

Structural Social Work: Maurice Moreau's Challenge to Social Work Practice

Ben Carniol

ABSTRACT. In rejecting a status quo orientation to social work, the late professor Maurice Moreau¹ formulated a structural approach to practice which made a valuable contribution to progressive forms of social work in Canada. Drawing upon Moreau's work, this article examines empowerment and progressive social work practice. More specifically, empowerment is examined with reference to the social worker's actions in: maximizing client resources; reducing power inequalities in client-worker relationships; unmasking the primary structures of oppression; facilitating a collective consciousness; fostering activism with social movements; and encouraging responsibility for feelings and behaviours leading to personal and political change.

INTRODUCTION

This article is based on an earlier draft prepared for this journal by Maurice Moreau. It is with sadness that I report that Maurice was not able to complete this article. He had been ill with AIDS-related complications which subsequently led to his tragic death. Aside from the pain of loss experienced by those who knew him, his death has left a huge gap among a network of progressive educators and practitioners in Canada. In completing this work, I also

Ben Carniol, LL.B., MSW, is a Professor at The Ryerson School of Social Work, 350 Victoria St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 2K3.

Journal of Progressive Human Services, Vol. 3(1) 1992
© 1992 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

1

relied on my conversations with Maurice about this article, and on my familiarity with his work.

The following pages present the structural approach to social work pioneered by Maurice Moreau (1979; 1989; 1990) and developed and applied by others in their teaching and practice. The structural approach is highly critical of conventional social work and posits an alternative, more effective form of practice.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONTEXTS

According to Moreau, professional practice is profoundly influenced by a society's economic and political forces. Western societies have generated a fluctuating mix of unrest and apathy in response to the injustices caused by the intertwined systemic roots of patriarchal capitalism, heterosexism, racism, and other oppressions. But the 1960s also left their mark: student rebellions in France and elsewhere, civil rights demonstrations initiated by Black Americans, and opposition to the Vietnam war. This activism paved the way for other mobilizations in the following decades. Despite the prevalence of neo-conservatism, environmentalist movements appeared and grew in many countries, as did organizations of gay men and lesbians advocating for their rights. A rejuvenated women's movement also intensified its focus within the private sphere of family relationships and within more public arenas such as the legislature, the workplace, and the media.

Within Canada each of these movements evolved in their own way, side by side with a feisty labour movement which at times erupted into union militancy. A history of colonial relations between Canada's public authorities and indigenous population, as well as more recent confrontations sparked renewed mobilization and politicization within the grassroots of First Nation communities in 1990. Furthermore, growing Quebecois support for a new nation separate and independent from Canada marked an upsurge of nationalism.

While Canadians reconsidered political boundaries, international capital restructured its control over markets and politicians. Within North America, unemployment, homelessness, and poverty catapulted to new post-Depression heights (Riches & Ternowetsky, 1990)

as manufacturers relocated to other regions and nations in search of cheap labour and docile or repressed trade unions (Gray, 1986). The casualties of this economic and social exploitation disproportionately included people of colour, indigenous people, and others in various prejudiced categories, with women being over-represented in all these groups. Violence against women, gays and lesbians, and Blacks reached scandalous levels while suicide and imprisonment among indigenous people remained well over the national rates.

In sum, the welfare state in Canada (and elsewhere) found itself presiding over a contradictory system in which white heterosexual affluent males from a privileged class exercised hierarchical control while various disempowered populations pressured the state to meet their social needs. The state largely identified with the privileged and their social relations of top-down control. But networks of people in subordinated groups with a critical consciousness about their unjustified subordination continued to pressure from below (Moscovitch & Albert, 1987).

CONFLICTING PRACTICE THEORIES

Just as the processes of social control conflicted with the social relations of upward pressure on the system, so too social work theory became polarized. On the one hand, conventional social work theory continued to legitimate the system and to shield it from basic critiques. Based on systems theory, these theories, like their welfare state counterpart, were supportive of top-down control. They became fashionable under the labels of "Ecological" and "Life Model" perspectives. But as Moreau (1989) pointed out:

Social problems are not caused by deficits in communication between individuals and systems as both ecology and systems theory posit. Differential access to power and conflict between systems are the problem and not a lack of mutual fit, reciprocity, interdependence and balance between individuals and systems. (p. 23)

In contrast to the systems theory approach, radical social workers struggled to develop alliances with the powerless in order to challenge the system (Bailey & Brake, 1975; Carniol, 1985; *Case Con* (UK) Journal; *Catalyst* (US) Journal; Cloward & Piven, 1976; Corrigan & Leonard, 1978; Galper, 1980; Lee, 1986; Lesemann, 1984; Levine, 1982; Moore & Morrison, 1988; Moreau, 1989; Ng, Walker & Muller, 1990; Wharf, 1990; Withom, 1984).

The structural approach developed by Moreau during this period added its voice to the growing radical social work literature. It offered itself as an umbrella that spanned and included the major radical themes. Indeed, Moreau alerted radicals about the futility of debates trying to show that any one particular oppression was somehow more debilitating and therefore more central than other oppressions. Based on his research and his practice, Moreau concluded that ranking the various exploitative social divisions in a hierarchy of importance was not useful. Instead the structural approach "places alongside each other the divisions of class, gender, race, age, ability/disability, and sexuality as the most significant social relations of advanced patriarchal capitalism" (Moreau, 1989, p. 1). Concurring with Sklar and the other authors of *Liberating Theory*, Moreau (1989) stated that:

Only empirical investigation of a particular society at a particular time can verify the existence or non-existence of a hierarchy of dominations in that particular case. And often, rather than a hierarchy of oppression, there will be a holistic interweaving of oppression. (Albert, Cagan, Chomsky, Hanel, Kins, Sargent & Sklar, 1986) p. 1

Understanding this "interweaving of oppression" became a key goal of the structural approach which held that just as oppressions are interwoven, so are their structural roots. More specifically, Moreau argued that the interlocked structures of patriarchy, racism, capitalism, heterosexism, ageism, and ableism, referred to here as "primary structures," reproduced various forms of inequality. Moreau accepted the analysis of the others who identified the respective roots of these separate oppressions. He acknowledged the importance of economic, gender, colour, sexuality and other institutionalized relations in reproducing these "primary structures." In

addition to the "primary structures," Moreau's analysis includes "secondary structures," i.e., personality, family, community and bureaucracy (including those of the media, schools and government). The terms "primary" and "secondary" are used because the primary structures of oppression have a far greater impact on secondary structures than vice versa.

For Moreau the secondary structures express and perpetuate the supremacy of the primary structures of oppression. These secondary structures which do not always accept oppressive relations, often contained conflict, especially when individuals, families, and organizations struggled against the unjustifiable domination of exploitative relations. Despite some encroachments against the primary structures of oppression, these conflicts usually fall victim to the status quo precisely because privileged power holders still exercise the greater balance of power. In brief, the structural approach acknowledges the dominance of the primary structures of oppression in order to eliminate them. As a result the structural approach goes beyond a focus on these secondary structures.

MAJOR ELEMENTS OF STRUCTURAL SOCIAL WORK

Chart 1 delineates the structural approach by comparing it to conventional social work practice. Although the average social worker carries out one or more of the activities of the structural approach at various times, the full measure of client empowerment can only be attained if all six of these activities are included.

Defense

Defense of the client refers to the worker's stance vis-a-vis the needs of clients for adequate material resources. It answers the question: Whose side are we on? While social work does aspire to meet essential client needs for a decent life, agency practices and elitist professional attitudes often become formidable barriers to the achievement of this goal. By encouraging us to focus primarily on assessments of emotions, parenting skills, and interpersonal capacities, mainstream social work literature also conveys the message that these tasks are more important than addressing issues of

CHART 1: STRUCTURAL & CONVENTIONAL SOCIAL WORK COMPARED

Structural Social Work

Defense: Responding to client's need for immediate resources; advocacy for client rights and for greater resources to clients.

Client-Worker Power:

Acting to share decision-making power with clients and to demystify professional techniques; no records hidden from the client.

Unmasking Structures:

Fostering an understanding of the client's living/working conditions by linking these to the primary structures of oppression (patriarchy, racism, capitalism, heterosexism).

Conventional Social Work

Worker minimizes client advocacy because worker tries to be "objective" or "neutral"; uses authority as social control agent.

Client-worker power differences maximized by the worker following an elitist model of professionalism, calling for unilateral decisions by the worker.

Psychologizing problems, thereby obscuring structural source of problem. Practice leading to the adaptation or adjustment of clients to oppressive structures and relations.

Personal Change: Enhanced client power via worker encouraging clients to take responsibility for feelings, thoughts and behaviour which may be destructive to self or to others; linking feelings, thoughts and behaviour to primary structures.

Personal change limited to personal adjustments which are congruent with dominant patterns of social relations.

Collective Consciousness: Respecting the client's individuality while raising consciousness about the group or social movement whose members share similar structural locations with clients; joining such groups and movements.

Encouraging individualism; seeing the client as primarily responsible for problems and solutions; results in client isolation and alienation.

Political Change: Activism by clients and workers within social justice organizations and social movements; developing alternative services and using non-violent conflict tactics; coalition/solidarity work.

Since dominant institutional structures are seen as desirable, political activism which challenges these structures is seen as unprofessional.

"mere" material resources. Often written from a white middle-class perspective, such literature also contains a sexist bias which expects more emotional nourishment from women than from men.

* → The client's need for resources, that is, adequate money, shelter, food, clothing, services, and emotional support is the progressive worker's first priority although workers cannot magically extract these resources from a miserly welfare state. They remain clear about the client's right to entitlements. Such clarity stems from the worker's knowledge that most problems derive from the system's maldistribution of wealth and power and that this maldistribution can be changed.

→ Meanwhile, faced with client need for more resources, structural workers advocate vigorously with clients, with other workers, and with other organizations to push back the barriers to access, so that clients receive at least their legal requirements. When the interpretation of client entitlement is fuzzy, structural workers press for the most generous reading of the rules. Rather than "doing for," these workers also make every effort to involve clients, to join with clients in seeking the required resources. This process supports and validates the clients' own efforts to defend themselves against institutions and officialdom.

Conservative social workers respond to client advocacy differently. Some view client advocacy as too political or as a risk to their own position. Others engage in advocacy but "do for," leaving clients as mystified as they previously were about how to locate suitable housing or how to obtain an emergency allowance from social assistance. Still other conservative workers may defend clients' rights when they are blatantly violated. But this advocacy often devolves into a test of wills among professionals and agencies, with the client being treated like a pawn and excluded from the process. In short, to be effective and to empower clients "the defense" must take into account the worker's own power within the client-worker relationship.

Client-Worker Power

→ Many social workers still follow a medical model in which the social worker-as-expert diagnoses the problem and prescribes solutions which clients are expected to follow. This flows from a con-

Advocates do
paternalistic - my power
so I can this. →
doing for →
a Wilson of the
benevolent SW

control-oriented, paternalistic version of professionalism and dovetails with an agency's acceptance of hierarchical structures as "normal" or "natural." This model assumes that workers, using their professional judgement, will control or "manage" client information, assessments, planning and intervention decisions. This process is more recently called "case management."

A more democratic, egalitarian, and feminist approach expects the worker to demystify the techniques and the jargon. It provides clients with choices, shares assessments, and invites feedback. The structural approach encourages workers to reduce the distance between themselves and clients by discussing the most comfortable use of names, the location of meetings, access to the worker, and by including informal chitchat. At a more technical level, workers share the rationale behind their actions, their questions, and their interpretation of the client's situation. The workers acknowledge the limits of their perception of the client's situation and possible solutions, and encourage the client to challenge them.

In sum, structural workers place their professional power at the disposal of clients in an explicit and conscious manner. They seek to share their limited power and to promote a client-worker relationship based on mutual dialogue rather than a top-down interaction. This approach draws on feminist strategies for optimizing egalitarian relationships, on a one-to-one or a group basis (Levine, 1982). It also draws from the experience with Canada's First Nation people which suggests that authentic dialogue is capable of hearing the oppressed and "offers promise as a means of critical self-examination and as a major catalyst for social change" (Howse & Statwick, 1990, p. 87). Since clients often see the social worker's authority as equivalent to the power of the entire social agency, structural workers also share information about the limits of their own power. The sharing of such information is also encouraged by much of mainstream social work literature.

Unmasking Structures

Although conventional social work literature includes some emphasis on client advocacy for resources and recognizes the value of some mutuality within worker-client relationships, this is where the similarity to the structural approach ends. Unlike structural theory,



* conventional or mainstream theorists are unable to unmask the structural sources of oppressions impacting upon the client because, from their perspective, they fail to see the system as oppressive. Instead, most of the social work practice literature actually perpetuates the masking process, making this literature and the practice it recommends part of the problem rather than part of the solution. By obscuring the sources of oppression, this literature and its related practices, effectively psychologize problems which are essentially political in nature. This in turn fosters client adaptation to oppressive structures.

In contrast, the structural approach explicitly exposes the primary structures of oppression; just as workers demystify professional techniques and processes and invite client feedback, they share their insights into the nature of primary structures. As part of the client-worker dialogue, workers reach for feedback on this topic as well, avoiding both professional jargon and political rhetoric. Workers articulate rather than obscure the contradiction between the client's needs and their denial by top-down hierarchies (Carniol, 1990a; Gilroy, 1990; Levine, 1982; Moreau, 1990a).

By shifting the focus to root causes of oppression grounded in systemic inequalities, workers avoid blaming clients as psychologically defective. Using the adult education approach of Paulo Freire (1971), workers help clients to name (rather than suppress) the more obvious oppressions affecting their living and working conditions. The implications of all this are discussed and through their words and actions workers clearly show whose side they are on. The client is also welcomed as a partner in advocacy which contributes to progressive personal and social change.

Decolonizing

Personal Change

While most social problems are caused by the primary structures of oppression, this does not mean we can now blame everything on the system and ignore the individual's responsibility for harmful behaviour. On the contrary, personal change is also central to the structural approach.

Since liberated structures cannot be created by unliberated individuals, how can liberated individuals exist when our system exerts

Clinical effects
 → ~~ignored~~
 ↓
 on need
 Eco-system
 In a white (see
 research on racism)

← ignored

daily pressure on us to conform to exploitative structures? Rather than debating the proverbial chicken-and-egg question (which comes first?) Moreau agreed with those who concluded that we must work simultaneously on both liberating persons and liberating structures.

Leonard (1984) observes that our personalities are shaped by the family, schools, and other institutions structured by patriarchal authority. Such institutions socialize children and adults to conform to patriarchal norms enabling them to fit into a capitalist economy and not to question the class privileges of their "betters." Sugar-coating this bitter pill in clichés of equal opportunity, fair treatment, and other promises that the present system cannot fulfill makes it easier to swallow. But these top-down social relations create frustrations and discontents which can be harnessed to social change. Likewise, to the extent we have psychologically embraced codes of conduct, thoughts, and feelings which celebrate top-down social relations, we will repress our own opposition to these oppressive social relations. It has been argued that oppressed people typically internalize self-hatred and guilt in order to reinforce their self-image as devalued persons (Lerner, 1986). According to Moreau (1990a), such feelings provide the oppressed with the illusion of autonomy in that inferiorized individuals attempt to personally control their own punishment, hoping for relief from their status if they atone sufficiently for their alleged faults. Moreau adds:

Workers must seize any opportunity they can construct with the persons to enable them to replace self-hatred with self-respect and self-care. Genuine care, reassurance and support must be provided in efforts to deguilt them. Considerable attention must be given to helping the client confront and reclaim repressed, disowned feelings of fear, hurt, and anger in order that these feelings may be validated and connected to their true source, that is channelled outwardly instead of against oneself. (p. 60)

As our consciousness grows and we realize that more caring, more humane versions of social relations exist, inner turmoil may develop as we experience rebellion against our conformity to op-

pressive structures. This personal rebellion against inequality can be reinforced by our becoming politically active with others engaged in collective action against unjust structures. Shifts in self-perception may also lead to shifts in our behaviour (Leonard, 1984).

Social workers who have undergone personal and political changes are better able to address personal and political change with clients. The worker and client can become co-investigators, linking client thoughts, feelings, and behaviour to the problem situation and to the personal impacts of the primary structures of oppression. The co-investigation may also explore the impact on the client of the feelings and behaviour of others. This in turn, can open the way for the worker and the client to work on changing any self-destructive thoughts, feelings, and behaviour expressed by the client. As workers support clients in their new behaviour, the goal is one of achieving more satisfying social relations with family members, friends, co-workers, and co-activists (Moreau, 1990c).

Collective Consciousness

Structural workers understand that personal change in clients requires exploited individuals to reject the individualism which isolates them and prevents them from recognizing their common experiences. But the structural approach differentiates individualism (the individual as source and solution of problems) from individuality which respects the uniqueness of each individual (Adamson et al. 1988 p. 101). Individuality can raise collective consciousness among women, First Nation people, Blacks and other people of colour, gay men and lesbians, the poor and the working class— which in turn can fuel the development of social movements and networks geared to progressive change. Although these grassroots movements have had their mixture of growth and stagnation, their survival fosters a consciousness about the collective nature of inequality, and acts as a continuing threat to the dominance of individualism.

Structural workers have also found it useful to understand the nature of social movements, their stigmatization by dominant power-holders, and their viability in specific communities. Such knowledge enables workers to point out to clients the similarities in their physi-

←

person is political

good

cal condition, thoughts, behaviour, or feelings with those of others. This opens the door towards developing social empathy with others in similar situations, in sharp contrast to the individualistic version of empathy which characterizes conventional social work. For example, when a bored and depressed woman describes herself as "only a housewife" and exclaims "men always get what they want!" a conventional worker might respond "You feel you don't ever get what you want?" A structural worker might ask "You feel that you and other women don't get what you want?" The process of consciousness-raising would also include a dialogue about why men generally get a better deal than women. If the worker is a female, self-disclosure about her own experience with women's subordinate status has helped to develop more mutual and egalitarian client-worker relationships (Russell, 1989, p. 77).

In the client-worker dialogue, the worker supports the client's examination of the limits of individualistic remedies and the power-enhancing potential of collective solutions. As clients develop a critical consciousness about groups whose members share some of the client's experiences, the worker helps the client to contact them. Since progressive workers themselves often have linked their own experiences (as workers, as people of colour, as women, or as part of other subordinated groups) with others in similar situations, in a sense, these workers become role models in terms of their own empowerment due to their participation within collectivities oriented to personal and political change.

Political Change

The focus on political and personal change is interwoven. While Chart 1 lists the six structural activities in a sequence, with political change listed last, this list is not intended to convey a linear process. For example, there is an element of political change inherent in workers and clients sharing power and working together to obtain resources in defense of client needs.

Political change is an on-going process, rather than a one-shot event. Given this, structural social workers recognize the need to join the process rather than remaining on the sidelines or on the side of perpetuating oppressive social relations. They also understand


that political change can move in the progressive direction of eliminating oppression by dismantling privileges or in the regressive direction which expands privileges, widens the gap between rich and poor, and worsens exploitation. Still another kind of change creates the impression of being progressive when in fact it is regressive, consolidating privileges while pretending to weaken them. Political change, as used here, refers to both the personal/political dimensions of change; that is a feminized version of social change which rejects the artificial splits between the personal and the political aspects of life (Gilroy, 1990; Levine, 1982).

Structural social workers help clients to change both personally and politically by developing linkages to various social movements and progressive community networks, and also by becoming activists. For example, many Black clients and workers became personally and politically empowered by being activists in the civil rights movement. Although each movement has its own history, regional meaning, fluctuations, leadership processes, openings for member support and activism, and its own share of frustrations, participation is empowering for those involved. These movements, represent one of the most powerful catalysts for political change in Western societies (Adamson, Briskin & McPhail, 1988; Cunningham, Findlay, Kadar, Lennon & Silva, 1988; Piven & Cloward, 1979).

Most change is superficial when those directly affected are not involved in the process. While participation can be manipulated by professionals and others, it can also be democratic, authentic, and inspiring. The latter, to which structural social workers are committed, involves risk, courage, and a vision of a transformed world based on humane social values. Easier said than done. Therefore progressive activists often look for support and nourishment from groups, networks, and individuals, active within progressive social movements. Such support can also promote solidarity with clients in a host of social change efforts (Cameron & Kerans, 1985; Carniol, 1990b, Ch. 7) and thus interrupt—sometimes briefly, sometimes for longer periods—the harmful social relations imposed by the top-down flow of power. Such top-down hierarchies are only one version of social relations and can be rejected in favour of the more satisfying horizontal exchanges based on mutual respect and egali-

tarian relationships. In that way, political change is a valuable support to personal change.

**CLIENT EMPOWERMENT:
GENERALIST VS. SPECIALIZED SOCIAL WORK**



Client empowerment, that is, the expansion of client power and choices, is maximized when social workers engage in all of the above structural activities. Rather than defining client empowerment as a separate activity in the above framework, each of the six activities contributes in its own way to client empowerment. More specifically, client power and choices increase as a result of greater access to material resources, from greater freedom in the client-worker relationship, greater awareness about systemic sources of oppression, greater consciousness about others similarly oppressed, greater ability to join the activism of social movements, and from greater ability to change personal behaviour which is harmful to oneself or to others. These processes of empowerment enable clients and workers to participate in the larger process of transforming dominant ideologies, structures, and social relations.

The structural approach to client empowerment leans towards a generalist model of practice, a model which as Moreau recognized, "requires skill in individual, family, group, and community work" (Moreau, 1990b, p. 34). Put another way, structural workers are seen as capable of interweaving a double focus on both personal and political change. Given this, the structural approach opposes the common practice in social work education of separating out the potentially more radical areas of the curriculum (such as community organization and policy courses) and then insulating the rest of the curriculum from their critiques.

One of Moreau's major contributions has been to bring a radical critique back to the central core of social work, namely its practice intervention. He reminds us that social work with individuals is not inherently conservative, nor is community work or policy analysis automatically focused on reducing oppression. Rather each specialization can contain either status quo or emancipatory perspectives.

The structural approach advocates the latter and therefore supports progressive innovations in all areas of social work, from research (Ralph, 1988; Whitmore & Kerans, 1988) to international development (Albert, 1990; Campfens, 1988; Moore, 1989; Tester, 1990; Wilson, 1989). It attempts via an integration of practice into a generalist form, to empower clients through processes which contribute to the dismantling of structural inequalities.

BUT WHO WOULD HIRE ONE?

Can structural social workers find work in the prevailing social welfare system? Yes. Social agencies of the welfare state are not necessarily monolithic in their approach. Although social service bureaucracies have been bent to express exploitative social relations based on class, racism, sexism, heterosexism, ageism, and ableism, many clients, workers, and some administrators are dissatisfied with these arrangements. Side by side with bureaucratic formal hierarchies, one can often find a parallel, informal network geared to providing a better response to client needs. Depending on the level of peer support, the politics of the labour unions, on the region's interest in client rights, and on the leadership of progressive social workers—one can implement at least some of the activities of the structural approach (Clutterbuck, David, Novick & Volpe, 1990; Novick & Volpe, 1990; Moreau, 1989).

Not surprisingly, structural workers face an uphill struggle. They are resisted by the social agency via supervisors and managers oriented to assembly line service. The obstacles grow where caseloads are ridiculously large and when agencies offer mostly a band-aid service. Large caseloads severely curtail the time for building the client-worker relationship and limit opportunities for dialogues that explore the personal and political dimensions of problems and solutions. Yet even in these settings, social workers still have choices: they can defend agency practices to clients or they can unmask these practices. They can psychologize problems or they can point to systemic roots. They can focus exclusively on the individual client or they can include the similar experience of others, giving information about how to contact such groups.

Some settings are more conducive to the structural approach than others, especially those sponsored by one of the larger social movements. Those agencies and schools of social work that attract a cluster of progressive practitioners and educators, can become temporarily emancipated zones in which horizontal social relations are aspired to and practiced. Very tenuous in a larger system that persists in its top-down, vertical social relations, these experiments in democracy and freedom find themselves racing against time, trying to consolidate insights, exporting what works to other receptive settings, and making preparations for the inevitable effort by the privileged to dismantle what they sense is a threat to the status quo. Fortunately, control by the privileged is never total, or absolute, because they must make some allowances for a limited range of independence by professionals and their institutional settings. It is within this range that oppositional politics become feasible and that the structural approach can take root and grow.

CONCLUSION

For Moreau, the structural approach was not a new "method" but rather "a way of thinking and acting at all levels of life" (Moreau 1990b, p. 34). He saw it not as a dogma, but as a working hypothesis, to be continuously submitted to the tests of practice. Those of us educators, researchers, and practitioners who have used and refined this approach find that the effort to link the structural roots of social problems to client empowerment reinvigorates the progressive potential of social work.

The structural approach also reminds us that words such as "empowerment," "change" and "dignity" along with social work specialization can be easily distorted and given conservative meanings which perpetuate the status quo. While the defenders of privilege stigmatize words like "radical," the structural approach has reclaimed its authentic meaning as one of attending to the roots of social and personal problems, not merely to their symptoms. By simultaneously addressing the personal and political dimensions of oppressions, and doing so through nonviolent ways, structural workers challenge their more conventional colleagues to shed

their implicit consent to the prevailing social relations. Whether this approach can become a prototype for more democratic, more egalitarian, and more feminist social work practices, remains to be seen. Partly, that will depend on the extent to which other teachers, researchers, and practitioners develop the approach further and tap into the progressive potential of changes emanating from this approach.

ENDNOTE

1. Maurice Moreau established the basis of his approach in 1973 as a student at the Columbia University School of Social Work in New York City. He received significant input from Gisele Legault of the Université de Montréal and from Pierre Racine and Michele Bourgon of the Université du Québec in Montréal. Also helpful to Moreau's development of the structural approach were the following people at the School of Social Work, Carleton University (Ottawa): Helen Levine, Mike Brake, Peter Findlay, Roland Lecompte, Allan Moscovitch, and Jim Albert. The work of Peter Leonard, formerly of Warwick University (England) and now at McGill University (Montréal) contributed to the theoretical foundations of the structural approach. Justin Levesque, Jean Panet-Raymond, Lynne Leonard, Linda Davies, Shirley Steele, Liesel Urtnowski, Gwyn Frayne, Sandra Frost, Mary Hlywa and Marilyn Rowell in Montréal also helped Moreau to clarify his ideas. This article benefitted from the editorial suggestions of Michele Bourgon, Université du Québec in Montréal, and Dorothy Moore, Maritime School of Social Work, Dalhousie University. Credit for excellent typing and retyping goes to Patience Wilson.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, N., Briskin, L. & McPhail, M. (1988). *Feminist organizing for change: The contemporary women's movement in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Albert, J. (1990). Foreign aid. The welfare function in imperialist relations between north and south paper presented at the Annual Conference of The Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work, Victoria, British Columbia.
- Bailey, R. & Brake, M. (1975). *Radical social work*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Cameron, J.G. & Kerans, P. (1985). Social and political action. In S. Yelaja (Ed.), *An introduction to social work practice in Canada* (pp. 111-143). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall.
- Campfens, H. (1988). Forces shaping the new social work in Latin America. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 5, 9-27.
- Camiol, B. (1985). Clash of ideologies in social work education. *Canadian Social Work Review* '84, 184-200.

- Carniol, B. (1990a). Social work and the labour movement. In B. Wharf (Ed.) *Social work and social change in Canada* (pp. 114-143). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Carniol, B. (1990b). *Case critical: Challenging social work in Canada*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Case Con.* British Journal.
- Catalyst.* U.S. Journal.
- Cloward, R. & Piven, F.F. (1976). Notes toward a radical social work. In R. Bailey and M. Brake (Eds.), *Radical social work* (pp. vii-xlviii). London: Edward Arnold.
- Clutterbuck, P., Davis, E., Novick, M., & Volpe, R. (1990). *Best practice survey: A review prepared for the children at risk sub-committee of the Laidlaw Foundation*, Vol. 2, Toronto: Laidlaw Foundation.
- Corrigan, P. & Leonard, P. (1978). *Social work practice under capitalism: A Marxist approach*. London: Macmillan.
- Cunningham, F., Findlay, S., Kadar, M., Lennon, A. & Silva, E. (1988). *Social movements/social change: The politics and practice of organizing*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. NY: Herder & Herder.
- Galper, J. (1980). *Social work practice: A radical perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gilroy, J. (1990). Social work and the women's movement. In B. Wharf (Ed.), *Social work and social change in Canada* (pp. 52-78). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Gray, L. (1986). *Global assembly line*. U.S.A.: Educational T.V. and Film Centre, 58 Min., 16mm and video.
- Howse, Y. & Stalwick, H. (1990). Social work and the First Nation movement: "Our children, our culture." In B. Wharf (Ed.) *Social work and social change in Canada* (pp. 79-113). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Lee, B. (1986). *The pragmatics of community organization*. Mississauga, Ont.: Common Act Press.
- Leonard, P. (1984). *Personality and ideology: Towards a materialist understanding of the individual*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Lerner, M. (1986). *Surplus powerlessness: The psychodynamics of everyday life . . . and the psychology of individual and social transformation*. Oakland, California: The Institute for Labor and Mental Health.
- Lesemann, F. (1984). *Services and circuses: Community and the welfare state*. Montreal: Black Rose.
- Levine, H. (1982). Personal is political: Feminism and the helping professions. In A. Miles & G. Finn (Eds.), *Feminism in Canada: From pressure to politics* (pp. 251-268). Montreal: Black Rose.
- Moore, D.E. & Morrison, J.H. (Eds.). (1988). *Work, ethnicity and oral history*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: International Education Centre, St. Mary's University.
- Moore, D. (1989). *Challenges to women's development*. Unpublished paper delivered to the University of Guyana Consultation on Curriculum Development in Women's Studies. Georgetown, Guyana.

→ HQ 1453. F45

- Moreau, M. (1979). A structural approach to social work practice. *Canadian Journal of Social Work Education*, 5(1), 78-94.
- Moreau, M. (1985). *Structural social work practice: A case illustration*. Unpublished paper. Montreal.
- Moreau, M. & Leonard, L. (1989). *Empowerment through a structural approach to social work: A report from practice*. Montreal and Ottawa: Ecole de service sociale, Université de Montreal and Carleton University School of Social Work.
- Moreau, M. (1990a). Empowerment through advocacy and consciousness-raising: Implications of a structural approach to social work. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 17(2), 53-67.
- Moreau, M. (1990b). *Practice implications of a structural approach to social work*. Unpublished previous draft for this journal, Montreal.
- Moreau, M. (1990c). Objective #5: Enhancing the client's power through personal change. Unpublished research notes. Montreal.
- Moscovitch, A. & Albert, J. (1987). *The 'benevolent' state: The growth of welfare in Canada*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Ng, R., Walker, G. & Muller, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Community organization and the Canadian state*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Novick, M. & Volpe, R. (1990). *Perspectives on social practice: A review prepared for the children at risk sub-committee of the Laidlaw Foundation*, vol. 1. Toronto: Laidlaw Foundation.
- Piven, F.F. & Cloward, R.A. (1979). *Poor people's movements: Why they succeed, how they fail*. New York: Vintage.
- Ralph, D. (1988). Researching from the bottom: Lessons participatory research has for feminists. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 22, 36-40.
- Riches, G. and Temowetsky, G. (1990). *Unemployment and welfare*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Russell, M.N. (1989). Feminist social work skills. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 6(1), 69-81.
- Sklar, H., Albert, M., Cagan, L., Chomsky, N., Hahnel, R., King, M. & Sargent, L. (1986). *Liberating theory*. Boston: South End Press.
- Tester, F. (1991). The globalized economy: What does it mean for Canadian social and environmental policy? *Canadian Review of Social Policy* 27, 3-11.
- Wharf, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Social work and social change in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Withorn, A. (1984). *Serving the people: Social service and social change*. N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- Whitmore, E. & Kerans, P. (1988). Participation, empowerment and welfare. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 22, 51-60.
- Wilson, M. (1989). *Practice in a revolutionary context: Social work in Nicaragua*. Unpublished paper, Annual Conference of the Alberta Association of Social workers, Calgary, Alberta.