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**ABSTRACT**

Keynes, Polanyi, Marshall, Titmuss. Contemporary social policies were based on the theories and on the proposals of heretical thinkers. Also through a rediscovery of their thinking, the current crisis could maybe lead to a new design of social cohesion. This paper tries to design an approach to social policies that is based on (and renews) the “transformative” lessons of the classics.

First of all I re-read their contributions, focusing the attention on three key-points: (1) the ineffectiveness of laissez-faire and the consequent need for a new centrality of in politics; (2) a non paternalistic definition of equality; (3) the need for a dynamic vision of citizenship. Their contributions seem to anticipate many critics to the welfare interventions since 1970. However another contribution to the reformulation of social policy comes from the collective action of social movements. In Italy (one of the most inequal and fragmented welfare systems in Europe), in the ‘80s, voluntary associations developed a very interesting debate regarding the need of a new social policy. This debate can be read through classical categories.

The final result of the paper is the proposition of a tool to study welfare services under the promise of transformative social policy. It is based on three interconnected dimensions: (1) empowerment (user); (2) sociability (citizenship); (3) institutions building (institutions). A brief reflection about the methods to follow in order to study the institutions and the devices of welfare services under "the promises of transformative social policy" will conclude the paper.
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At the turning point. Foundations, betrayals and memory in the change of social policies
Introduction
The classics, not by chance. Origins and aims of the paper.

It has already been observed that the increase in social inequalities produced by the economic crisis highlights the limits of social policies (Fattore, 2009, 50). However, for a long time, especially since the mid-1970s, the failure (more or less radical) of assets and the achievements of welfare systems built after World War II in Western Europe have been discussed. Many analyses of these failures are aimed at showing how the expectations of social protection generated by the paradigm shift of the new postwar order were disregarded (Zincone, 2003, 12). The structures of the 1940s welfare programmes and the expectations that it produced were inspired by a debate which is an essential reference for scholars of social policy. Despite the changes, the intellectual heritage of Keynes, Marshall, Polanyi, Titmuss reminds us the “architrave” of the structures of the welfare systems of Western Europe (and of the expectations they have generated).

Against this backdrop, we reflect on the interpretive potential of the social policy classics to help build an approach to the study of welfare services. This particular research interest arises from the need to build interpretative tools to study partnerships between volunteering associations and public institutions in the field of Italian social welfare services (Guidi, 2009): are the contributions of those who have inspired the welfare systems still current? If they are, then how could they be used to study partnerships for the management of social welfare services? The reconstruction of their contribution is therefore not systematic or commemorative. It is more similar to a re-memory (Morrison, 1987) from which several tools can be derived for an empirical study. In anticipation of several of the conclusions, I think it could be argued that if on the one hand the contribution of the classics has been eroded by changes and it presents some deficiencies, on the other it is still potentially useful for researching on the partnerships in social welfare services and perhaps more generally, for the framing of social policy in crisis.

In the first chapter I will concentrate on the “foundational” lessons of the classics, with an emphasis on the similarity with some subsequent research programs. The second chapter focuses on a criticism of the classics concerning the creation of postwar welfare systems, highlighting once again the similarity to various subsequent contributions. The third chapter makes a brief balance about the relevance of the classics for the study of contemporary social policy. The fourth chapter outlines the main findings of the Italian debate and some elements in common with the legacy of the classics and the fifth, the final chapter, identifies some lines of investigation on social services based on the classics. The paper concludes with some final remarks including a proposed method: use the “foundational lessons” that are produced in some “turning points” of the institutional structures as instruments for the maintenance and change of these structures.

1 In this Paper I will use the adjective “foundational” to identify the act to found something, particularly an institutional structure. With regard to the quotations, in [ ] there are the original editions of the quoted contributions. The contributions are often quoted from the Italian edition (when available) because I unfortunately had no time to check the correspondences with the english version.
1. Foundations. A way to re-read the classics of social policies

The birth and expansion of social policies arose before the 1940s and within the context of social and institutional structures that were substantially different from those of the democratic post-war period (Alber, 1987; Ferrera, 2006; Hill, 1999 [1996]; Ritter, 1999 [1986]). However, the economic crisis of the 1930s, the experience of totalitarianism and war constitute the crucial turning points from which the principles of action and forms of state were consistently reconfigured. Social policies are renewed, not only in terms of the number of initiatives offered to the population, but also - more importantly - for the constitutional principles that are placed (or that are deemed to be placed) on the basis of interventions. As Titmuss claimed in relation to poverty, the social legislation of the early twentieth century already presented something new but as there were no new ideas on which to build, or new insights into the phenomenology of the social needs and human behavior, ideas and methods of the laws against poverty were transplanted in the new social services. (Titmuss, 1986 [1958], 31).

Although there should be some elements of continuity with the previous structure, innovations in health care, assistance and security produced in the mid-twentieth century, they are justified (Boltanski, Thevenot, 1991) in a different way from the previous season of social policies. In a particular social-historical context, atypical and “heretic” scholars such as Keynes, Marshall, Titmuss and Polanyi highlighted for the first time in a good systematic way on some fundamental elements of new social policies, have contributed directly to the reconfiguration of state functions after the conflict and have critically followed the implementation of some of the most important choices of social policy. 2

The set of reflections behind this change, even though marked by the period, represent a considerable legacy. Their reconstruction is extremely challenging. However a reading of the most important works of Keynes, Marshall, Titmuss and Polanyi enables us to isolate several useful guidelines for the study of welfare services.

1.1 From laissez-faire to a renewed political centrality

A first element that can be considered as the turning point regarding the democratic welfare state concerns the devices of the production of social welfare, or the integration of private interest and public good. Criticism on the effectiveness of the self-regulating market proposed since the mid ‘20s is the basis for affirming the centrality of public institutions in the field of welfare.

Criticism of the principle of the self-regulating market as an instrument of public welfare is explored thoroughly in the complex and multifaceted work of J. M. Keynes and K. Polanyi. A reinterpretation of Keynes enables us to observe a) moral unscientific background of the issue that would be enough for the laissez-faire market forces of capitalism to produce and distribute determinant components of welfare and b) the power exercised by the clergy and commercial classes in spreading the doctrine of laissez-faire.

---

2 Their intellectual contribution in founding the structures of the welfare systems after the World War II is clearly identifiable. It is impossible in this context to deepen the relationship between each of them and the practical realizations in UK after the War, but, as well-known, they have had also several important practical roles. The more peripheral scholar among them is Polanyi who, however, is been rediscovered recently by many research programmes. Obviously we could consider other scholars. But they are definitly the classical scholars most quoted in the studies on modern social policies.
With Polanyi it is possible to articulate - beyond the market - the various institutional ways to satisfy social needs and to argue for the special destructiveness of the principles of the market. Both also enable us to understand the active and compensatory role of the State.

1.1.1 Criticism of the self-regulating market as an instrument for public welfare

In the reconstruction of Keynes, the processing and dissemination of the laissez-faire doctrine as the art of public government supposedly originated between the late seventeenth century and the middle of the next, at a historic low division of knowledge. The role of the economists of the time in spreading the doctrine of laissez-faire would have been insignificant. The language of some of the economists of the time lent towards laissez-faire (Keynes, 1991 [1926a], 27), but this doctrine wouldn't have an economic foundation. Laissez-faire is more the popularization of a series of philosophical acquisitions related to individualization (understood as the priority assigned to the individual than the social order) and secularism (understood as the immanence of the attribution of legitimacy of sovereign power) that have little to do with the scientific demonstration about the superiority of the market as a regulator of social welfare. Thus, laisser-faire would be a moral and metaphysical doctrine rather than an economic theory (ibidem, 24-37).

A corroboration of this can be seen by the identification of vehicles with which the principle of laissez-faire would be affirmed in Europe around the eighteenth century. The spread of the belief about the opportunity offered by private interest in ensuring public welfare would have in fact, according to Keynes, for players clergy and merchants. The clergy played a vital role in the popularization of philosophy, its legitimacy and its uncritical acceptance. The commercial class would have directly recommended opting for an abstentionistic paradigm in public government, so as to get greater freedom of action. Thus, the dissemination of laisser-faire would be instrumental to the interests of a particular social group.

The "moral nature" and the "interested diffusion" of the doctrine of laissez-faire tend to reinforce the reasons for Keynes’s rejection. Studies on economic history conducted by Polanyi in the first half of the twentieth century seem to confirm and enrich the criticism of a self-regulating market as an instrument of integration between private and public interests.

Polanyi’s contribution is, like that of Keynes, extraordinarily rich and varied, although not without its setbacks and problems. We would like to especially emphasize here the features of Polanyi’s criticism of the market as a form of integration, which leads to a justification of the use of forms of exchange with different titles from monetary ones. Polanyi argues that all human communities make an institutional and systematic allocation of resources, but not necessarily using the market as regulative principle (Polanyi, 1980 [1957]). The capitalist market, which since the mid-nineteenth century gradually imposed itself on a large part of Europe as the predominant regulative principle, would be one of the other ways to address this need, but not the only nor the most effective.

The success of the capitalist market according to Polanyi, in the early twentieth century was possible because of the dis-embeddedness of the members of society by previous ties and the concomitant monopolization of the social bond (ibidem, 338-360). The crucial way in which the market becomes a form of regulation of social life has
consequences at all peaceful: to succeed, the self-regulation of economic life must have complete power and organize society by itself, with the inevitable consequence, Polanyi argues, of its destruction.

This is why the need arose to build protective countermeasures that at least offset the action of the self-regulated market. Which is possible enhancing the contribution of other historical forms of integration, redistribution and reciprocity (Polanyi, 1974 [1944], 144-148).

Unlike the market, licenses for participating in these forms of exchange originate from resources that are not subordinate to the (uncertain) production of profit, but rather from bonds gained on the political and on the social land (redistribution and reciprocity) (Dalton, 1980 [1971], XXXI). Even on these grounds there may be perverse effects of destruction, but, according to Polanyi, what would be different is that in these cases, the economic process would be embedded into the social aggregate from which the economic flows. Although each era is characterized by the predominance of a regulative principle, according to Polanyi, the economic process will be carried out more effectively if the community uses the other two principles in opposition and compensation.

1.1.2 For the State. Principles and instruments of a welfare policy

Following different paths, the analysis of Keynes and Polanyi contributes to the foundation of the conceptual architecture of modern welfare systems, arguing about the ineffectivity and harmfulness of the capitalist market as the only form of regulation and on the necessity to use other principles of adjustment alongside and against the market. Criticism of the market is thus severe, but not destructive.

The proposal of Keynes, notoriously averse to socialist sympathies, turns decisively "towards possible improvements in the technique of modern capitalism through collective action" (Keynes, 1991 [1926a], 42). It means to affirm the centrality of politics over the market, (Keynes, 1991 [1925], 56) or the need to subordinate the deployment of free economic forces to produce conditions for social justice (Keynes, 1991 [1926a], 37-38). It is thus to (re)consider the functions of the state for this purpose, avoiding opposition to individual liberties and developing a balanced mix of different principles in order to compensate for the defects (Keynes, 1968 [1926b], 262).

The task is particularly complex. Keynes does not define precisely the productive functions of the State nor what are the social services. In the Keynes's formulation, the selection criterion for what the government should make is asserted “in negative”: what the market does not produce, why not profitable, should come under the action of the State (Keynes, 1991 [1926a], 40). The State is directly involved to generate goods and services by extending the available production (Keynes, 1991 [1933], 95). A society that only uses the principle of the capitalist market for production runs the risk of not “fully utilizing the opportunities of economic welfare being offered to us by the development of the technology but stops much before” (ibidem, 96-97). With a Welfare State (directly involved in productive tasks) it is possible, according to Keynes, reproduce the social forces that are needed by capitalists; while capitalism can't produce all the elements on which it is based without a Welfare State. This is the keynesian way to produce social

---

3 As known, Keynes focuses his attention on the direction, the coordination and the control of structural foundaments of the market (Keynes, 1991, [1926a], 41), on the importance to reach the goal of full occupation (Keynes 1991 [1937], 116) and on the public insurance services for workers (Keynes, 1991 [1930], 80).
justice, without losing the efficiency of the market as it is typical of authoritarian states (Keynes, 1991 [1936], 117).

1.1.3 Polanyian and keynesian paths in the studies on welfare: some notes

These original elaborations of Keynes and Polanyi have had considerable success and a recent rediscovery. As is well known, Keynes has been one of the most popular references of macroeconomic thinking of the "trente glorieuses" (Screpanti, Zamagni, 2004). His contributions have also been recently rediscovered in the studies on economic policies against unemployment (Lunghini, 1995; Mazzetti, 1997) and then, from 2008, in order to fully understand and address the economic and social crisis (Lunghini, 2009). With Lunghin’s words, ultimately, Keynes has left in thought on social and economic policies an "heritage lying" (ibidem).

The rediscovery of Polanyi has been slower, but lately, very consistent. Esping-Andersen has successfully taken the concept of "decommodification" from Polanyi to build an analysis from which he distinguishes three welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990, 43). A second analysis of Polanyi, after the golden age of capitalism, concerns a substantive approach to the study of economics and the theory of the three forms of exchange that are retrieved from a multiple perspective (Salsano, 2003, 3-4). For example North uses Polanyi according to the theory of transaction costs applied to institutional change (North, 2003 [1977]); anti-utilitarian thinkers such as Caillé and Latouche use him to question the market, its forms of rationality and its relationship with democracy (Caillé, 1991 [1988], 1998 [2000], 2003 [1998] and Latouche, 2000 [1999], 2003 [1998]).

A third and significant explicit reference to the polanyian lesson comes from economic sociology, where certain polanyian concepts such as embeddedness and reciprocity, albeit reformulated, have been some of the founding tenets of the discipline’s new success since the 1990s (Granovetter, 1985; Bagnasco, 1999; Laville, 1998 [1994]; Regini, 2007; Swedberg, 2005 [2003]).

1.2 Citizenship and social rights: a plan for equality

The contributions of Keynes and Polanyi only quote the concept of citizenship, which is fundamental in an analysis of welfare systems and is crucial in T.H.Marshall’s work. Marshall divides the architecture of historical and social citizenship into three components, which roughly correspond to three time periods in English history. In the eighteenth century, there was the spread of civil rights (regarding individual freedom and protection); in the nineteenth century, the focus was on political rights (the faculty to vote); finally in the twentieth century it was the turn of social rights. These included


This reconstruction is based on an interpretive effort, which constitutes an important intellectual heritage for clarifying the principles of the democratic welfare systems at the times of its foundation. While not free from defects,4 Marshall’s contribution tackles the

4 Zincone, 2003 critics Marhall’s evolutionistic approach and observes that his analyses tend to be limited to the Britain.
relationship between subject and political society from a purely legal context (Costa, 2005) and renews the discourse on equality.

1.2.1 The shapes of citizenship and the definition of equality

Focusing on a crucial point - that has not been considered much in Marshallian studies - Marshall thinks that a typical element of citizenship of the twentieth century is the unification of its three constituent elements: civil, political and social. During the twentieth century these three categories have in fact been placed in a new setting: in terms of the «equality of social dignity» (Marshall T.H., 1976 [1963], 33).

Marshall’s concept of citizenship depends on a historical definition of a plan for equality: if the plan for equality concerns individual freedoms, for example, social policies will defend this equality only. Every assistential service is out of this logic of equality. So the institutions have to find a different frame to interpret poverty and to produce an assistential service, e.g. the frames of morality and public order. In this case, it’s socially right to blame the poor for having failed in the use of freedom because the use of freedom is not the plane for defining equality (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 211). In this case the "boundary line" between who is and who is not a citizen is fixed only in the frame of the equality of freedom-from, without being concerned with the social production of the freedom-to. Therefore, locking a poor person in prison is not an exclusion because society has guaranteed his freedom and he has probably chosen not to be free, and so not to be citizen (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 211).

Finally, in Marshall’s work citizenship is defined in a move away from the dominant conception of equality, that is from the “inequality socially rightful” (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 8). For the English society of the late nineteenth century, while the inequality of individual freedom is held to be unrightful, the inequality in the use of individual freedom is considered rightful. Coherently, assistential services of the late nineteenth century are repressive against those who fail in using their personal freedom because they are not citizens. They can be imprisoned because they have already missed their state of citizen.

Comparing the contribution of the classics with developments in contemporary thought, Marshall seems to ultimately ask "equality, of what?", which is, of course, the foundational senian question (Sen, 1996 [1992]). For Marshall, with the answer to this question we arrive at a definition of citizenship for the twentieth century. The answers to the question of Sen and Marshall seem very similar.

1.2.2 Social citizenship of XX century

Citizenship in the twentieth century represents a substantial component of the concept of equality. This is related to the distribution of a minimum material stock that allows a
social protection of individual civil rights with the social production of the conditions that can make real their exercise.

To sum up, the result is a framework of citizenship based on the belief that “freedom of choice comes into play when you create the ability to choose” (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 5). This is decisive for the foundation of modern welfare states because it asserts their mission: to create the capacity to choose. Moreover, Marshall's focus on the capabilities and the differences makes his discourse on equality very close to the senian response to the question "equality of what?" and to the capability theory that stems from it (Sen, 1996 [1992], 2000 [1999]). This characterization of the status of citizenship implies the legitimacy of all the inequalities if they are not an "expression of hereditary privilege" and if they preserve the unity of members of a community “in a single civilization" (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 63): the recognition of belonging is a common good.

What is at issue is therefore not merely the absence of resources for the incapable individual but "the whole picture of social inequality". While in the nineteenth century the question is about “alleviating the obvious hardships of poverty in the lower strata of society" (ibidem, p.39) in the twentieth century welfare interventions are aimed at a user who is recognized as part of the whole, also including those people who do not need it (ibidem, 18, 47, 63, 65, 67).

Finally, while the treatment of inequality in the nineteenth century appears as a private matter for prosecution, that of the twentieth century becomes a public matter of protection and promotion. In the first case, assistance demonstrates and confirms that whoever does not use the freedom is a non-citizen, while in the second case assistance confirms the membership of the societal entity. In the first case the relationship between the user and the rest of society is interrupted, the intervention intentionally separates the non-citizen by the society and allows the availability of a stock as a donation for survival (ibidem, 27). In the second case, the intervention is socializing. It is built on the reactivation of the link between actor and system, because the actor can only realize himself in the system and the system can only go on with the contribution of the actor. This action simultaneously creates the capacity of the individual user and enables the reproduction of the system where the user is located. Under the principle of social citizenship, welfare services are in the middle of the production processes of society.

The distinguishing feature of the postwar welfare services is not therefore the distribution of consumer goods to the beneficiary to enable him to survive. The distribution of goods ensures that citizens can actually exercise the same power of choice over their own life as those who do not receive assistance. The interpretation of Marshall is close to Sen's contribution on the relationship between ownership and freedom, centered on "the freedom generated by the goods, not on the goods in themselves" (Sen, 2000 [1999], 78). Ultimately, although in welfare goods and material resources come into question, they are not understandable as objects of redistribution; they are only relevant in terms of autonomy.

2. Betrayals. Traps of the particular in the translation of the welfare systems

To sum up, with Keynes, Polanyi and Marshall, I highlighted several theoretical and analytical foundations of the new structures of post-war welfare. Of these references, we identified in particular (a) the centrality of the severe, but not destructive criticism of the capitalist market as a form of integration (thus the need for pluralistic forms of social
integration); (b) the decline of a counterweight to the capitalist market in terms of social belonging (citizenship), defined by the equality of capabilities to act, in terms of being produced by specific interventions (welfare).

Although rooted in a specific context, the theories proposed by the founding fathers of the democratic welfare system also seem interesting today. Of equal importance is also their criticism of the first achievements of the new British welfare system. These analyses provide a useful basis to interpret the current crisis of welfare systems.

2.1 An exhausted and contradictory citizenship? The problems of a labour-founded welfare

A first element of crisis can be seen in the specific historical context of the foundation of democratic welfare systems. When war ends, national unity is no longer a resource for citizenship and consequently universal social links tend to become weaker. In peacetime, there is no more space for a shared experience of daily life.

Ultimately, the "promise" of the postwar welfare is threatened primarily by the difficulty of reproducing a recognizable basis for citizenship in ordinary life (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 67). With the erosion of their symbolic references, the ties of citizenship were therefore already exhausted during the 1950s. If on the one hand, a recall to unity would be ineffective in moderating the tension towards personal welfare, on the other hand Marshall accords more chances to

sviluppo di fedeltà più ristrette, verso la comunità locale e specialmente verso il gruppo di lavoro. In quest'ultima forma la cittadinanza industriale, potrebbe, decentrandoli suoi obblighi alla unità di base della produzione, fornire un po' del vigore di cui sembra mancare in genere la cittadinanza (ibidem, 67).

The reference to the sphere of labour to found and maintain citizenship is a topic for social policies. The complexity of the plot between citizenship and work is understandable, as Marshall notes, along two paths that correspond to specific and consolidated accounts of critical research on social policies.

A first path concerns, in the words of Marshall (ibidem, 186), the relationship between "minor loyalties" (those bounded by professional groupings within which the worker is placed) and "higher loyalties". Minor loyalties can influence personal and social identity, they can promote the structured aggregation of interests and can be a vehicle for developing "higher loyalties. In this way they can facilitate the governing of complex societies. However, in contrast, minor loyalties can also costrain and stiffen the identity of the subject, hindering the development of universal solidarity and affecting public decision-making. The position of Marshall is disenchanted: you can not expect a permanent mobilization and it is impossible to repress minor loyalties. Institutions have the function of "creating conditions in which the various grounds and natural loyalties of social man can work in harmony", using existing conflicts "against those tough practices that constitute barriers to progress" (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 187).

Many scholars will work on the questions raised by Marshall in the period of the welfare system crisis: for example since the 1970s the scholars of the erosion of social ties by the welfare system (Habermas, 1975 [1973]; Ardigò, 1980); since the 1980s the scholars of neo-corporativism (Olson, 1990 [1965]; Regini, 2007); since the 1990s the scholars of the connections between the bounded and universal solidarities (Putnam, 1993, 2000 [1999]).
A second path of the study on the critical connections between work and citizenship denounces the possible subordination of the political principle to the market: it would mean reversing the foundations of the welfare system with contradictory social effects. In this case the status of citizen (and thus the entitlement to access welfare services) would be in fact recognized only to those who enter into an exchange relationship between labor force and monetary equivalent. This is clearly paradoxical in terms of the exclusion of unemployed people from the status of citizen: “the loss of job disintegrates social man” (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 184), says Marshall denouncing the dangers of the laboural foundation of the welfare system.

Richard Titmuss, another "founding father" of the democratic welfare system, already in the late 1950s, denounces the unsatisfactory outcomes of the interventions for those unable to work (Titmuss, 1986 [1958], 203). The segmentation of the British welfare system related to the conditions of workers tends therefore to increase the centrality of some and the marginalization of others: a perverse effect of the welfare system. The laboural foundation of citizenship is contradictory: “in their present form - Titmuss writes in two different contributions in 1955 - [the welfare systems] simultaneously expand and consolidate the area of social inequality” (Titmuss, 1986 [1958], 60), “tend to divide the social loyalties” (ibidem, 58); "it always begins to outline more clearly the sign of a social schism” (Titmuss, 1986 [1958], 75).

The critical analysis of Titmuss initiated a great deal of empirical studies on the welfare systems of Europe. Especially for the mediterranean family of welfare systems, they demonstrated since the 1970s that a welfare system based on a laboural-categorial foundation does not redistribute power (Ferrera, 2006), create new inequalities or consolidate previous inequalities (e.g.gender inequality, Pateman, 1989).

2.2 De-politicize the construction of welfare? The dangers of conformity and private interests

According to the classics of social policies, peace and success in the economic field since the mid-1950s have other negative consequences on the structures of democratic welfare systems.

The generalization of individual consumption chances (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 226) would have contributed, more or less directly, to inaugurate an era of conformism driven by the priority of attaining social superiority by the way of personal consumption (ibidem). In this context, social rights are reinterpreted, in the opinion of Marshall, as individual rights to the consumption of additional resources (Mezzadra, 2002, 12) thus the possibility of including the pursuit of private welfare within a framework of social compatibilities disappears (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 227). This triumph of private interest complicates the development of welfare systems built soon after the conflict. Titmuss's reflections bring the contrast between conformistic trends on the one hand and the chance to fully realize the founding ideals of social justice on the other into sharp focus.

Rafforzato dalle ideologie dell’iniziativa e delle opportunità individuali, [il mito del Welfare State] ha condotto alla convinzione che la maggior parte - per non dire tutti - dei nostri problemi sociali sia stata risolta o lo sarà presto. I pochi problemi che restano, così si pensa, verranno automaticamente risolti dall’aumento dei redditi e da interventi secondari. (...) Questo tipo di convinzione rende più rispettabile (...) l’agnosticismo politico e il neutralismo professionale. Evita il sorgere di nuove questioni riguardo ai mutamenti nelle concentrazioni del potere economico e sociale. Accetta, con l’aumentare della ricchezza, la legittimazione di una struttura di classe. E implica, non soltanto una tregua nella ricerca
dell’uguaglianza, ma in pratica un definitivo congelamento della lotta per la giustizia sociale (Titmuss, 1959, 198-199).

The criticism of Titmuss highlights the need to keep the social construction of the welfare system open. If the social construction of welfare system is closed, the promises of social justice will be betrayed. The macro-economic performances of the postwar period and the social affirmation of the “ideology” of consumerism tends to trivialize existing social problems and to entrust their solution to the magnifiche sorti e progressive of economic growth. The construction of the welfare system tends to be depoliticized, to move closer to the corporative requests of the insiders. Ultimately the space for a debate on the social distribution of power tends to close at the expense of the population excluded from welfare interventions.

The depoliticization of welfare issues is also, according to Titmuss, a substrate conducive not only to bureaucratic dominance but also to empower privately organized groups in the decisions and management of social security. With reference to several UK pension reforms of the 1950s, Titmuss writes


Titmuss and Marshall’s observations show the fragility of the structures and achievements of the welfare system in the medium term, in the absence of social forces that carry out the political nature of these structures and achievements. The political construction of the welfare system - they argue - can not stop without changing its nature. It will become a question of private consumption instead of a question of the social redistribution of power, a passage for particular interests instead of a device for public protection (Habermas, 1996 [1992]).

According to the critical perspective of Titmuss, the role of bureaucracy is also complicated. While bureaucracy has been from the origins of modern State the way to guarantee the impermeability of public organizations to particular interests, in the context of the fall of politicity of the 1950s bureaucracy also threatens to escalate. Not only does bureaucracy increase quantitatively, but it tends to become, in the words of Titmuss, a "private" and "secret" power, which redraws from government functions for the common good. Already in the mid-1950s Titmuss and Marshall complicated the categories of analysis of "public" and "private" in managing the welfare systems.

2.3 Abstraction, alienation and quality of welfare

According to Titmuss, particular traps permeated the same procedures that the welfare system uses to organize services. Health services in fact translate the principles of social justice through processes of classification The practices of classifications create subpopulations homogeneous for tipologies standard of needs (Marshall, 1976 [1963], 56, 60-61).\(^5\)

\(^5\) According to Marshall, the system can only check the processes of classifying and create the chances for their re-
To function as a tool for integration, citizenship must firstly define various issues as legitimate problems, then classify the users according to the problems they have and finally act on the problems with technical interventions. These operations tend to separate and regroup all the community through definitions (of problems and answers) produced by the system of services and, more specifically, by the expertises therein. Users usually do not matter in these processes: they are subordinate to their services. Welfare services, available because of the ownership of social rights and set up to rehabilitate, proceed usually by abstraction and lead to alienation of the users.

The result is an incoherence between the principles of unity and the recognition of social citizenship on the one hand and fragmentation and specialization of welfare services (based on social citizenship) on the other.

This development of social services corresponds to the empowerment of professional groups who are recognized as having the competences for the classification-building of "welfare problems". In this way scientific knowledge (corresponding to the medical advances of the 1930s and 1940s) becomes part of the institutional frame for the satisfaction of social needs and introduces new elements of particularism in the welfare system (the division of scientific knowledge).

Ultimately, the methods used to construct the social services and the weight of scientific knowledge and their professional groupings identify, in the 1950s in Britain, according to Titmuss, a new critical framework for the welfare system. Firstly, the power of professional interests is likely to defuse the political (open and dynamic) construction of the welfare system. Secondly, the dominance of bureaucracy and the power of the experts threaten, de facto, the social nature of welfare services: the services risk being seen as "finished products" (ibidem, 40), they risk being structured with no community or user contribution (and eventually against them).

---

3. A balance. The relevance of the classics for the study of contemporary social policy

Keynes’, Marshall’s, Titmuss’s and Polany’s contributions are much more articulate, difficult and problematic than I have described. Their lessons have been reread with the aim of returning to the origins of some key points that went along with the construction of the Welfare Systems after the Second World War in Europe. This lesson identify an “original promise” that accompanied some of the large effort to rebuild the social and institutional architecture of Europe after the Great Crisis, the Totalitarian Regimes and the War.

The four classics were innovative and not paradigmatic for the time. They gave shape to the rising welfare system and inspired the critique of welfare achievements. The works defined the frame in which many research programs on social policy were inscribed, after the so called “trente glorieuses”.

In reconstructing this "original promise" I referred to some specific elements in the thinking of the authors, without being systematic. I highlighted the issues that offer more opportunities to build useful tools to guide reflections on the present and future of social policies.

Five reflection paths seem to be relevant:
1. A first path concerns the unveiling of the ideological and moral nature of the principles of laissez-faire. It develops a severe but not destructive critique of the market as social regulator, and it highlights the need to compensate the social regulation of the market with other principles (redistribution and reciprocity). This path includes a broad range of recent studies which move from the observation of market failures to investigate other forms of social regulation and their mutual intertwining.
2. A second path concerns the foundation of the contemporary principle of redistribution, which invokes the principle of social citizenship and implies a definition of equality in terms of the ability to choose. In this guideline we can relate Sen’s masterful contribution on capabilities and operations.
3. A third path - which we primarily derive from the criticisms raised by the authors of the British welfare system – concerns the quality of the socio-political construction of the welfare system. If this process is not fuelled by a debate on social justice, the promise of redistribution will be blatantly betrayed. Within these guideline we can include a broad study of welfare which approximates to a study on the political and social public sphere and is nourished by paradigmatic contributions such as Habermas’ and the political science reflection on welfare (Habermas, 1996 [1992]).
4. The fourth path highlights on the one hand, the relationship between the aggregates and categorial interests, and on the other, the processes of construction and translation of the principle of social citizenship in times of peace and prosperity. We can report a vast literature on the misunderstood relationships between citizenship and work, on trends and operations of the neo-corporate welfare systems and on the weight exerted by pressure groups.
5. Finally, a fifth and last path underlines, always negatively and in connection with points 3. and 4., the creative power of the definition-classification of the technical and specialized devices of the welfare services. These services risk being incomprehensible and fragmented interventions, neglecting the roots of social services and excluding the users from rehabilitation. Titmuss’s critique leads us to a very consolidated area of study which emphasizes the creative power of “ordinary”
functionings and the “ordinary” institutional distortions of the welfare state compared to its founding principles.

The contributions of the classics can be now be tested in a specific field of study of the welfare system: social welfare.

4. At the turning point. A brief history of the founding welfare-mix debate in Italy

As mentioned in the Introduction, the reconsideration of certain directions of thought in the classics stems from the effort to build an interpretative instrument designed to study the partnership between volunteering associations and public agencies to plans and manage social care services. The emergence of partnerships between nonprofit actors and institutions has now been consolidated in many areas of public policy and, in the specific field of social policy, it has received considerable and academic attention in Italy (Ascoli 1999, Ascoli, Ranci, 2003; Ranci et al. 1991; Vitaddini, 2002). The spread of this phenomenon is on the other hand a paradigm shift of the forms of public services: the state-operator paradigm is abandoned and the paradigm of State-regulator/promoter succeeds by involving organized private actors in the construction and implementation of public policies (Trigilia, 1998 [2002]).

Italian legislation, which in the years 1990/1991 provided the first national legislative framework to this field, was preceded in the 1980s by a long foundational debate. A substantial part of this debate took place outside the academic context and had original forms and “new” actors. The protagonists of this debate were volunteering associations, a collective (relatively) new actor who in the 1980s appeared on the Italian political and institutional scene. This debate had important and tangible results (the production of new social legislation and the establishment of the National Centre for Volunteering), which took place in many locations (institutional and, mostly, non-institutional) and had many different voices (the different actors of the Italian volunteers met each other and with actors from academia, trade unions, politics and institutions). This diversity makes any attempt at a systemic reconstruction impossible, however it is possible, through the analysis of documents and interviews, to analyze the results. One of the possible outcomes is to isolate several key dimensions that are consistent with the lessons and criticisms of the classics.

4.1 The socio-institutional scenario of the italian debate

A brief reference to the social, political and institutional 1980's period is essential in this debate and understand its importance. The 1980s are often remembered as the time of crisis in terms of the legitimacy of the state, the end of social and political mobilization and the dissemination of theses on the primacy of the market at the expense of the forms hitherto assumed by welfare systems (Friedman, Friedman, 1981 [1980]). To summarize the socio-institutional Italian framework, we need to add several elements that affect our debate directly or indirectly. Of the indirect factors, the Italian context of the 1970s/1980s

6 In Italy the academic debate was very rich at this stage (Ardigo, 1979 Rossi, Donati, 1983; Paci, 1989) and had many connections with the debate surrounding volunteers.

7 The sources from which the analysis was conducted led to major conferences held in Italy in the 1980s, magazines of the same period and national and regional legislative sources between the years 1975 and 1991. These sources have been integrated with the construction of five semi-structured interviews with some direct protagonists of the debate. A first compilation of results of this debate have already been published in Guidi, 2009.
features some first, late and contradictory steps towards implementing the principles of the Republican Constitution of 1948 and the escalation of social and political tensions leading up to the period of subversive terrorism. Both factors involve institutional tension.

Other contextual factors instead regard directly our debate. The first concerns the particular features of the development of the Italian welfare system that contribute to a de-legitimization of the political class. Many scholars (Ferrera, 1993, 1998; Paci, 1989) showed that in Italy the political class, after the war, systematically designed interventions of social solidarity as a guided distribution of benefits with the purpose of building consensus and that it has failed for a long time to build a general legal framework for assistance, social security and health\(^8\). The result of this development is a welfare system which is in back, expensive, fragmented, particular, clientelare,\(^9\) familistic with large imbalances in the levels of social protection of the population unable to cope with (and in some cases, literally, to see) new states of social fragility. This scenario shows obvious limitations in the organization of volunteer work in the social sphere, especially in the context of marginality.. A second factor that directly affects our discussion concerns several changes in Italian civil society. The first change regards the Italian voluntary associations. They tend to differentiate on the basis of the propensity to act not just on the user, but more generally on “removing barriers and causes that restrict freedom, equity, personal development, participation” (Tavazza, 2001, 10; cfr.Pasini, 1994, 312-313; cfr.Ranci, 2006; cfr.Tavazza, 1981, 74).\(^10\) Since the 1970s there have been 'new' volunteers, characterized by the distance from a remedial approach and the trend to a promotional culture. The second change concerns the initiation of an intensive dialogue between members of volunteering associations with different cultural backgrounds: from the late 70s, in fact, the ideological barriers between catholic and socialist associations seem to fall, as they gain autonomy from political parties.

4.2 The main results of the debate

4.2.1 The new volunteering as a new political agreement

In this framework, the practices of the new movements of volunteering are intended as an opportunity to “constructively rethink participation” (Danni, Paracone, 1980, 63) in response to the cultural dominance of economism and the two great crises of the forms of politics:

- the crisis of representation, arising from the prevalence of patronage and welfarism strategies for the acquisition of consensus with the effects of de-empowerment and dependency (Getrevi, 1980, 45);
- the crisis of militancy, connected to an ideological and professionalizing drift of participation and a decrease in the aggregate capacity of political parties (Mazzoli, 2008).

\(^8\) The establishment of the National Health System dates back to 1978 and the Law on Assistance Framework was approved in 2000.
\(^9\) Clientelare is an Italian very pregnant adjective that means something of public (e.g. a welfare provision) got because of a private exchange (e.g. vs. the vote).
\(^10\) From this new approach of voluntary action were born new associations as Mo.V.L., Ceis, Comunità di Capodarco, Gruppo Abele. On the fundamental distinction between welfarism and volunteering to mark a boundary between old and new forms of association operating in social see Ranci, 1985, 19.
Participation seems to become in this case a means and a goal: the participation of citizens in a voluntary association is the means by which fragile and absent citizenship can acquire the tools to facilitate participation in all spheres of social life. During the 1980s many describe the new volunteerism for the special "talent" as defined by the co-essence of an effective service for users and the affirmation of a new political convention (Orsi, 1981, 77-79; Paracone, Morelli 1980, 51-55; Tavazza, 1985).

4.2.2 Personalization in the intervention logic of the new volunteering

In terms of providing a service, the particular feature of the emerging volunteering is to consider the user as a whole person. The contrast with the popular style in state welfare services is explicit. Associations denounce the segmentation of welfare interventions and in particular their tendency to work with indifference, by the means of classifications of the subject not corresponding to his needs but to the specific institutional competence of the structure that offers the service (Getrevi, 1980; Ranci, 1985, 129-133; Tavazza, 1985). In this approach the voice of the user would have had no space.

The service provided by volunteers is, however, for those arguing in the 1980s, about sharing action and focusing on all dimensions of the user's life (Ranci, 1985, 23). The volunteer is ideally one who works closely with the excluded and their condition of exclusion without the mediation of a rigid technical background packed, but especially with a willingness to listen and a willingness to act together (Orsi, 1981, 107). Those who talk about the volunteer in the 1980s claims this difference in the conception of the service: an intervention away from the standard paradigm of the welfare bureaucracy that separates rather than unites.

4.2.3 Socialization in the intervention logic of the new volunteering

The emphasis always placed by the "new" volunteers on the need to approach the excluded holistically is associated with the particular socializing potential of the volunteers. The sharing with the fragile person is the source of a dual push towards a socially rooted action.

The first one is the basis of a promotional, socially unifying and self-critical idea of the service provided by volunteers. According to the associations the interventions against the exclusion should give up a private logic, tipically focused on single issues and single users. Volunteering becomes a critical agent of socialization: in the daily encounter with the excluded and the prospect of his social rehabilitation, connections are built between the individual paths of exclusion and their social causes (Scansani, 1977, 34).

Secondly, the not-standard sharing with the patient is an opportunity to renew the bonds of citizenship. As one of the most significant documents in circulation since 1988 claims, “to welcome a child, to help a young person, not to leave an elderly etc.. simply means to be citizens in a “human” society (...) Volunteering for us is a new, complementary and indispensable, way to be full citizens” (Ciotti, 1988, 5; cfr. Pasini, 1994, 315). In this perspective of action, “the most urgent function” is that of building a new civic consciousness of solidarity, from which everyone can benefit (Albanesi, 1988, 72-73).
4.2.4 Institution building in the intervention logic of the new volunteering

In this debate, the new volunteers also tend to develop a position of critical collaboration with the institutions. While denouncing the deficiencies of assets, the modus operandi and achievements of the institutions of the welfare system, these associations interpret dialogue and cooperation with political forces and institutions as an indispensable instrument for achieving the objectives of social change. The repertoire developed during the 1970s and 1980s by new volunteers seems very effective for this purpose. In fact, next to the protest, volunteering offers some capacities to service that make it able to solve some social emergencies in which public agencies had failed. Over the 1980s therefore institutions also developed an interest in cooperating with volunteering (Tavazza, 1982, 11-12).

The contribution of volunteering in the welfare system, however, is clearly influenced in the debate by the perspective of transformation, "change society and institutions" is one of the most common slogans referring to the role of volunteering.

There was an idea of change, bringing solidarity in the policies of the institutions, in policies of the country, as balancing an idea of development based on the economy.

The goal was ambitious, but the anxiety of change was very strong.

Partnerships are created under the auspices of volunteering as “a political entity [that] goes further and acting on people, culture and structures, aims to obtain external conditions that guarantee the rights” (Pasini, 1994, 312).

4.3 The outcome of the debate on partnerships

The debate between volunteering, trade unions, political parties, scholars and institutions that took place in the 1980s was an unusual debate in the Italian context. It was non-paradigmatic in terms of the themes and characters. A debate insurgent because run by social-actors-in-construction and because focused on normative evaluations and on different visions of the present and future (Boltanski, 2005 [1990]). A debate at the turning point between different structures of social welfare services, driven by many crisis factors not considered as transitional.

The outcomes of this debate (that led Italian volunteering and social cooperation inside the management of welfare services) reveal a propensity to change compared to the achievements of the Italian welfare system in the 1945-1975 period. The propensity to change expressed by new volunteers is carried out with three basic aims:

1. the service rendered to the user. The modus operandi of state welfare agencies that had characterized its assistance in terms of standardization, fragmentation and separation were condemned. The volunteers then claimed the need for a service for the whole person in a rehabilitation perspective and proposed themselves as collective actors producing empowerment.

2. The quality of citizenship. The domination of the economy on life forms and the inadequacy of traditional forms of politics were denounced. Volunteering claimed the need to strengthen the sense of belonging to the community by (a)

---

11 "Volunteering to change society and institutions” is the title of one of the largest national conferences of the 1980s, the first since the establishment of the National Centre for Volunteering.
12 Two protagonists of the debate from national associations of volunteering.
connection between private troubles and social problems and (b) the link between different people. It proposed itself as a collective actor that produces a recognizable citizenship.

3. The functioning of institutions. Volunteering has been reported delays, opacity, rigidity of the Italian institutions. It claimed the need for a change in priorities setting and in the ordinary operations of the institutions, and it proposed itself as a collective actor for institution building.

Of course some elements of uncertainty and ambiguity can be derived from the reconstruction of the debate. The more frequent ghost among the volunteers is the loss of critical autonomy in their collaboration with institutions.

5. Studying welfare services. Lines of investigation based on the classics

The new legislation of 1991 on the partnerships between associations, social cooperatives and public bodies is an outcome of the debate of the 1980s and the start of the season of the welfare mix in Italy. In later years, also because of other legislative changes that have not mobilized any foundational debate, many public welfare services have been outsourced to private non-profit actors. This trend has been for at least several years at the center of critical attention on the adverse effects that can result from the principles of citizenship (De Leonards, 1998; Crounch, 2003 [2004]; Cefai, 2006).

Given these risks, reminding all players in the field of the terms of the "promise" of change that had characterized the foundational debate on the welfare-mix, can be crucial to identify areas of investigation recognizable by the actors involved and relevant for the assessment. The identification of three areas of inquiry (user empowerment, quality of citizenship, institution building) could be validated by a comparison with the literature.

We can first test the adequacy of the three areas by going back to the lessons of the classics.

The debate sponsored by the Italian volunteers recalls some aspects of central importance in the reconstruction of the classic's lessons. Avoiding an overly academic confrontation, I especially highlight the rehabilitation approach of the service, which is critical to the alienating technical protocols of welfare services, the significant reinforcement of the bond of citizenship, and the transformative power of social policies. The last point seems to near the classical lessons and the debate sponsored by volunteering in more general terms: if the classics approximate social policies to instruments of social justice, which compensate for the inequities of market, on the other hand the prospect of voluntary action in the debate refers to the indivisibility of care tasks with political action “on the culture and structure”. In a discussion of the relationship with institutions, volunteering in the 1980s proposes itself as a collective entity, which feeds the institutional frameworks of a transformative social policy, by contrasting the falls of politicity and belonging.

This location of the results of the debate of the 1980s within the frame of the classics of social policies, facilitates a comparison between the three areas of inquiry identified and the guidelines for a development of the recent specialized literature. It must first be noted that the areas of inquiry identified by the debate of the voluntary are close to the three components of social work of Dal Pra Ponticelli: the personal condition, the social context of these condition and the organizational and political structure of institutional responses (Dal Pra Ponticelli, 1987; Gui, 2003). In my opinion, even more significant is
the closeness of the outcome of the debate to the outcome of the reflection on the quality of partnerships undertaken by de Leonardis, Vitale, 2001. They propose to study the achievements of the new welfare along the dimensions of empowerment, sociability and institution building. Ruggeri, 2004, 136, has identified the features of security crisis of contemporary societies in the coordinates of the lack of ability, of socialization and of recrimination.

Ultimately, it is clear that the areas of inquiry identified in the volunteering debate of the 1980s meet many contributions in the literature on political and social service and derive an important validation from these contributions. In order to qualify the areas of inquiry so identified, the theoretical effort could continue quoting the analytical perspectives mentioned in chapters 1 and 2. Obviously it does not mean that the theoretical contributions of the classics are enough for the analysis of welfare services. However, a reference to their theories may help to set the principles of the welfare state into the framework of the research without assuming or delete them. 13

A simple conceptual map emerging from an analysis of the classics can help. The map could be built on three fundamental axes, corresponding to the user (x) to the conditions of citizenship (y) and to the institutions (z).

Fig.1 – A visual map for studying the partnerships between volunteering and public institutions

On each axis I may propose an aim for the partnerships in the welfare system:
- On the X axis (user), the empowerment of the user. We will investigate if and how the partnership contrasts the conditions of disability of user, promote and enhance its capabilities and increases (or at least maintain) its autonomy.
- On the Y axis (citizenship), the recognition of social citizenship. We will investigate if and how the partnership develops an approach aimed at the user’s

---

13 In addition to the contribution of the classics and to the research perspectives that I mentioned before, some others important contributions to study the partnerships derive from (a) the literature on new forms of public sphere and democracy that helps to focus the production of public goods in the transitional institutional contexts (Bifulco, de Leonardis, 2005; Pellizzoni, 2008); (b) some cognitivistic (Lanzara, 1993; Weick, 1997 [1995]; Gherardi, Lippi, 2000) and neo-institutionalistic (March, Olsen, 1989; Powell, DiMaggio, 2000 [1991]) approaches on organizational and institutional innovations with which studying the forms of learning and changing the partnerships (c) from the literature about the transformations in public services (above all about the paradigms of New Public Management and Governance) (Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2002 [2000]; Lascoumes, Le Gales, 2009 [2004]; Crouch, 2003 [2004]; della Rocca, Fortunato, 2006; Bifulco, 2008).
sociability (concerning the problems and the solutions), rebuilding the relations of the user with its community.

- On the Z axis (institutions), the institution building. We will investigate if and how the partnership contributes to improve how the institution functions, bearing in mind that learning is a reciprocal process.

Conclusions

At the turning point. Foundations, betrayals and memory in the change of social policies

a) Foundational debates at the turning points of social policy

Few other debates has a normative force as strong as those concerning social policies. Although often - and rightly - the subject of the debate relates to highly technical issues, inside every instrument of social policies (and all policies), there is always an assumption about what is judged to be significant or negligible, acceptable or unacceptable, right or wrong (Sen, 2000 [1999]; Lascoumes, Le Gales, 2009 [2004]). In some cases, however, the regulatory burden of the discourse on welfare is more explicit, it deviates from the how, focusing on the guidelines, discussing them with respect to judgments and interpretations about the past, present and future.

Some of the strong normative charged debates on welfare takes place in special circumstances, such as turning points. I refer to crucial historical moments when the debate on social policies is influenced by events of crisis that call for the revision of the paradigms of interpretation and it influences the changes in the way of understanding and configure the structures of the welfare systems.

The crisis and the debate, at the turning point, mark the path of the institutional innovation. The effects of breakage are concrete, but the debate at the turning point does not limit to prescribe magic or revolutionary solutions to the problems. Usual objects are placed in unusual frames, new frames are created where new objects are inserted, but this does not happen out of nothing. Debating at the turning point means above all to reckon with the past, with the ideas that have guided the action until then. Who debates at the turning point, before any proposals of change, must challenge the fundamentals and show that they are unfounded. It is not easy, it is maybe a task for heretics.

b) Debating the betrayals, after the turning point

I know that the institutional innovations pass mainly from ordinary components, more from actions than from intentions and are strongly bound by material artifacts and previous cognitive routines (Lanzara, 1994; Weick, 1995). But, in exceptional cases, a crisis generates a widely shared needs of different roots which a foundational debate can establish. In these cases, the normative density of the debate generates an expectation to future achievements, which is a myth, a "promise" that becomes a commitment to respect.

At the turning points, the "promise" exists in a visible and tangible way and has a considerable practical significance since it enables you to start new courses of action. The problem lies on the bottom. The "promise", translated into programs and measures, into new artifacts and relations will be dirtied, forgotten, used for other purposes, in many ways betrayed (Gherardi, Lippi, 2000). To translate is to betray: it is not that social policies are not new after the debate, but it is that they are differently new compared to
what has been discussed. Furthermore, when the translation process has finished, the routine of betrayal remains, that is the routine and that’s it. The "promise", or else the normative charge that founds an institutional innovation, tends to be betrayed for those who have generated it and tends to be dis-enacted (Weick, 1993 [1969]) for those working in the new field.

c) Remembering to remember, for a turning-point-debate

Under these conditions, to bring back the old "promise" on the scene - an exercise of re-memory (Morrison, 1987) - becomes a subversive operation. To remember where we come from can then serve as a contribution to institutional change, at least in so far as it forces us to say that we are changed and to investigate how we have changed. In this paper I have tried to show that the contribution of the classics on social democratic policies is timely and useful to the study of structures and achievements of welfare systems. The operation of re-memory can help researchers not to trivialize or expunge references to the founding principles of welfare and can accompany the social workers in a path of self-verification.

To investigate on the ordinary practices of the interventions of welfare it can be useful to go back where the reforms were formulated, namely in their foundational assumptions. The structures that are reached in the process of translation often tend to obscure the foundations. Remembering to remember them, knowing that they are not practices and they will be transformed, is a possible strategy for a study about social policies and services. And also, maybe, for a turning-point-debate.
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