

**FROM WELFARE STATE TO WELFARE SOCIETY:  
THE PARTNERSHIP MODEL**

**Inaugural Lecture  
To the memory of my  
Mother, Anna Gondos, Judit Urbanek and Stan van Asbroeck**

**Gabor Hegyesi  
Maastricht, 22 May 2003**

**I. INTRODUCTION: A PERSONAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE  
THEME OF THE LECTURE**

First of all, it is a great pleasure and honour to even formulate the words for, and then be at this event. Also, I would like to say many thanks to my family, my friends, and everybody who came to this lecture not only to listen to the lecturer, but to be with the community of CESRT, with the colleagues of the Faculty of Social Work in Maastricht and Sittard and with the whole community of the Hogeschool Zuyd. We all feel the importance of setting up centers of knowledge in Colleges, and I do my best to contribute to this project. I feel extremely honoured to be invited to this position from Hungary in the very year that my country became *de jure* a member of the European Union. I would like to express our thanks to all of you who supported the enlargement in the name of mutual respect and partnership.

The invitation to CESRT is also the outcome of partnership between people who trust each other and who share values, and between countries that can offer each other different cultures and knowledge.

You see we are already in the center of the topic of the lecture. Though its title concentrates on a very special form of "partnership", namely on a possible model of the post-welfare state regime, it is important "to put it into context". In other words, it is important to see that the concept of "partnership" is broad, and when we try to understand its meaning we have to take into consideration the connotations, which we have inherited in our everyday culture, language and life. Actually, life begins with three basic actions: feeding, eliminating, and partnership. We are making partnerships of necessity and of choice, consciously and unconsciously, with each other, and the Earth around us in our whole life.

Partnership above all else has a very important personal connotation. It is true for my life, too - various kinds of partnerships played an enormous important

role in my life, as I discovered while writing this paper. Without them, which helped me all along my life, most probably, I would not be here.

Our families form the first kind of partnership, naturally, if we are lucky. Lucky people have supporting families, and I am a lucky person. E.g. my father was my first partner in playing table football in my childhood. Later, my mother became my first typist and secretary, who then supported me all along my way in life. She passed away two years ago, while I was teaching here in Maastricht. Also, I would like to mention my sister who left Hungary exactly on this very day in 1970, and went to live to Australia. Years later she (and her partner!) would help me to study at Monash University between 1985 and 1987 where I could get a Masters in Social Work which helped to establish social work education in Hungary. Recently, she has driven my attention to the “theory and practice” of synergy that has enriched a lot my research into “partnership”.

Also, in Australia I established my first life partnership with my first wife and with our wonderful daughter from where I constantly get love and support.

Then I established my second partnership in Hungary, and I owe a lot to my “life partner”, to my wife, who was doing all the stuff that I did not, when I wrote my papers or did my research. And, of course, I owe a lot to the kids, who are the losers of competitions for free time.

The second type of partnership is the circle of friends and colleagues in Hungary and abroad. Again, I am very lucky in this respect, as life gave me the chance to give and get friendship, which is one of the nicest partnerships, as it is not given by birth, but is chosen and accepted mutually. It is impossible to list all the important friends in my life, and I would like to say many thanks to all my friends – and, I am sure, they will know who I am talking about. Still, I would like to mention four names among them. Anna Gondos and Judit Urbanek, with whom we started the first Hungarian non-governmental social services at the beginning of the 1980s and who, unfortunately, are no longer with us; and Katalin Talyigás from Hungary and Jon Van Til from the US. They have been partners in the field of social work, civil society, and research for a long time – and I hope, for many years still to come. Also, I am very lucky with my places of work. I can mention some good examples such as the Social Work Department at my University and other schools where I teach; the various civil organizations where I can really enjoy the joy of free creation of partnership with other volunteers and colleagues, and the beauty of teaching itself, which is again another partnership with students.

Stan van Asbroeck established the third circle of partnership. It happened in 1992 in Spa, Belgium, at the Conference of the European Association of Schools of Social Work. Without even knowing me, he asked if I was interested in setting up a TEMPUS-program among Belgian, Dutch and Hungarian schools of social work. This has become a kind of collaboration of mutual friendship and I think

the names of the main partners, with whom we have worked for many years in close partnership deserve to be mentioned. Beside Stan van Asbroeck I want to mention Jan Agten from Katholieke Hogeschool Geel, Nol Reverda, Anne van den Berg and Peter Hendriks from the Hogeschool Zuyd, Sue Lawrence from the London Metropolitan University (they joined us three years later), and my colleagues from ELTE University, Kinga Goncz and Ágnes Darvas. (Naturally, many other colleagues played an important role in the creation of the program, but it would take too much space to write down all their names).

The meeting with Stan has proven strong: I think we met at the right place and at the right time. Unfortunately, he left us here in this world much too early. But it is true for him and the other colleagues that maybe the most important factor in establishing this very firm partnership was that the meeting itself happened among the proper people. We shared common values, our interests were similar, and we were motivated to spend time and work hard together, which we did with good intention.

This team then, probably I could say that with the leadership of Nol Reverda and Sue Lawrence, created the MACESS course (Master of Comparative European Social Studies), and a further initiative of Nol is CESRT (Comparative European Social Research and Theory). I really appreciate that I can still be in both initiatives, and can be a part of the broad community of the Hogeschool Zuyd. And, I can enjoy the wonderful teamwork of my colleagues in both institutes, with whom I think we work in a real partner relationship. This ceremony is partly one of the outcomes of a long partnership that started ten years ago.

This short journey through my life from a special point of view not only served the purpose of saying thanks to the members of my partnerships, but also gave me a chance to do the initial research (through “participatory observation”) into them. The question of this “research” was to find an answer to one of the important questions in everybody’s life namely why one relationship works well, while another does not. In other words, what makes a relationship a “partnership”, while there are relationships that could be described as “neutral” or “conflictive”, or even “hateful”? Though the personal, social psychological level is not a part of our main research I will come back to this point, because it has its own merit in analyzing the topic of the lecture.

\* \* \*

The **social connotation of “partnership”** has an equal importance also. Again, at a very early stage of my lecture, I would like to stress that one could describe neither personal life, nor social history with the notion of “partnership” alone. That would be not more than an ideology of a movement or that of a political party. In social life, just like in our personal life, we always find good examples when cooperation, collaboration, partnership, or conversely conflict, struggle, war characterize the relationship. There are “archetypes” (Jung, 1988) not only at personal level, but also in history. Let me refer to two famous, well-known historical archetypes from the Roman age. One example would be for partnership, the other for the opposite, for antagonism.

Once a riot broke out in Rome. The aristocrats were very afraid of them. One of them went out to the people and told them his version of society. As it is known, he said that society works just like our body. We have the head, we have the heart, and we have hands and legs. They are all needed to be able to have a full life – he said. They do not struggle with each other, rather they have a good division of labour, and they work in partnership with each other. Similarly to this, in society we have all these functions: you need somebody who is thinking and making decisions, and you need people who are working. And, just like the parts of our body, they should be in peaceful partnership with each other, instead of fighting with each other. This speech was so successful that everybody went home. It is obvious that this approach of partnership can also be the archetype of a conservative policy that keeps the status quo of society in the interest of those who have the power. I shall come back to this point later.

The other archetype can be the Spartacus revolution. It is difficult to imagine Spartacus as somebody who is in partnership with the Roman aristocrats. Everything is in between the two opposing positions.

The aim of this introductory presentation – the basic concept of this new CESRT research – is to contribute to the clarification of the nature and the effect of partnership in our new welfare era. Every welfare model can be characterized by some degree of partnership. What we are looking for is a more consciously balanced one. Is it possible? Is it accepted? Are there good political, economic, and professional conditions to reach these goals? Do we know enough about this model? Can we write down the protocol, the characteristics of a partnership model? To be able to respond these questions at a satisfactory, in-depth level, we first have to understand the development and changes of welfare regimes and the special, very complex and contradictory conditions of the birth of the concept of welfare society.

## II. THE CONCEPTS OF WELFARE STATE AND WELFARE SOCIETY

The literature on welfare regimes is enormous and our knowledge about its meaning and history is widely spread. There has been a broad and sometimes wild political debate in the last twenty years even among people at large, let alone professionals. The fate of the welfare state has become a part of the everyday political discourse. This gives me the chance to only summarize the most important concepts and models that are necessary to later analyze the partnership model, without the need to go into too many details.

### a. The origins and meanings of welfare state

Since the existence of any kind of human life on the Globe, from the simplest tribe fifty thousand years ago until the most complex industrialized states in the Northern Hemisphere, they all have had to do something about the social problems in their societies. Poverty, illness, death of husbands, loss of parents, becoming paralyzed, becoming a victim of war, fire that destroyed the village, or flood that destroyed the whole yearly harvest etc., are on the sad pages of the Large Historian Book of Human kind. For thousands of years, in the case of such a tragedy, it was mainly the family or the tribe that had a list of mainly unconscious problem-solving methods. They were embedded into the everyday *reciprocal exchange systems of local societies* (Polanyi, 1946). In a way, it is quite understandable that Arthur E. Imhof (1985) asks in the title of his book: "how could our ancestors survive" under those harsh circumstances? Anthropologists know a lot about those defending mechanisms of ancient societies which made it possible such as family ties, social protection of networks of relatives and neighbours, tribal witch doctors, the rich belief systems of local societies, the symbolic and real gift relationships (see e.g. Lévi-Strauss, 1955).

There were two other helping systems beside the one mentioned above, namely the always existing (various) churches and the various power systems (the pharaohs, kings, aristocrats, landlords, etc.) who had a kind of obligation towards their people to support them in difficult situations. This long era can be called from our point of view as the pre-social policy period, as there was no state policy on 'what to do with social problems and with those who suffered as victims of them'. Naturally, the state always interfered if the status quo was endangered (see the many riots, revolutions), but in these cases social problems were seen merely as problems of order.

This was exactly the case when capitalism was "invented" in England during the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries when landlords started to get rid of their peasants in order to gain more free land for sheep. These people were wandering throughout the country and naturally, without any income and support they became "hungry criminals". Thousands of them were hung, imprisoned, or later

deported to the prison-continent, Australia, as they were forced to steel if they wanted to survive. The number of social problems was growing, and the Catholic Church could not do its usual work as Henry VIII dissolved it, and established the Anglican Church. Under these very difficult historical conditions we can see the birth of the concept of the first modern state intervention to solve social problems not only by police forces but by prevention and social institutions. The Poor Law (1601, Elisabeth I) was a breakthrough, and Ferge (1989) may state that the "*marginal period*" of welfare begins with the Poor Law. The goal was just a marginal intervention into society, but since then the *state* has a more and more important in social policy.

More exactly, it is in the second half of the 19th century that we can count the origin of the modern welfare state. Ferge (ibid) says that this is the start of the "*corrective period*". This refers to the goals of the new way of thinking. First England tried to correct the devastating consequences of industrialization through new social work methods in the 1870s and 80s (e.g. settlements, or the work of the ladies of the Charity Organization Society); then Germany did the same through the first social security schemes since 1883. Peter Flora (1995, p.503) gives an explanation of this change: "The modern welfare state is a European invention, just like the nation state, mass democracy and industrial capitalism. The birth of the welfare state was a kind of response to the problems caused by capitalist industrialization itself: it was forced by democratic class struggle, and stepped into the place of nation states."

It is not accidental that the famous book of Tönnies "*Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*" (Community and State) was published in this period. Again, it proves what we saw in England before the Poor Law was introduced which is that the traditional, embedded community problem-solving mechanisms cannot efficiently face the new challenges of industrialization, that's why new state intervention is needed.

It is important to see that when the modern welfare states stepped into the third phase of their development after the World War II, they already had different characteristics (based on for example the above mentioned historical roots). But, they all had some similar goals as well, as Briggs (1991, p.226) listed:

- To guarantee minimal income to people in need
- To strengthen the role of social security systems in order to prevent risk situations of people
- To assure social services to everybody who need them at the highest possible level.

Also, probably the most popular concept of the welfare state namely that of Thomas Marshall (1954, 1991) emphasizes that reaching a high level of social rights is the main characteristics of every welfare state. As it is well known, he states that there is a logical development in societies as from the 18<sup>th</sup> century

when we could gain basic human rights through revolutions. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century nations could reach various political rights. It was the 20<sup>th</sup> century when, through the welfare states, people began to reach social and cultural rights, as the highest possible level of citizenship.

It was then Esping-Andersen (utilizing Titmuss' famous typology of welfare models) who managed to go beyond the similarities, and gave a more political and value based typology of welfare states highlighting some of their very important differences (1990). The liberal, the corporatist and social democratic (Scandinavian) models – though the typology is under serious criticism – help us to think deeper and in a more complex manner than before. Also, he does not deal with the Southern and Central-East European countries, which is another limitation of his model (Leibfried, 1992; Lorenz, 1994).

Historically it is interesting that when Esping-Andersen published his theses on welfare state regimes in 1991, there were many politicians and scientists who stated that the welfare state era was over. They already had another name for it namely, the *welfare society*. Why did it happen? What was wrong with the welfare states?

#### **b. The crisis of welfare states**

The answer for the last question is very important as it (or maybe they) can give explanation(s) about the success of the partnership model.

Again, there are a great number of books, articles, papers, and presentations dealing with this issue. Though there were discussions and debates about the welfare state all the time, the real attack on its concept and practice began with the gaining of power by right-wing politicians and neo-liberal and neo-conservative believers, Margaret Thatcher in 1979 and Ronald Reagan in 1980. It is not accidental that both politicians got power in the liberal types of welfare states. It might not be accidental too, that they came into power almost at the same time. And Mishra published a book on the theme that became very famous in as early as 1984: *The welfare State in Crisis*. He wrote: "In varying degrees and forms, the welfare state throughout the industrialized West is in disarray" (p. xiii). His writing and that of Johnson (1987, p.31) mention what may be the most important constituents of crisis:

- \* **Economic problems:** after the oil crisis the most industrialized countries had to face lower rates of economic growth, higher levels of unemployment and lower rates of investment. Cameron (1985, p. 8-21) argues that the growth of public expenditure was responsible for declining investment and loss of competitiveness.
- **Problems of Government:** It is a fact that the Keynesian economic policies and Beveridge-style welfare policies contributed to the growth in size of

governments, to the increased government borrowing and spending, as an inevitable consequence of the working and functioning of the welfare state. For the New right, however, the growth of government is an unmitigated disaster. As Norman Johnson writes (*ibid*, p.34.) for them the intervention of these governments in the economy in order to reach the goals of their welfare programs and to provide various welfare services was a failure. The consequence was only a massive expenditure of resources and a great deal of harm, while these efforts brought little benefit. Their verdict was that governments of welfare states became overloaded, bureaucratic, inefficient and ineffective. (See also Friedman and Friedman (1980), Hayek, F.A. (1944), Gilder, G. (1982), etc.)

- **Fiscal problems:** at this point left- and right-wing critics of the welfare state agreed that this kind of problem was embedded in the system. It was because fiscal problems stem from the kind of structural problem that governments tried to achieve a balance between expenditure of the growing demands for public goods and services, and the willingness of people to pay high tax for these welfare provisions.
- **Legitimacy crisis:** If there are great economic, governmental and fiscal problems (or many people believe that there are), this may lead to problems of legitimacy that can later turn into a **crisis**. As Habermas wrote (1976, p.46) “the political system requires an input of mass loyalty”, and if this loyalty is not given then a “legitimacy deficit” occurs namely, a legitimacy crisis happens.

Summarizing the views of the New Right theorists, they envisaged the collapse of the welfare state (and, they did their best to reach this goal). To avoid the collapse of the state there are two remedies only, they stated: a drastic reduction in the role of the state and a much firmer commitment to the principles of capitalism which are individualism, private property, the free market, competition and profit. Service will be provided in the *laissez-faire* policy of the new era again mainly by the family and voluntary organizations, instead of the welfare state.

### c. Search for a new welfare paradigm

A kind of competition began in order to change or reform the welfare state in the eighties. The neo-liberal attack on the welfare states was quick and successful, but there were also important criticisms from the supporters of the welfare state. Though they were a little bit slower, from the 1980s several publications appeared which looked for arguments either to defend the goals and practice of the welfare state, or at least to suggest ways to overcome some of the problems



or failures, while “not throwing out the baby with the bathwater” (Glennester, (1983), Walker (1984), Bean, Ferris, Whynes (1984), Klein, O’Higgins, (1985). Workshops, seminars, expert meeting were organized discussing this topic, and researchers looked for new concepts (e.g. Evers, Wintersberger, (1988), Gondos, Hegyesi (1984, 1987, 1989)).

Shortly, there were three major directions one could categorize the very complicated and colorful reform concepts during the decade (partly based on Johnson, *ibid*, p.179). One cannot say, however, that these changes occurred in one particular country or countries. Almost every country tried to introduce some elements of the new concepts, with more or less emphasis on some of them, according to the types of the Esping-Andersen welfare regimes. We could see more neo-liberal changes in Great Britain under the Tories, and more welfare partnership steps under the Blair government. We could experience more welfare-mix changes in Central-East-Europe and in Scandinavia, and even more partnership ideas in the corporatist countries where subsidiarity was the central concept of the welfare state, anyway.

- **The New Right/Neo-Conservative/Neo-Liberal plans.**

These categories do not completely cover each other; they do not exactly mean the same. However, from a distance, they belong to one type of “school”: they prefer market, and “fight” against the state. Pierre Bourdieu’s short definition (1998, p.3) sheds light into the meaning of neo-liberalism. According to him it is “the program of destroying of those collective structures which are able to stop the free market logic.” It means that neo-liberals want a minimal state, whereas the neo-conservatives’ attitude towards the state is “distrustful but not paranoid: they wish to see the state’s role reduced, but they recognise that it has a part to play in social policy” (Peele, 1984, p.17.). The New Right also shares this anti-statist attitude, but it is a more day-to-day political movement with strong anti-socialist, anti-women, anti-abortion, anti-divorce, anti-sex-education programs, favouring capitalism, the family, and favours fundamentalist religion (Levitas, 1986).

The practice of this concept, namely the cut of welfare expenditure has been a reality in many countries in the last 20 years. Naturally, even in the US and Great Britain, the changes always depended on which parties got into power. But, nevertheless, the policy of cutback became a policy mainly of those countries, which used to be categorized (in the Esping-Andersen model) in the liberal and corporative countries, and the Central-East-European countries after the political change. Actually, the fall of the socialist countries contributed to the strengthening of this concept simply by their fall, because the existence of these countries meant a kind of competition between capitalist and socialist countries. And, social policy was one field where - at least, in words - the socialist social policy with its goals, such as full

employment, anti-poverty and equalitarian measures, housing programs, cheap price for the most needed articles, etc. was competitive with the more affluent capitalist countries. As the danger passed away, the reason to allocate income for welfare expenses also passed away (Hegyesi-Kozma, 2002).

In summary, this group of social political theoreticians and politicians concentrate mainly on economic rationality, and accept the fact that there are winners and losers in a capitalist society. And, the state is not responsible generally for the losers, only for a very limited degree, for that minimum that keeps them alive. The families or volunteers should give other services needed – if they are available. **If not – it is their fault. “Blame the victim”.**

This is exactly the point where another reform alternative can be described that of the welfare pluralism or welfare mix that tried to find other solutions, based on other values.

- **The “welfare mix” or “welfare pluralism” plans**

Neither conceptually, nor practically is this reform suggestion completely new. The existence of the four sectors, namely the statutory, the market, the non-profit (voluntary), and the informal (the households) ones, and their participation in offering services to people was a part of the well-known reality of market economics. The shift in approaching these sectors also gave an impetus in criticism of the welfare states on various bases. The main criticism was that the *state* had too much importance and power in the welfare state model, against the other three, and this was harmful. The centralised systems killed local initiatives, communities lost their autonomy, and families lost their integrity and responsibility. That’s why the new model suggests a more equal share for every sector. Some characteristics of this model are as follows:

- the localities have to work out what kind of services they need; services have to be more decentralised and participatory that gives local people the chance to control services and bring information about the needs of people living there (Hadley-Hatch, 1981). Community-based services, neighbourhood organisations and councils should do this job;
- Logically, this concept gives a much greater role to the voluntary sector (Kramer, 1980) in terms of provision of social services, income, offering choice for people, assuring participation in local social life and social planning, and prevention;
- Also, the informal sector would take on greater caring responsibility. As it was very often written (e.g. Gilbert, 1983), informal care meant care by the families, or more precisely, by women. This was the basic concept of closing down so many

psychiatric clinics, hospital theatres, and sending patients back home, or very often, to the streets;

- As to the market, or the commercial sector, it was seen the most problematic, of course, from the point of view: how to regulate it and see it as a part of service provision. As Beresford and Croft (1984, p. 25) wrote:

“The problem is that welfare pluralists seem to overestimate the capacity of the state to regulate the slice of the welfare market the commercial sector takes and the quality of its provision, once the state sector and state controls are reduced in accordance with welfare pluralist philosophy. More fundamentally, and central to the essentially regressive nature of welfare pluralism, despite their protestations, arguments and intentions to the contrary, welfare pluralists...cannot escape opening wider the door to privatisation by the support for the commercial sector inherent in their advocacy of a plurality of sources of welfare.”

Privatisation became one of the main aims of social political changes during these years in places where cutbacks became a political goal. Very often the consequence was a growing inequality as the privatised services naturally started to serve the solvent, while the poor got the state services at a lower quality level;

- And, finally, the state. States never “behaved” similarly to each other. The Scandinavian countries, for example, did not follow the anti-welfare state, neo-liberal path. There hasn’t been a real cutback, but the development of state expenditure on social welfare slowed down. An interesting phenomenon became known in these countries namely, that statutory authorities initiated most local innovative schemes (Hadley, McGrath, 1980). This is a good sign from a partnership alternative, and may lead us to the next type of change – namely the partnership model.

- **The welfare society model/the partnership plan**

We have arrived at the main goal of the presentation, to the model I would like to analyse thoroughly. Now it is time to give the definition of the model, but it is clear from the literature that there is not one accepted definition.

Claire Gazdar writes (2000, p. 4) for example that “partnership ...might be: “...A relationship where roles and expectations are clearly agreed and where each party respects and values the others. It does not mean that all partners are performing identical roles or have equal resources and responsibilities”.

As Margaret Harris states (1998, p.1): The post-World War II dominance of governmental agencies in welfare service provision has been replaced by 'welfare pluralism' during the 1980s and 1990s. Both profit and third sector agencies are now expected to work 'in partnership' with governmental agencies to respond to social need and to provide mainstream welfare services." Later (ibid. p. 16) she adds, while referring to Billis (1993, Chapter 13) that he "points out that the word is often used interchangeably with other terms such as collaboration, co-ordination, co-operation, and joint activities and that, in practice, it can involve a range of power balance between two parties."

A group of researchers and practitioners in Budapest gave a more idealistic definition of welfare society in May 1995 hoping that the Minister of Welfare of the time would introduce it. By the time the text was ready the Minister had to step down because he opposed the greatest cutback of welfare provisions in a post-socialist country by a leftist government. (We had to wait another eight years until now to have a similar chance to introduce a partnership model soon. Unless...?) Let me just summarize the main points of our definition from that booklet (Ádám, Csató, Hegyesi et al, 1995, p.9.):

"The welfare society model is a further developed welfare mix. The difference lies mainly in the structure and relationships of the sectors with each other. In the welfare mix the four sectors do not have a consciously planned and implemented system of partnership mechanism, though there are various co-operations between the sectors, for example, in the form of contracts between the local governments and NGOs.

In the partnership model this is exactly the aim. The goal of the partnership mechanism is to maximise the advantages, and at the same time minimize the disadvantages of the sectors (today we would call it a win-win strategy). This structure attempts to optimise the synergy of the sectors through their partnership in order to achieve major social goals, such as finding successful methods for eliminating poverty, integrating people with weak positions into society, providing high quality social services to everybody, preventing social exclusion, and fighting for anti-oppressive practice".

The next part deals with the partnership model that is partly visionary and partly reality in its details.

### III. CAN WE TRAVEL ON THE “FOURTH ROAD”? “PARTNERSHIP” - THE CENTRAL CONCEPT IN THE WELFARE SOCIETY MODEL

Zsuzsa Ferge (1989, p. 4.) calls the welfare society model a “fourth road” referring to the hoped mixture of state, market and non-profit sectors. Where does this road come from? Where does it go?

It is an interesting research in itself to find out the origins of the concept of the welfare society. As we know it now, it comes from various parts of the world, from various experiences, from various theories and theoreticians. There is no one country in the world that could claim to have such a full system in practice. At the same time, there are various forms of the model around the world, which try to utilise the major conceptual element of the welfare society model, namely “the conscious effort to build partnership among the four sectors”. This is what we have to analyse now very shortly through the major question: **why would the sectors form a partnership with each other at all?**

There are various theories about the relationship between the government, the market, the non-profit and the informal sectors. (There are scholars who use only two sectors (the market and the government), others three sectors (market, government, and the non-profit). Though this is a very important theoretical issue, under this time constraint let me use this four sector model, which may give the full picture, and expresses my view. Generally, I can agree with Bartal’s comments (1998, p.67-74) that the relationship-theories can be categorised into two main categories, namely the **conflict** and the **co-operation** ones. They all try to explain the role of the four sectors in the production of as much **public good** as could meet everybody’s needs. The question here is how shall people have enough fresh water and air, safety, clean streets and light towers, brotherhood and freedom, equal rights and equal chances? The beginning of research for the answer was in itself **an indicator** of the crisis of the welfare state because it had failed to meet its promises, namely to meet everybody’s needs – at least according to its critics.

**Some of the major conflict theories are:**

- a. Burton Weisbrod, an economist, began to search for a theoretical explanation for the very important question, namely ‘why is there a **constant shortage** in public goods?’ This fact was seemingly contradicting the classical market theory stating that ‘if there is demand for anything, the market will respond with supply’. He worked out an additional theory for this, which is referred to in literature as “**heterogeneity**” or “**market and government failure**” theory

(Weisbrod, 1975, 1977, 1988). It says that (due to various reasons) neither market, nor government can provide public good enough, that's why there is a need for other sector(s) to do the same. That would be the non-profit and informal sector. The relationship among the sectors can be described as dynamic conflicts in this theory because they act according to the conflict between the demand and supply that leads to a failure.

- b. A similar internal logic characterizes the **trust** or **contract failure** theory (Nelson-Krashinsky, 1973; Hansmann, 1987). Here they find that even contracts can be failures under special conditions. As a consequence, people who are looking for social services trust more in non-profit organizations than in state or profit organisations. Again, the need for the existence of the sectors is coming from their failures and not from co-operations.
- c. The third conflict model in this short outline is that of Estelle James (1989). She deals with the '**supply side**' of provision of public and private socially important goods, and tries to give an explanation why anybody begins to organize a non-profit organization at all. Partly, as she states, the demand is there as a consequence of the market, government and contract failures, but this is not enough. The presence of those people, communities and organizations are also needed who have **motivations** (such as religious and other ideological values) and **personal abilities** to meet the residual demands of people around.

These theories emphasised the conflicts and competition among the sectors. Now I turn to the other type of theories.

### **Some of the major co-operation theories**

- a. The **interdependency theory** was compiled in the U.S.A. by Lester Salamon (1987a,b) almost as a response to the cutbacks from the non-profit expenditure of the Reagan administration in the 1980s. He stated that actually there had already been a wild partnership system between federal government and the non-profit sector. The speciality of the American system is, however, that the federal government generally only *regulates* the public goods sector but does not act as *social provider and financier*, only through "third party governments", such as banks, local governments, foundations, etc. These public sums of money mostly went to non-profit agencies, which meant that a rich partnership system came into existence – says Salamon. His other genuine idea was as he questioned that statement of the failure

theories according to which the non-profit sector is a secondary creation; it comes only into existence when the market and/or the government fails to act. He claims that almost exactly the opposite is true. When there is a failure in the market it is the community and the non-profit sector that reacts. (I would add to this that this is similar to what Alexis de Tocqueville (1993) described in his brilliant essay on the American democracy at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: whenever people feel that something is missing, for example they want to build a church, they come together and act accordingly). Continuing Salamon's theory: he refers to a very important factor that was overlooked until that time. It is not only the government and the market that have failures but the non-profit sector, too. He claims that there are four voluntary failures that have necessitated government action and that justify government support to the voluntary sector: "first, philanthropic insufficiency; second, philanthropic particularism; third, philanthropic paternalism; and fourth, philanthropic amateurism" (ibid, p.48). Then, because the sector's weaknesses correspond with government's strengths, there is a potential (and actually widespread) collaboration between government (through the third-party government) and the voluntary sector in providing collective goods.

- b. The **welfare society** theory can rely on many previous attempts to conceptualise the new post-welfare state situation. Among others, Michael Walzer (1988) called it a "Democratic Welfare Society", Zsuzsa Ferge (1989) the "Fourth road", a distinguished Finnish colleague referred to it as "Post Modern Welfare" (Abrahamson, 1989) and the Evers - Olk (1996) research as welfare society. Its major characteristic is that it emphasises the existence of four sectors in order to maximise the resources available for the growing needs of people for social services. This problem has been mirrored in Walter Lorenz's scheme (1998) where he points out that due to complex international changes such as globalisation, migration, growing inequality, the need for social care has been growing, while resources for these purposes at state level have been diminishing. The goal of the social society model is obviously promising for those social professionals who are really concerned with the contradiction between lack of resources and growing number of unmet needs. If there is not enough right, not enough social policy, not enough financial resources, then the work of the social worker becomes again case work or direct crisis intervention, rather than complex social professional work at those levels where it is sufficient from the point of view of the problem.

A new social partnership model (Mendell, 1991) has emerged in a Canadian region at local level. It follows the philosophy of social society and builds partnership between those calling for social change and those calling for the private sector 'to mend the holes in the social safety net' created by the gradual abandonment of social programs. A Community Loan Association, the first loan fund in Canada, was established in response to rising unemployment, deepening poverty and alienation within the region.

- c. The third interdisciplinary theory is the **Social Origins of Civil Society** (1996), written by Salamon and Anheier. In this article the authors' intention is to specify those concrete historical, social, cultural, legal, ideological and political circumstances which determine the way of co-operation between mainly the government and the civil sector, but this approach can be broadened to the examination of the other sectors, too. In other words, it is not accidental that the welfare mix is so different in various countries. This sociological-historical approach previously appeared in Wolfgang Seibel's paper (1992) that wrote that non-profit associations do not "freely swim in the social space" but they are embedded in social and economic structures (p.51). Based on their shared view Lester Salamon and Helmut Anheier define four different models of non-profit sectors in the World. They are similar to the Esping-Andersen typology but this concept is rather concerned with the state-civil sector relationship, while the Esping-Andersen model concentrates on the differences and similarities of social policies in various nations.

The first model is the **liberal** one. It mainly refers to the US. Here the main characteristic is a relatively large non-profit sector, with 'third party government' partnership with the non-profit organisations. At the same time, you can find very little direct civil involvement in the governments' issues as a partner, except lobbying, but that is very strong and well organised. The main feature of the American non-profit sector is giving social services. Great - Britain, which is generally also classified as a liberal country, does not look like a country that has a typical "liberal-type" non-profit sector. It undoubtedly has similarities to the liberal and the social democratic model at the same time.

In the **social democratic** model the non-profit sector mostly amends the state in providing public goods, and plays the role of the VOICE, of the advocator. Naturally, the Scandinavian countries belong mainly to this group.

In the third, **corporate** model the role of the non-profit sector is correcting the welfare provisions; the special subsidiary model in



Germany can be one of the forerunners to the partnership model with its corporate structures. Other typical countries belonging to this model can be France and Italy.

The fourth model is called the **state power** model. Japan is almost the only country that belongs here with its very special social structure, little social policy and little non-profit sector, with little state support towards it.

Finally, let me close this section with a short quote written by Jon Van Til. I can share his view on the title of this paragraph: "why would the sectors form a partnership with each other at all"? While Lester Salamon is right to state in the previously quoted book that actually every model is based on a kind of cooperation, and you cannot avoid it, its depth, complexity and equal basis is based on the values, political goals, strategies and willingness of the partners. Van Til writes (2000, p.68): "Contemporary liberals and moderates speak of the importance of "public-private partnerships" in which government and third-sector organisations work together to achieve public ends. Today's neo-conservatives, on the contrary, hold the primacy of the two "private" sectors—business and voluntary, and call for the minimization of the government to save it for the enforcement of various "moral values".

#### IV. ANALYSYS OF SUCCESSES AND FAILURES OF PARTNERSHIP MODELS: WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS?

1. I hope I managed to prove that there are theoretical considerations and practical experiences that make the “partnership model” feasible in tackling social problems. Also, I hope, it became obvious in the analyses that its success depends on many factors, because it is not acceptable to everybody, as it crosses the interests and values of many people and parties, or it goes against traditions of countries, regions or local societies.

In 2003, however, we are in a relatively good position as there are models around that already use and rely on the partnership concept. We can analyse them, conduct research into them, and, based on the experiences, we can learn from their failures and successes; and we can strengthen and develop them, even we can look for new applications in other fields. Let me just refer to three of them.

##### a. The EU experience

Social policy was not a central issue in building the European Common Market (later Union) for a long time. In the first years it was rather a political and economic unification, and social policy was left to the member states.

It is still the case in terms of running each individual system, but more and more concern emerged about a common concept of a “social Europe”. This became especially important when problems of the welfare states of the member countries caused unprecedented economic and political difficulties, which cried out for common policy. Let me mention perhaps the two most important issues of those years according to my understanding: the high unemployment rate and its political consequences (specially in terms of minorities and the growing popularity of far right-wing parties), and the growing demand for migration from outside Europe. It took years until the Recommendation of the Council of Ministers and the Parliament accepted a common criteria that relates to sufficient resources and payments that opens a channel towards finding a common minimum level of revenues in member countries. Still, it was a breakthrough, and suggested that other fields of social policy in the member countries could be opened up, too. Then, the Maastricht Treaty talks about that steps that should be taken “in areas such as housing, health and the education system” (Estivill, 1994, p.105).

The next steps were first the adoption of the White Paper on “European Social Policy” in April 1993, and then the adoption of the Green Paper on “European Social Policy - Options for the Union” in November of the same year. In the Green Paper, the creation of a minimum revenue and plans for the integration of all those who are excluded were laid down (Flynn, 1994). At the same time, the Commission of the European Communities adopted the policy of “partnership”.

As Estivill writes (ibid. p.107): "In the Maastricht Treaty, in various programmes (particularly in "Poverty 3"), in a number of recommendations, in the Green Paper itself, and in the President Delor's speeches, **partnership** (bolded by G.H.) seems to be the somewhat magic word for resolving some of the difficulties facing the European social policy".

What kind of partnership relations did he envisage? For example, relations between the European Union, the States and the regional and local public administrations; labour relations; voluntary organisations, citizens' associations, groups associating specific groups or interests, self-help initiatives, projects which act at grassroots level. The function of these actions and mechanisms would be to express emerging needs and demands. And, they could act as "new forms of mediation and control, without which the European House would be a cold place indeed" (ibid. p.107).

He also suggested new forms of partnership mechanisms in the form of forums for debate, reconciliation, and negotiations, which can be promoted among all the actors in European social policy (ibid. p.108).

Then, something must have gone wrong. Allan Larsson, Director General of the Directorate General for Employment and Social Affairs of the European Commission, only five years later, delivered the opening speech at the First Convention of the European Economic and Social Committee (ECOSOC) in Brussels in 1999. He said that the European Union "faces low confidence among its citizens" because they "accuse the EU of inefficiency, point to democratic deficits and call for greater responsiveness to grassroots opinion" (Larsson, 1999, p.94). The low participation of voters at the European elections also underlines the problem of trust.

The Commission had addressed the problem, and suggested a three-step program to overcome those problems above. The first, the "Reform of the Commission" aims to rebuild the confidence in the EU, and contains "four touchstones which President Prodi and Vice President Kinnock have identified": efficiency, accountability, service, and transparency. The second program is called "The shared employment and social agenda" where civil society has to have chance and responsibility. The key areas are new employment package, resources for employment strategy (structural funds), new social protection scheme, anti-discrimination actions, social inclusion, and social policy at European level.

The third program is "The need for partnership". This program reflects the understanding that the previous program on partnership (see above) remained on paper. As Allan Larsson put this into words that "none of the matters of concern to citizens can be addressed effectively without strong, open partnership, engaging all those who connect policy to people and action on the ground" (ibid. p.96). "Partnership" in this new program refers to two partners: social partners and civil society. The form of partnership is called as *dialogue*.

The *social dialogue* is a key, treaty-based element of the economic and social policy process at European, national and sector level. Its goals are to contribute to the process of modernising working life in the EU, to enhance this dialogue on the adaptability pillar of the employment strategy, on the life long learning, and on the modernisation of the organisation of work.

The *civil dialogue* means three things.

The first is a *political statement*, a value-based choice, which means that the Commission "fully recognises the importance of the role of NGOs and civil society organisations in the real world, the real world of Europe's safety net; of rights and access; of social protection and welfare, as policy advocates and as service providers" (ibid. p.97).

The second is that partnership can effectively work and flourish on common issues only if *structures* and *agenda* are created. The European Social Forum is one of the possible structures helping to identify and develop the notion and role of European civil society.

The third issue deals with the missing treaty basis that would build partnership further.

Most probably, this would be the next logical step. For me, who participated at the 1999 meeting, the most important lesson was what Allan Larsson stated that without structure and agenda political statement and goodwill is not enough. The contrary is also true, however: without willingness of the politicians there will be neither structure, nor agenda.

At this moment, an *agenda* is quickly developing in terms of partnership. At the Lisbon European Council in 2000 an Open Method of Co-ordination (Hodson and Maher, 2001) was established "in order to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty and social exclusion by 2010" (Call for proposals, 2002). The applications had to come from partnerships involving partners based in at least 3 Member States. Based on this policy, 64 projects were selected last year. In Phase II though those who want to continue the program have to apply again for further funding. And, they have the chance to involve organisations from the applicant countries in the name of East-West partnership. This fact underlines the firm political commitment of the EU to partnership as a concept. What is still missing is a strong structural mechanism.

That has been one the promises of another partnership project in recent years, that of the Compact in United Kingdom.

## **b. The UK experience**

The Labour Government came into power in 1997. Though it was the previous Conservative Government that introduced the mechanism of "partnership" in the form of contracts, many still believe that the plan for a "COMPACT" or a broad contract between the Government and the voluntary sector played an

important role in the victory of the New Labour. Ideologically, the concept of the COMPACT is a part of their "Third way in Politics" of workers' movement. It also plays a key role in the new social policy (Harris, 1998, p.1). The potential advantages of "partnerships" between the government and the voluntary sector was already discussed at the end of the 1980s (Brindley and Stoker, 1988), then Nicholas Deakin (1991) put forward almost a plan of a kind of COMPACT. Later then he led the preparations and consultations for signing a document between the representatives of the voluntary sector and the Government. This document has two very important statements from the point of view of the voluntary sector. First, the Government appreciates the service provider and critical roles of the voluntary sector, and does not want to undermine its autonomy. Second, the Government wants to contribute to the development of the sector by providing more financial safety, and developing partnership schemes with each other at national and local levels. As a consequence, a number of councils have gone on to develop local Compacts in partnership with local agencies (Gazdar, 2000, p.4). Though COMPACT was signed less than five years ago there are experiences available. The Voluntary Governing Bodies (VGB) study by Harris (1998) was conducted before the COMPACT was introduced, but was made with chairpersons of voluntary agencies who had previous experience with partnership schemes. Their opinions may contribute to develop better models. Their major problem was that "in practice voluntary agencies are increasingly constrained to provide services defined as a priority by government and to deliver them using procedures specified by and familiar to governmental officers. The study also suggests that getting the views of voluntary agencies heard in government is a battle rather than a dialogue of equals" (ibid. p.16). This description of the relationship can hardly be called a "partnership". COMPACT tackles this problem by emphasising the importance of equality and genuine involvement in the work of COMPACT. As there is structure and agenda, as representatives of national and local governing bodies and voluntary agencies meet from time to time and discuss issues of mutual interest, social planning and regulations, there is also a chance for good practice of "partnerships". Since there is a lack of a deep evaluation of COMPACT I have to rely on some reports, verbal presentations, and my own personal observations in Scotland. Gazdar (ibid. p.4) reports some important problems:

- Voluntary organisations often complain about the "token nature of involvement and the lack of subsequent feedback or action". Certainly, in a genuine partnership all contributions should be valued. Staff of many local councils should be better trained to understand issues faced by voluntary agencies.
- Sustainability, or lack of it, has often undermined partnerships between both NGOs and the private sector and local councils. Short-term funding makes development and risk taking difficult if not impossible. Also there are times when local councils' priorities are not matched by what the voluntary sector is providing. (At the time of writing my lecture it is the case of intermediate care).

Marylin Taylor reported at a recent conference in Budapest (Taylor, 2003) that the greatest problem with COMPACT is the resistance of many local governments. This is exactly what local NGOs shared with us on a study tour in Scotland (Hegyesei, 2001), organised by the Charity Aids Foundation. This resistance can take many forms, such as: the representative of the council does not come to the compulsory meeting that is a part of the COMPACT system; s/he comes but is not prepared; the next meeting is always delayed; too little time is given to NGO representatives to seriously discuss the papers with volunteer board members, important information is withdrawn, etc. The lesson here is that even when there is political will, structure and an agenda is available, they still do not assure the success of the partnership model.

### **c. The Hungarian experience**

After the last sentence of point b.) one might expect a 'happy end'. Unfortunately, this is not the case, and I am not in a position to be able to report to you the Hungarian success story. (Not yet, perhaps). What I can summarise here very shortly, still can be interesting for those who are interested in the history of the partnership model, and in the development of one of the countries-in-transition that will be a member of the EU next year.

The birth of the Hungarian "emerging sector" (Salamon - Anheier) can be legally put on the very day when the Hungarian Parliament accepted the Law of the Free Association in 1989. This gave the impetus to abolish the one party system and to start to set up a multi-party democracy. Also, this was the legal basis to start to organise associations based on the free will and initiatives of people. (Though there had always been a civil society under the surface; Hegyesei, 1990). The development was very quick. Today there are approximately 50.000 non-profit organisations (Bocz et al, 2001), mainly associations and foundations (most of them are operational ones, and do not provide finances for other non-profit organisations).

The political transaction brought very deep economic crisis. Just to give you a glimpse of the depth and scope of difficulties at the beginning of the nineties let me mention some data: the number of unemployed was more than 30%; the inflation rate was almost the same; the ratio of people living under the poverty line was 40 %; there was no indexation in financial provisions, that's why most of pensioners could hardly survive. The government (actually a social democrat - liberal coalition) in order to avoid a bankruptcy of the state), introduced a dramatic cutback in the expenditure of the social political welfare system in 1995. This financial crisis dramatically affected the conditions of the non-profit sector. The contribution of the state to the annual income of the sector fell under 20% (Harsányi, 1997). In other parts of the world the same data would be at least 40% or more (Salamon - Anheier, 1994, p.122).

The sector arrived at a crossroads: if the tendency would continue after 1998, a large part of the organizations could not go on. After a strong lobbying activity (for example, through CIVICUS, the World Organization of Civil Society that held its annual conference in Budapest, and through a Parliament debate between the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Government, and representatives of the non-profit sector (Barabás, 1997)), the Parliament accepted in December 1997 the Nonprofit Law. The law introduced a clear system of tax-exemption based on the position of the given non-profit organization on a scale that measured its non-profit activity. The making of the law was a very important outcome that year. The representatives of the sector and the Ministry of Justice established partnership meetings, organized forums all over the country, and the law was the outcome of a joint effort. The success of this series of joint efforts made it possible to set up a small Department of Non-profit Issues at the highest level in the administration namely, the Prime Ministerial Office.

Based on the positive changes of 1997 there was a hope that this tendency would continue. As mentioned earlier, the sector had already the first concept to set up a partnership model between the NGOs of social services and the Ministry of Welfare (Ádám, Csató, Hegyesi, et al, 1995). The Hungarian COMPACT was under construction parallel to the British process. There was, however, a major difference. The Hungarian coalition government lost the election in 1998, and the next, right-wing, nationalistic government had a very different non-profit concept. It showed no interest in building a partnership with the whole sector. The policy intended to control the sector in order to divide it along political lines, and strengthen the right-wing civil organizations through direct financial support. This policy completely undermined the integrity of the sector by questioning the autonomy of organizations, by forcing the service provider organizations to take political side (naturally, as an organization, most of them were neutral), and by supporting corruption. In the long run, this was an anti-civil policy independent of political sympathy, because its main goal was to collect clients from the sector.

This gave a push to NGOs with a very different vision of civil society to set up a project that aimed to bring to Hungary other concepts of government - civil sector relationship. The years of 1998-2002 were those of preparation. And, in 2002 the Government lost the elections in a very sharp competition, partly due to its fatal civil policy. The result was the election of the social democrat - liberal coalition, partly due to their political promises on this matter. One of them was the suggestion to set up a complex partnership system between the Government and the Sector. The plan of a Hungarian COMPACT was put on the table.

This election was in May 2002. Since then groups of NGOs have been working on various aspects of the relations between the four sectors. In light of the previous years, however, it is understandable that the most important part of the suggestions - which were completed two months ago - deals with the relationship between the government and the civil sector, and the Ministry of

Health, Social and Family and those non-profit organizations which work in this field (Hallgató et al (2003)). I try to summarize this complicated plan very shortly, just concentrating on the most important characteristics in order to show you the place of the partnership concept in it. The concept is still debated at the ministerial level, but it has been supported until now by a majority of people. However, a decision can be expected in 2003.

The most important characteristics of the suggestions are as follows:

- A National Council of the Non-profit Sector, based on elections, will be set up. This would give legitimacy to the representatives of the sector in the meetings with the representatives of the Government. The topics (the agenda) will be carefully set, and will give a chance for the representatives of the sector to express their views about any topics (first of all about laws and the annual budget) that may affect the interests of the NGOs. The Council will rely on two lower levels. The first level will be that of localities. Here the local Councils will have close contacts with local governments. Then the second level, the regions will elect their own representatives and will co-operate with the regional governments (yet to be set up, when Hungary joins the EU). The large associations will have a special pool, and they will have the right to send their own representatives to the National Council. The costs of the system will be financed from the budget, independently from the Government.
- A similar structure will be set up to be the partner of the Ministry of Health, Social and Family Matters. The Social Political Council will also have three levels. The council at national level will deal with the regulations of the Ministry. Through the meetings the representatives will have a serious task to keep their eyes on how the major social political values will be taken into considerations, and how the social political goals will be reached. The representatives of the councils will be elected every four years, always in the middle of the parliamentary election period (which is also four years). The Social Political Council will have one place in the National Council of the Non-profit Sector, representing the field. The Social Political Council will have two Co-chairs: one of them will be the Minister, the other will be the Chair elected by the representatives of the nonprofit sector. There will be representatives of other ministries and bodies, too, which might have any interest in participating in the discussion, well publicized beforehand.

The preparatory discussions will happen in working groups. They will be open to anybody who wants to express her/his view.



- It is only suggested to non-profit organizations working on special fields that they should build up their own representative system to their own ministries as the NGOs of the social field did. In this case, they all have one place in the National Council of the Non-profit Sector. There are other ideas about how to organize their own representations, however. These organizations also will get representation through the elections.

These ideas will be discussed once more in the forms of a road show around Hungary and in the form of a continued debate on the special Internet. You cannot decide a partnership model without using partnership-friendly solutions, can you?

2. This brings us to the last point of the lecture: what implications can we draw from the theoretical findings and practical experiences?

Perhaps, its most obvious characteristic is that it does not happen automatically, as it is a very complicated structure. It is based on values to choose them, and knowledge to implement and run it. Still, it is not pure idealism to state that from the point of view of welfare interests, from the point of view of those people who suffer of shortages, who are excluded, who cannot live according to their political freedom because they are imprisoned in their poverty, from the point of view of the clients and from the point of view of participatory democracy the partnership model offers the most what is available at this moment. And, that's why various forms of it already came into existence, even under conditions when people were not completely conscious about it. Perhaps, we are in a position now that we are able to determine some of those major conditions and elements in detail, which help us to at least understand it better. These can be read almost as a first draft of a curriculum for a school about: how to organize a partnership model?

- The central categories are the **'interest'** and **'values'**. Without them the representatives of the sectors do not appreciate the added value that comes from partnership. Political parties, especially governments, commercial people, non-profit managers and every day people have to have an understanding that this added value comes from the competitive advantages that Lester Salamon described first (ibid, 1987b) from the point of view of partnership. It can be understood at central governmental level, but also at local level (Geddes, 1998). The analyses of strengths and weaknesses bring us to the field of synergy. Jinni Lue Richards wrote (1991, No. 11.p.64) that synergy is "developing interrelated systems that have an impact beyond the sum of their parts." To correlate this definition to our field, this means, that everybody and every organization are interested in using synergy if there is shortage and

this shortage causes trouble. It is obvious that synergy is a very important approach and even a fact of biological and social life. But – there are other approaches, as we saw in the case of the Spartacus revolt, as an example (to avoid being called simply an idealist). Still, partnership is the conscious art of social synergy, and it is very important to use this approach for everybody who is dealing with social problems – namely with shortages. It is possible to list further strengths and weaknesses of the state, the non-profit sector, and the market, as we did it in our 1995 booklet (Ádám et al, ibid. p.8-9). The partnership model cannot be based on anything but synergy at political and social political level.

- The next category to analyze is '**economics**'. 'If you want a partnership model, you need the partners. In this respect, the non-profit organizations are in the most vulnerable situation. Éva Kuti (1998. p.2002) gives a good outline about the economic conditions between the state and the non-profit sector in a partnership model. She states that the direct state financial support is distributed according to clear, normative laws; the tax-exempts are high; the public interest test (the basis of tax decision) is normative; private donations are high; accountability of the organizations is set. It is clear that if an organization is at the mercy of any of the donors it will not be an equal partner.
- The next to be analyzed should be '**human resources**'. Partnership and synergy needs special knowledge, values, and skills for people wherever they work in the partnership system. (Here I would like to refer back to the Introduction of the lecture). Naturally, running and managing a partnership model means that people work together, and there is always a human side of this, with personal trust or dislike. People like to work together, if it is easy. Very often, however, it is not easy. We have to learn to work in team even if we do not like each other at a personal level. This is important - and even more important to know that it is possible, from a social-psychological point of view. And, it can be reached with special training (Csepeli, 2001. p.260). People working in partnership models have to acquire not only management skills, but also a lot of knowledge about networking, building social capital (Putnam, 1993), evaluating the programs and listening to each other. Synergy naturally works at personal level, too. Just stick with it and persistence pays.

- Should not forget about what Allan Larsson said: we need structure and agenda. In other words, if partnership means mechanism, it is extremely important to know for example, who are the partners, who is responsible for what, who is representing whom, who has to report to who, what is the deadline. You may want to call it the partnership protocol that has outstanding importance. The sectors have to be well organised, they have to have representatives who then can change the protocols but without clear set of information there is no trust, and without trust there is no partnership.
- Last, but not least at all, there is a soft category, culture and morality. This stems logically from the last sentence. Culture and morality also play an important role in building or destroying trust. Generally, there are cultures where informality plays a decisive role. Let say, a Mafioso Gang could also be described as a partnership model. We need a lot of knowledge and understanding towards cultural differences, and at the same time, a firm belief that in a real partnership should not be corruption and too much informality, if we come to decision-making and planning.

\* \* \*

We are in the most fortunate situation as we are at the crossroads to conduct a research into “partnership” with my colleagues at CESRT. This will give us a chance partly to check what I said above, partly to make an important contribution to the general knowledge and the advancement of the understanding of the welfare of society and human kind. Though, for many of us it is not a pure research for new knowledge, but an action research, which means that we want to use the findings immediately for the bettering of the partnership model, because it gives the most chances to get closer to our social-political and democratic goals. And, as it is about ‘partnership’ I invite everybody here to participate in it. There is space for everybody!

**\* THANK YOU FOR YOUR KIND ATTENTION \***

**THE END**

## Bibliography

- Abrahamson, P.** (1989) *Post Modern Welfare: Markets, State, and Civil Society. Towards Year 2000*. Roskilde, (Denmark): Roskilde University, Institute of Economic and Planning.
- Ádám, A., Csató, Zs., Hegyesi, G., Kirschner, P., dr. Takács Gy., Talyigás, K.** (1995) *The Ministry of Welfare and civil organizations*. Budapest: Ministry of Welfare.
- Barabás, M. (ed.)** (1997) *Párhuzamosok és metszéspontok – avagy állam, gazdaság és civil társadalom Magyarországon (Parallels and crossroads. State, market and the civil society in Hungary)*. Proceedings of the conference held in the Parliament on 4 July. Budapest: European House.
- Bartal, A.M. (1998)** *A nonprofit szektor elméletei (Theories of the nonprofit sector)*. Szombathely: Ligatura.
- Bean, O., Ferris, J. and Whynes, D. (eds.)** (1985) *In Defence of Welfare*. London: Tavistock.
- Bocz, J., Cseh, J. Kuti, É., Mészáros, G., Sebestyén, I.** (2002) *Nonprofit szervezetek Moagyarországon 2000 (Noprofit organisations in Hungary 2000)*. Budapest: Central Statistical Office.
- Bullain, N., Simon, I. (eds.)** (1998) *Travel around the nonprofit law*. Budapest: Foundation for the Development of Civil Society.
- Call for Proposals VP/2002/010** for transnational exchange projects under the Community Action Programme to *Combat Social Exclusion 2002-2006* (under 2002 Budget Line B3-4105)
- Cameron, D.R.** (1985) Public Expenditure and Economic Performance in International Perspective. In: Klein, R., O'Higgins, M. (eds.) *The Future of Welfare*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Csanády, D.** (2003) The Scottish Model of COMPACT. In: Csanády, D. Gosztonyi, G. (eds.) *Partnership between local governments and civil organizations*. Budapest: Resource Center.
- Csepli, Gy.** (2001) *A szervezkedő ember (The organizing man)*. Budapest: Osiris Publishing House.
- Esping-Andersen, G.** (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Estivill, J.** (1994) A VIEW FROM THE SOUTH – Building a New European Social Policy. In: Commission of the European Communities (ed.) *The Future of the European Social Policy – Options for the Union*. Records of the Proceedings of the European Conference at Brussels, from 26<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May. Louvain-la-Neuve: Louvain university Press.
- Evers, A., Wintersberger, H.** (1988) *Shifts in the Welfare Mix*. Vienna: European Centre for Social Welfare Training and Research.
- Evers, A., Olk, Th.** (1996) Wohlfahrtspluralismus – Analytische und nomativ-politische Dimensionen eines Leitbegriffs. In: Evers, A., Olk, Th. (eds.)

*Wohlfahrtspluralismus. Vom Wohlfahrtsstaat zur Wohlfahrtsgesellschaft.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 9-62.

**Ferge, ZS.** (1989) *Van-e negyedik út? (Is there a Fourth Road?)*. Budapest: KJK.

**Flora, P.** (1986) Introduction. In: Flora, P. (ed.) *Growth to Limits. The Western European Welfare States Since World War II*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, pp. 3-25.

**Flynn, P.** (1994) Preface. In: Commission of the European Communities (ed.) *The Future of the European Social Policy. Options for the Union*. Records of the Proceedings of the European Conference, Brussels, 26-28 May. Louvain-la-Neuve: Louvain university Press.

**Friedman, F., Friedman, R.** (1980) *Free to Choose*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

**Gazdar, Claire** (2000) Working in partnership...Improving services for older people. Paper presented at a conference on "*New Initiatives in Care for the Elderly*", Budapest, 21-23. 08.

**Gilder, G.** (1982) *Wealth and Poverty*. New York: Bantam Books.

**Glennester, H. (ed.)** (1983) *The Future of the Welfare State*. London: Heinemann.

**Gondos, A., Hegyesi, G.** (1984) Non-governmental socio-political solutions in the field of human services: the way to a welfare mix. Presentation at an expert meeting on "*Established social services versus new social initiatives*", 28. 10.- 3-11. Frankfurt.

**Gondos, A., Hegyesi, G. and Herczog, M.** (1989) Introducing a model of mixed service provisions. In: *Clients or Co-producers?* Presentations of an International workshop on "*The position and participation of clients as a key question in advancing social policy*". The National Board of Social Welfare in Finland, Helsinki, 27-29 Augustus.

**Gosztonyi, G.** (2003) Civil friendly local government - local government friendly civil organization. In: Csanády, D., Gosztonyi, G. (eds.) *Partnership between local governments and civil organizations*. Budapest: Resource Center.

**Hallgató, É., Talyigás, K., Gosztonyi, G., Hegyesi, G., Szabó, J.** (2003) *Proposal about the concept of setting up the Council of Social Policy*. Budapest: Social Professional Association.

**Habermas, J.** (1976) *Legitimation Crisis*. London: Heinemann.

**Hadley, R., McGrath, M.** (1980) *Going Local*. London: Bedford Square Press.

**Hadley, R., Hatch, S.** (1981) *Social Welfare and the Failure of the State*. London: Allen and Unwin.

**Harsányi, L.** (1997) *Az állam és a nonprofit szektor (The state and the nonprofit sector)*. Budapest: INFO-Társadalomtudomány No. 42.

**Harris, M.** (1998) Partnership in social welfare provisions? The perspective of third sector boards. A paper prepared for the ISTR Conference, Geneva, 5-7 July.

**Hayek, F.A.** (1944) *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge.

**Hegyesi, G.** (1989) The appearance of non-profit organizations in East-Europe and Hungary. Presentation at the Salzburg Seminar on "*The role of non-profit organizations*", 1-12 May.

- Hegyesi, G.** (1989) A jóléti pluralizmus első jelei Magyarországon (The first appearance of welfare pluralism in Hungary). In: *ESÉLY (CHANCE)*, Vol.1. No.1. Budapest, p.39-49.
- Hegyesi, G.** (1990) Integrációs modellek és a nonprofit szektor (Integrative models and the nonprofit sector). *ESÉLY (CHANCE)*, Vol.2. No.3. Budapest, p.4-10.
- Hegyesi, G., Gondos, A., Orsó, É.** (1992) Social Policy in Hungary. In: Macarov, D., Dixon, J. (eds.) *Social Policy in Socialist Countries*. London: Routledge, p. 98-130.
- Hegyesi, G.** (1992) The Revival of the Nonprofit Sector in Hungary. In: McCarthy, K., Hodgkinson, V., Sumariwalla, R., and Ass. (eds.) *The Nonprofit Sector in the Global Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, p. 309-322.
- Hegyesi, G., Talyigás, K. with Gayer, A., Gáthy, V., Gyuris, T., Kaposvári, A., Kozma, J., Lévai, K., Szémán, Zs., Visy, E.** (2000) *Setting up Standards for Human Services*. Budapest: Hungarian Association of Nonprofit Human Services.
- Hegyesi, G.** (2001) *Report on the COMPACT in Scotland*. Study tour as a part of the KNOW HOW FUND –Charities Aid Foundation program.
- Hegyesi, G., Reverda, N.** (2003) *From the Welfare State to Welfare Society: the Partnership Model. Research Proposal*. Maastricht: CESRT.
- Hodson, D., Maher, I.** (2001) The Open Method as a New Mode of Governance: The Case of Soft Economic Policy Co-ordination. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, November 2001, Vol. 39, No. 4 pp. 719-46.
- Jung, C. G.** (1988) *A lélektani típusok (Types of personality)*. Budapest: Európa Publishing House.
- Imhof, A.E.** (1985) *Die Verlorenen Welten*. München: C.H. Beck Verlag
- Kelen, A.** (2001) *The Gratis Economy*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Klein, R., O'Higgins, M. (eds.)** (1985) *The Future of Welfare*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kramer, R.** (1980) *Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kuti, É.** (1998) *Hívjuk talán nonprofitnak (Why don't we call it as nonprofit...?)* Budapest: Nonprofit Kutatócsoport.
- Larsson, A.** (1999) *Speech*. In: The Civil Society Organized at European Level. Proceedings of the First Convention of the European Economic and Social Committee. 15-16 October. Brussels.
- Leibfried, S.** (1992) "Towards a European Welfare State? On integrating poverty regimes into the European Community", In: Ferge, Zs., Kolberg, J.E. (Eds.) *Social Policy in a Changing Europe*. Vienna: Campus.
- Lévai, K., Szémán, Zs.** (1993) *Societal trigonometry*. Budapest: Scientica Humana.
- Lévai, K. (eds.)** (1999) *Progress through partnership*. Budapest: Social Innovation Foundation.
- Levitas, R. (ed.)** (1986) *The Ideology of the New Right*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, C.** (1955) *Tristes tropiques*, Paris: Librairie Plon.

- Lorenz, W.** (1994) *Social Work in a Changing Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Marshall, T.H.** (1991) *The development of citizenship until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century*. In: A jóléti állam (The Welfare State) (Ed.: Ferge, Zs., Lévai, K.). Budapest: T-Twins, p. 50-58.
- Mendell, M.** (1991) *New Social Partnerships*. Paper presented at Lyon Conference: *Le développement local: pratiques, conceptions et enjeux économiques*. 03. 05. Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Mishra, R.** (1984) *The Welfare State in Crisis*. Brighton: Whetsheaf.
- O'Conner, J.** (1973) *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St Martin's Press
- Peele, G.** (1984) *Revival and Reaction: The Right in Contemporary America*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Polanyi, K.** (1946) *Origins of our time. The Great Transformation*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Putnam, R.D., with Leonardi, R., Nanetti, R.Y.** (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R.D.** (2000) *Bowling Alone: Civic Disengagement in America*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Salamon, L.M.** (1987a) *Partners in Public Service: The Scope and Theory of Governmental Nonprofit Relations*. In: Powell, W. (ed.) *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 99-117.
- Salamon, L. M.** (1987b) *Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: The Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 16, nos. 1-2 (January-June), pp. 29-49.
- Salamon, L. M., Anheier, H.K.** (1994) *The Emerging Sector: The Nonprofit Sector in Comparative Perspective – An Overview*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies.
- Shardlow, S. M.** (2000) *Ethical Aspects of Social Work – A Common Set of Values and the Regulation for Practice: England an Example*. In: Adams, A., Erath, P., Shardlow, S.M. (eds.) *Key Themes in European Social Work*. Dorset: Russell House Publishing, p.39-46.
- Taylor, M.** (2003) *Comments on the COMPACT based on: Craig, G., Taylor, M., et al (2002) Contract or rust? A role of compacts in local governance?* The Policy Press.
- Talyigás, K.** (2000) *Standardization of Care for the Elderly*. In: Gáthy, V. (ed.) *Introducing Quality Standards in Elderly Care*. Budapest: Social innovation Foundation.
- de Tocqueville, A.** (1993) *The American Democracy*. Budapest: Europa Publishing House.
- Van Til, J.** (2000) *Growing Civil Society From Nonprofit Sector to Third Space*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
- Walker, A.** (1984) *Social Planning: A Strategy for Socialist Welfare*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Walzer, M.** (1988) The Concept of the Democratic Welfare State. In: Gutman, A. (ed.) *Democracy and the Welfare State*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Weisbrod, B.A.** (1975) Toward a Theory of the Voluntary Non-profit Sector in a Three-Sector Economy. In: Phelps, E.S. (ed.) *Altruism, Morality and Economic Theory*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, pp. 171-195.
- Weisbrod, B.A.** (1977) *The Voluntary Nonprofit Sector: An Economic Analysis*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Weisbrod, B.A.** (1988) *The Nonprofit Economy*. Harvard University Press.