sight evidences studying Taoism, Confucianism, as well Buddhism, gaining some insight into cultural studies – that the process of enlightenment took at a much earlier stage place in Asian countries, in particular in the Chinese culture than this had been the case in the Western culture. As said before, in the European case we find the rooting of capitalism in

the movement of enlightenment. And we can see the difference, looking at the painting that had been mentioned before, giving some insight into Chinese thinking and looking on the other hand on *Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe*, first published in 1719. Coming from Western literature, this piece is taken as pendant to the before mentioned Asian paintings. Crusoe, after he rejected acknowledging two warnings demanding to accept what had been seen as god-given social order, stranded on the deserted island, entirely depending on himself. However, rather than 'finding his self in himself', he replicated his history and his socialisation, finally in the domestication of Friday. Actually, when first seeing the footsteps on the shores and being confronted with the uncivilised inhabitants he was first afraid of being dragged into such rules of a pure, 'unregulated' being. He regained his personality, his character, his security – one could say: his being – only after regaining external rules, providing order: time frames, reporting and accounting system (his diary) etc.

If it is right that enlightenment can be located at a much earlier time in the Asian countries, it means as well that it is not in the same way linked to capitalism. And in actual fact – this is as well the reason for mentioning the pictures as they visualise this very much – the enlightenment can be seen very much as an inner enlightenment. Despite of and linked with shamanism and necromancy in many instances, we are facing a tradition that has three direct meanings for our subject:

- \* Ruling is not secularised after first being deified, as this is the case in the Christian traditions (*see for the latter: Herrmann, Peter, 2007: Ruling between God, Government and People; William Thompson Working Papers, 2; available at <http://www.ucc.ie/en/socialpolicy/WilliamThompsonWorkingPapers/>*). Whereas in Christian tradition god creates man – as most impressively presented in *Michelangelo's 'Creation'* – in Asian tradition more likely man create themselves, striving to a higher form of existence, but seeing this higher existence very much as an existence hic et nunc – as self-actualisation.
- \* Then, performance and servitude is not geared towards the afterlife – not in the understanding of a Christian religion. Rather, it is very much
  - linked to personal enlightenment
  - and can as such easily be transformed into principles of secular seniority.
- \* Finally, empowerment gains an entirely different meaning then – in the Western tradition – going back to the ancient teaching and linking well into the understanding of modern enlightenment – empowerment is very much about the orientation towards practice and practicing 'the good'. *Aristotle*, for example writes

*Every art and every investigation, and likewise every practical pursuit or undertaking, seems to aim at some good: hence it has been well said that the good is that which all things aim.*

*(Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics; Translated and with Notes by Harris Rackham.*

*With an Introduction by Stephen Watt; Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996: 3)*

Furthermore, nearly every contemplation about what is 'good', is linked to practice, not least to the questions of

- the management of the household and with this the conscientious acting with regards to some kind of common good or common welfare (*see for instance the instructive writing by Xenophon [Xenophon: Gespraech ueber die Haushaltsfuehrung; in: Oekonomische Schriften. Griechisch und Deutsch: Gert Audring; Berlin: Akademie Verlag; 1992: 13-128]*)<sup>6</sup>
- the good conduct towards divinity.

It is another form of trinity: action – good – commonality, taking together, very much an outward orientation.

Different in Asian cultures, we find linked with the inner enlightenment the orientation on empowerment much more as contradicting matter, being concerned

- on the one hand with the development of inner strength
- on the other hand dealing with the amalgamation of individual and social, intrinsically linked together in the principle of 'shu', mentioned as crucial issue amongst others in *Confucius' Analects*

---

<sup>6</sup> Seen in this light, we see of course (a) the Aristotelian limitation by being stuck in methodological individualism and (b) the link between *Aristotelian's* 'management society' and the works of *Adam Smith*. However, an important difference is that Aristotle sees the good very much as a secular issue whereas *Smith* actually outsourced the good: goods as the well-being is said to be a matter of the good in terms of commodities whereas the good in terms of welfare is left to moral philosophy and with this not least to god.

*Tzu-kung asked, 'Is there a single word which can be a guide to conduct throughout one's life?' The Master said, 'It is perhaps the word 'shu'. Do not impose on others what you yourself do not desire.'*  
(*Confucius: The Analects. Book XV. 24; Translated with an Introduction by D.C. Lau; London: Penguin Books, 1979: 135*)

Although this requires further detailed research, the working theses is that both frequently made statements – one saying that Chinese tradition denies individuality, the other saying that there is no understanding of the social – are insufficiently reflecting the scope of the 'national character'. Prevalent is a disregard of Western-style individualism and equally the understanding of communities and societies as distinct, 'external' force. Borders seem to blur; respect of property, including intellectual property is less meaningful; on the other hand, positions, hierarchies, seniority etc. play a major role as well in terms of empowerment. And from here it seems to be justified saying that both, individual and social are appropriated by roles into which the individual emerges, finding their expression in a limitation of matters of concern, in the Confucian demand

*not [to] concern yourself with matters of government unless they are the responsibility of your office*  
(*Confucius: The Analects. Book XIV. 26; Translated with an Introduction by D.C. Lau; London: Penguin Books, 1979: 128*),

a matter that gets an additionally interesting perspective when read together with the 11<sup>th</sup> of the Analects in book XII as they are quoted elsewhere.

Of course, this is so far more or less an impressionistic view. And of course, it is extremely difficult to understand these patters today – secularisation has as well an international and global dimension: on the one hand 'secularisation' is a matter that did not only strike Western cultures insofar we understand it as turning away from traditional norms and attitudes; on the other hand it is a matter of blending different normative systems, as well of the externalisation of norms and attitudes. So, it is not only a matter not finding 'ideal forms' in reality; it is as well a matter of different forms amalgamating. In any case traditions are not entirely overcome – rather, it is a dialectical historical process of transforming certain patterns into the new formation.

### **An Integrated Approach Towards a New Care Framework – Outlook**

These remarks point only on a few characteristic elements – a thorough analysis of social services in their different settings has to remain subject of further research. However, already the few remarks can throw some light on the assessment of social services in the light of the Social Quality Approach (*for more general discussions on social quality and social services see Herrmann, Peter: Person-Oriented Services and Social Service Providers in Comparative and European Perspective; Nova Publishers; 2007; Herrmann, Peter: various contributions in Herrmann, Peter/Brandstaetter, Albert/ O'Connell, Cathal: Defining Social Services in Europe. Between the Particular and the General; Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2007*).

Three issues are essential for developing a methodological framework as it at the centre of this contribution:

i.

Looking at care services as core of sustainable and empowering welfare systems has to look at the 'state' or the system of governance in which the services are located.

In this regard the European governance structure is seen much more legalistic, pragmatic and secularised. This means that even clientelist and familiarist structures are at least in principle seen as public and that the political system is accountable in legal terms and as well in economic terms, being directly linked to the capitalist accumulation regime. This means that service provision in the West has the advantage of calculability and accountability; however the advantage of Asian systems seems to be its nearness and personal obligatory embeddedness. Still, looking at the latter this is definitely as well a pattern that even today prevails extensively also in the West.

ii.

Looking at care services as core of sustainable and empowering welfare systems has to consider as well the understanding of empowerment. In a social quality perspective, the general framework for such an analysis is given by the 3x4-factor matrix as outlined above: conditional, constitutional and normative factors. However, the concretisation differs according to the historical background as well. In Asia, the challenge is to overcome an individualist approach that is very much based on an inwards oriented enlightenment, distinct from Western enlightenment that had been very much characterised by its direct link to the emergence of capitalism, where consequently the challenge is to overcome commodification and contractualist reductionism.

iii.

Looking at care services as core of sustainable and empowering welfare systems has finally to consider the definition of and relationship between individual and social/community. The Western perspective is based on distinctiveness, allowing the development of the individual through society and making societal development possible on the basis of personalities. This is different in the Asian cultural system of thoughts where we find an amalgamation of personality and sociality in structures of status and hierarchies.

---

Finally, the discussion of different subjects as it is delivered here, has to be seen in the main as delivering some thoughts for developing a systematic methodological framework. Coming back to *Karl Marx* words as cited in the beginning,

*The concrete is concrete because it is a synthesis of many determinations, thus a unity of the diverse.*

*(Marx, Karl: Economic Manuscripts of 1957-58; in: Karl Marx. Frederick Engels. Collected Works; Volume 28: Karl Marx: 1857-61: London: Lawrence&Wishart; 1986: 38)*

This means not least that any care service has to be seen in the context of the accumulation regimes and the respective mode of regulation – some remarks had been made already before. Any attempt of developing services in terms empowering welfare systems has paradoxically to go beyond these existing structures, allowing the development of real and thus somewhat independent practice of human beings. Then, services are not about commodified segmented activities but about developing rights-based citizenship. Any suggestion of suggesting technically lead assessments of service provision, including the current proposals for ‘neutral’ quality assessment are misleading in their under-complexity.

This means as well, that the notion of the developmental welfare state gains another meaning. Any social policy and as part of this; any care service has a productive role and is linked to the productive system. The actually important question is, however, to gain another consensus on what is produced.

---

i Director of the Independent Research Institute European Social, Organisational and Science Consultancy, Aghabullogue, Ireland,  
Senior Research Fellow at the Department of Applied Social Studies, National University of Ireland, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland  
Senior Advisor to the European Foundation on Social Quality, Amsterdam, Netherlands  
Currently visiting professor at the Department of Social Work, Social Policy Research Centre. National Taiwan University; Taipei, Taiwan  
mail to: herrmann@esosc.eu

ii The elaboration of the paper is to a large extent part of the work during a research visit in 2007, made possible with the generous support by the Institute for Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences, National Taiwan University, Taipei and allowing close cooperation with the Social Policy Research Centre at the National Taiwan University. I am grateful as well to various colleagues, in particular Hsiao-hung Nancy Chen, National Chengchi University, Taipei; «GreetingLine», National Taiwan University, Taipei; Ming-Cheng Kuo National Chengchi University, Taipei; «GreetingLine» Yang, National Taiwan University, Taipei; Shih-Jiun Shi, National Taiwan University, Taipei.  
The discussion of social services is as well closely linked to the work of the author as scientific advisor of the project on Quality and Accessibility of Social Services for Inclusion (QuASi) which had been financed by the Commission of the European Communities and of which Eurodiaconia (<http://eurodiaconia.org/>) had been the lead organisation. Some of the definitions are taken from the final report thereof.