

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

The emergence of welfare state, primarily as a consequence of industrial revolution, witnessed the state being gradually forced to take up the responsibilities of well-being of its citizen. Often the pressure put on the state manifests itself through various popular movements and the state response is articulated through legislations. Ensuring full employment to its people has now become one of the major welfare objectives of any state irrespective of its nature or type. The Directive Principle of State Policy of Indian Constitution declares providing full employment to all its citizen as one of the state's most important goals. The goal so far has hardly been realised. No single sociological or economic explanation can be sought for the persistence of mass-unemployment which looms large as a major political issue impinging on countless socio-political unrests since independence. No doubt, with the slow but impressive agricultural transformation, gradually accelerating industrialisation and large scale deliberate expansion in services, there has been marked expansion in number of vacancies and the employment potentials have increased manifold. But the generation of seemingly vast employment potentials have always fell short of the number of persons wanting job primarily because of the fast multiplying population and tremendous growth in educated manpower. The

gap between the number of vacancies available and persons wanting job is ever widening since independence.

The need for re-settlement of ex-servicemen arises primarily because there is greater supply of manpower in practically every sector of our economy than the vacancies available. In a hypothetically reversed situation, a discussion on the re-settlement of ex-servicemen may appear meaningless and most of the functions of the Directorate of Resettlement, Ministry of Defence, Government of India (henceforth being referred to as DGR) may become redundant. Therefore, re-settlement of ex-servicemen can best be conceived as a process of making special effort<sup>1</sup> by the state to help the ex-servicemen re-settle in their post-retirement life, which essentially means making adequate arrangements for their reemployment or self-employment by various means and ensuring their smooth placement in the civilian occupational system. Viewed this way, a re-settlement study should mainly attempt to make a systematic understanding of interaction between the special provisions made by the state for the re-settlement of a particular group, and, individual or group responses to the provisions made as well as their responses to the problem itself.

Basic Premises:

The entire process of re-settlement begins with the following four basic premises:

1) That most of the ex-servicemen retire early and for survival they invariably require a job soon after retirement.

2) That there is no favourable sign in the overall economic scenario which may narrow down the gap between persons wanting jobs and vacancies available in foreseeable future.

3) That prolonged military training and uniform service conditions coupled with their impressive and ever increasing numerical strength have set ex-servicemen as a category apart, which, for several reasons, deserves and requires special treatment of the state.

4) And finally, that the compulsions of the nature of job in the services are such that most of the ranks have to retire between 32-41 and the government is incapable of guaranteeing them a job upto 58, by lateral placement or otherwise, which may be comparable to the civilian job tenure - and the state pursuing the policy of mixed economy, expects positive contributions from the private sectors, associations and ex-servicemen themselves, for the amelioration of their problems.

#### Justification of the Problem:

A scientific understanding of 'the development and nature and laws of human society' has been one of the

primary sociological concerns from the early days of the emergence of this discipline.<sup>2</sup> This primary concern of sociologists has rendered the study of social problems under severe criticism, though the study of social problems is not formally excluded from the subject matter of sociology. Despite its 'slashing' criticism, sociology in many countries is said to have been 'fathered' by the study of social problems.<sup>3</sup> More respectable treatment to the study of social problems is given by our sister discipline, Social Work,<sup>4</sup> because of their explicit "conviction that rational and scientific solutions to social problems could be found through social reform and individual guidance."<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, as specialists in research methodology, it is argued that some sociologists made contributions of inestimable value to administrators of social agencies who desired scientific appraisals of the effectiveness of their welfare programmes. In fact, for more than half a century sociologists and social workers have cooperated closely in a wide variety of activities designed for community betterment. Thus, so far as scientific understanding of social problem is concerned, sociological concepts and theories, and to great extent its methods and techniques can provide best answers.

An attempt, therefore, is being made to make a scientific understanding of the problems of ex-servicemen in general which essentially revolves around their re-settlement.

The choice of the problem is indeed guided by its 'topicality', currency, and pragmatic derivations.<sup>6</sup> As already suggested, considering professional socialization of the past, the uniformity of rank they hold even after retirement, statutory provisions controlling and regulating their post-retirement behaviour; uniformity of pensions, economic status and, by and large, similarity of the problems that they face in general make the ex-servicemen a highly distinct social category. The population of this special social category is rapidly increasing. It is estimated that now 65,000 to 70,000 are being added every year to the existing population of around 3 million ex-servicemen. The early age of retirement, added family responsibilities, gradual disintegration of old system of social security based on village kinship, caste and joint family system, and, virtual absence of modern social security system, make their problem more acute than a qualified young job seeker. An average ex-serviceman finds himself in a paradoxical situation of competing at once with retired civilians and fresh job-seekers with hardly anyone of his age to compete and throw a challenge.

Re-settlement is a process, which not only endeavours at smooth second-career transition but also attempts to bear the jerks of transition itself by way of institutional counselling, guidance, training and liaisoning. There is close and intimate interplay between the institutions

controlling, regulating and assisting the ex-servicemen and the objective realities of society where he returns back. Competition, caste, family, rank and status and a variety of other social factors start constraining him soon after he gets released from the services. Both 're-settlement' as a process and problem and 'ex-servicemen' as a significant social category are important in our contemporary national context -- hence the justification of the present problem of research.

As a part of introduction, we now intend to dwell upon the concept of resettlement in some greater detail. This exercise is necessary at least for two reasons. First, that it is the first word of the title of the present work, therefore, the word must be adequately exemplified so that our deliberations in the subsequent chapters may have clear and definite meaning. Second, that in India the term 'resettlement' is being applied for a variety of social problems and processes. Therefore, it is also worthwhile to examine whether the term "resettlement" has a definite meaning when it is applied to different contexts and categories.

The terms resettlement and rehabilitation are at times confused and used interchangeably. Further, the meaning of the term resettlement cannot be fully appreciated without understanding the term "settlement" since in the former the meaning of the latter is subsumed. While discussing the

terms settlement, resettlement and rehabilitation, we do not intend to establish a continuum among the three. They are three distinct sociological processes indeed. But a simultaneous discussion of the three at one place exemplifies the meaning of each of the three related concepts and particularly that of resettlement which concerns us for the moment.

#### Settlement, Resettlement and Rehabilitation

Resettlement presupposes dislocation from settlement. Etymologically, of numerous meanings given,<sup>7</sup> we have preferred the term settlement to mean 'establishment in life, in an office or employment' for the purpose of present analysis. Viewed this way, settlement refers to a process of status acquisition in society and creation of interests in the relationship which surround him. Settlement, therefore, is a universal process depending upon one's ascribed/achieved status and personal ability and interests.

The nature of settlement, however, differs from society to society in terms of those undertaking primary responsibility of settlement of an individual. For example, a man of a status or ascriptive society gets settled in his life as per his ascribed status and the prevalent norms of his tribe, caste or estate. It is the responsibility of elders in the family, kinship, tribe or caste to see that the growing child properly acquired occupational skills of

the family and on attaining adulthood he shares rights and duties of every economic activity of the family like any other member. In typical achievement oriented societies, however, the individual concerned is solely responsible for his settlement. The questions of major decisions pertaining to choice of job, choice of life partner, etc. are to be resolved by the individual concerned. In matter of one's settlement an individual has to proceed almost in unaided manner, parents usually taking up the responsibility of schooling them only upto high school stage.

A brief reference on the concept of 'settlement' exemplifies the term 're-settlement'. Re-settlement as a process has a very restricted meaning. It limits itself only to the sociological aspects of seeking a second or subsequent career after putting in a major part of ones economically productive life to a given employment/self-employment. The crucial aspect in defining the process of re-settlement is that it is not an end result of an individual's own choice, he is compelled by the requirements of his job to leave it at an age when he would have rather continued the job. Thus, it is not changing jobs as is the case with the managerial class, white collar technical hands, and floating industrial workers, etc., in Indian situation. The waiting period from one job to another for such class may be termed as a stage of 'frictional unemployment' or 'transit period for professional mobility' or 'preferred voluntary unemployment' for

a short period. This is apparently done to enhance one's skill to find better job prospects which are also often clubbed with attending to numerous personal items which remain unattended hitherto because of the professional compulsions and the rigours of an industrial society. Thus, with the concept of resettlement a sense of compulsion is associated for those requiring it explicitly or implicitly. If anyone refuses to be in employment or opts out of work, he is out of the purview of present study. We will subsequently notice that it is in this sense that those who voluntarily opt out of the services are excluded from the definition of ex-servicemen.

Re-habilitation,<sup>8</sup> on the other hand, is a related process for which the victim himself is not responsible. An individual being subjected to rehabilitation is a child of circumstances. One can cite numerous examples - a victim of war, riot, flood, famine, fire, or landslide, earthquake, cyclone, etc., or deformed birth having permanent mental or physical impairment of delinquency, drug addiction, etc. to name only a few. Thus, those who need physical, mental, economic or social rehabilitation, seldom consent to the misfortune and peril which surround them.

The special nature of the problems of ex-servicemen in the contemporary socio-economic framework necessitates "re-settlement" as an alternative for mitigating their problems. As it has already been defined, re-settlement

is a process by which some additional support is ensured to the interested parties who are themselves anxious to sort out their problems and are prepared to take up the challenges by exploiting the additional support - whether by institutions/associations or by the informal sources. Definitionally, in the process of resettlement, it is presumed that the person concerned will take the first initiative and seek the additional support extended or assured. Where rehabilitative measures are required, on the other hand, the state machinery and other welfare associations/organisations are obliged to go to the doorstep of victims to extend their support and give relief to the party of rehabilitation whether an individual or a group among such victims want such relief or not. Thus, in rehabilitative measures, it is the catastrophe and its victims which are important. It is the collectivity or the aggregate connected with an unforeseen and uncontrollable calamity which is important for taking up any rehabilitative measure rather than an individual. In case of the subjects of re-settlement this is not so. They are treated as an end product of some unavoidable socio-economic process which consigns them to some unfavourable and deprived position. The subjects of re-settlement are treated individually rather than collectively by the state machinery and other institutions for the purpose of extending him any relief. The relief granted is not generalised in nature, as is in case of rehabilitative

measures. Every one intending to get resettled institutionally must take his first initiative to successfully claim the extra support being provided by the Government in their favour.

If settlement, resettlement and rehabilitation are three sociological processes which must take place when conditions for any one of them exists, the question then arises as to who should take up the primary responsibility for undertaking the problem/process? In other words, if conditions of any of the three processes exist, who should be expected to come forward and provide relief? For the performance of a great number of social functions, individual is socially recognized to be primarily responsible. In other words, it is the duty of the individual to take appropriate measures in a given circumstance, viz., in case of settlement. Similarly, it is the primary responsibility of the state and other welfare organisations to take up rehabilitative measures if situations so warrant. It is in this sense that the process of resettlement falls in between settlement and rehabilitation as resettlement measures are supposed to be taken up on mutual basis, both by the individual and the state. Therefore, we can get the following scheme in terms of those generally found responsible for taking decision and making necessary arrangements for the three processes:

Chart 1.1: Showing those responsible for taking decision and making efforts for tackling the situation/problems of settlement, resettlement and rehabilitation

Problems/ Processes	Responsibility in terms of degree of desirability		
	Primary Responsibility	Secondary Responsibility	Preferred Re- sponsibility (no formal responsibility)
Settlement	Individual	Family, relations & peer groups	State
Resettle- ment	Mutual, the victim (individual) and those responsible for his deprived state of affairs (institution)	Family, relations & peer groups	Either <u>only</u> the victim or only those responsible for his state of affairs
Rehabili- tation	Societal, Govern- mental	Family, relations & peer groups	Individual

Usually settlement has individualistic personal reference - it concerns an individual and his very personal matters. Whereas both re-settlement and rehabilitation have group reference viz. resettlement or rehabilitation of an individual of such and such a group. Similarly, in terms of temporal orientation, settlement always has futuristic reference whereas both resettlement and rehabilitation have past reference. In case of resettlement and rehabilitative measures the course of action arises due to certain deprivation or calamity already occurred to the victims of either of the two processes respectively. Thus,

in case of resettlement and rehabilitation the temporal orientation must have a past reference. This is not the case with the process of settlement. It depends upon the ambitions of the individual, what he expects from him and what he wants to achieve in his career. It is in this sense that 'settlement' has futuristic orientation. The temporal and social and spatial reference of the problems of settlement, resettlement and rehabilitation can be viewed as follows:

Chart 1.2: Showing the temporal, social and spatial reference of the process of settlement, re-settlement and rehabilitation

Reference	Problem/Process		
	Settlement	Resettlement	Rehabilitation
Temporal	Future	Past	Past
Social	Individual	Group	Group
Spatial	Disperse	Localised	Localised

Thus, settlement always refers to an individual and is always oriented towards future having a spatially disperse canvas in any universe. Whereas both re-settlement and rehabilitation have group reference, past orientation and localised spatial framework.

Because of their greater similarities, the terms re-settlement and re-habilitation have been quite often used interchangeably. Still, as it has already been discerned there lies a clear difference between the two concepts in

terms of the responsibilities attributed to tackle or mitigate the problem in individual cases. Those who are subjects of the rehabilitation of any type are not expected to take initiative for tackling their problems. Whereas, in the case of re-settlement both the subjects of re-settlement and those primarily responsible for the conditions of such subjects are to share the responsibilities in tackling their problems. It is considered joint responsibility and it is this sense of jointness of responsibilities which delineates the term from settlement on the one hand and rehabilitation on the other.

The joint responsibility of resettlement may be shared with an individual member either by a formal institution, usually the one which caused him to get out of work prematurely or by the primary relatives of the sufferer.

The matter of Resettlement:

The matter of resettlement is compensation for the deprivations incurred throughout one's occupational career. The need for such compensation may be explicitly recognised by the state or implicitly conceived by the society. The deprivations thus recognised or conceived are primarily economic and socio-psychological. The politically deprived groups, as mentioned already, require a compensation of different order which we have named as rehabilitation. And further, resettlement as a compensatory process is applicable only to the occupational categories having like experiences of deprivations with reference to other majority occupations

with comparable statuses. The numbers of occupational categories thus deprived must find themselves in minority among the set of comparable occupations in a given political economy.

The process of resettlement, therefore, emerges out of the explicit or implicit concern for compensation of an occupational group having economic and/or socio-psychological deprivation conditioned by its nature of work and the economic and socio-psychological rewards associated with it. The sense of deprivations gets sharpened when the objective conditions of work and reward system associated with it is considered as "minority occupations" and is compared with the "like majority occupation" enjoying same social status but having better economic and socio-psychological rewards. The following six factors contribute to the emergence of resettlement as a compensatory process for the members of any occupational category who are considered as deprived merely as a result of such factors either 'jointly' or 'severally'.

(1) Conditions requiring separate living of a worker from his family (especially that of procreation) for the most part of his occupational career. Such conditions may prevail (a) either because of the low and/or precarious income associated with an employment or self-employment or (b) because of the tough organisational norms, for

example, those of the military and para military forces requiring its rank to live in the barracks with their colleagues in non-family stations depriving them for the most part of their career to live with their families. Resettlement, therefore, pertains to all those who emigrate to some distant place to seek job or gainful occupation but are compelled by way of paucity of funds or the requirements of the job, to maintain their family somewhere else (usually the native place) than the place of work. The one who becomes a subject matter of resettlement has a history of maintaining his family (particularly of procreation) from a distant place by way of regular remittances and only by infrequent personal care materialising through occasional visits on important occasions or long leave.

Those who are unable to live with their family by virtue of low and precarious income and high cost of living of the cities include the unskilled urban/'industrial workers' from the villages or petty self-employed unorganised workers such as those vending milk, eggs, fish, vegetable, fruits and other such consumer items which chiefly belong to the informal sector.

While explaining the conditions requiring a worker to maintain his family from a distance, it is assumed that all those who migrate to urban centres <sup>industrial</sup> and towns from their respective villages in search of some gainful employment or work or, join the armed forces, are firstly men, and secondly,

such men love to live with their respective families as part of their self-fulfilment and meeting their most basic socio-psychological needs. It follows, therefore, that all those who are constrained to keep their family members in the vicinity of their place of work must consider themselves as deprived to the extent they are obliged to carry the burden of maintaining their respective families from a physically unapproachable distance. Thus, an economically well-placed person having capacity to keep his wife and children with him voluntarily chooses to keep them at native place or somewhere else on personal considerations, do not fulfil the requirements of the conditions of resettlement and therefore are excluded from its definition. It is being emphasised here that resettlement applies only to those who are constrained or inhibited to keep their family where they work. Therefore, resettlement is applicable only in those cases where external compulsion or forbearance is sufficient enough to preclude a working hand from keeping his family where he works.

(2) The second condition is the physical requirement of the job leading to early retirement. The examples include all such careers conditioned by such physical requirements as those working in the armed forces, career outdoor sportsmen, circus workers, etc. The air-hostess and sportswomen and lady circus players in certain cases may have identical

physical requirements of early retirement but are taken here as exceptions and excluded for the purpose of the present formulations. Similarly, among the outdoor sports highly paid sports like cricket, tennis, etc. are excluded which compensate its career incumbent adequately enough before they are physically unable to play and also because the players of such games generally come from the high echelon of society providing them better standards of socio-economic securities than the other sportsmen, viz. hockey, football, basketball players, athletes, wrestlers, swimmers, etc. in <sup>the</sup> Indian context.

(3) The third important condition is the number and intensity of socio-economic obligations left to be performed directly as consequence of conditions (1) and (2) mentioned above either jointly or even separately. In case of ex-servicemen all the three conditions are met, viz. they have to work away from their family for the most part of their career; the requirements of their job make them to retire early and finally which is also crucial that a great many of their socio-economic obligations, such as education, marriage and employment of the children, etc., remain to be fulfilled. Although the migrant labourers and the outdoor sportsmen are the exclusive examples of (1) and (2) above respectively, for majority of them their socio-economic obligations remain to be fulfilled and therefore are among those who require resettlement measures.

(4) The fourth important condition is that income from the previous career (employment or self-employment) should be such as to allow negligible or only scant savings so that when he comes back to his home to live permanently he finds his pension or savings quite inadequate to meet the obligations and responsibilities. Therefore, he must be forced to supplement his income. By previous career it is assumed that those working in a career roughly for a decade or more will only be included for the purpose of present analysis.

(5) The fifth condition is the numerical preponderance of those conditioned by the above four factors whether occupationally or territorially. Therefore, individual cases or socially insignificant numbers will not qualify itself to become a subject matter of the present study.

(6) And finally, the group claiming or being considered as a subject matter of resettlement must have its historicity whether occupationally or territorially. The occupations or territories giving rise to the conditions 1-5 above must have a history of at least two or more generations. Therefore, the occupationally deprived category of first generation in its occupational history will be excluded for the purpose of analysis.

#### Resettlement as a Social Process:

Settlement is applicable to all societies irrespective of stages of development. It is expected of a child in every

society that once he grows up he will create a world of his own and thereby become responsible for all that he does in his personal matters. He is expected to satiate his basic needs from the nest that he weaves and in the very process of weaving he undertakes a number of economic activities. The recognition of the fact of an individual being responsible to the woman he marries and the children he procreates is the starting point of the concept of settlement. Thus, settlement is a process to meet the socially recognised requirement to satiate one's primary needs in and through his family and rights and duties associated from such recognition. It is in the realm of duties, responsibilities or obligations towards one's family that most of the activities of settlement are guided.

With the duty to take care is associated the right to earn reasonable livelihood. In the underdeveloped societies' rights and duties are mutually complementary. Family, kinship, caste and other social institutions unflinchingly help an individual to meet his family obligations, the moment he establishes or is made to establish his family. In developing (transitional) societies, the duty to take care remains but the social institutions such as family, kinship, caste, etc. turn insipid in securing an 'individual' right to earn reasonable livelihood. It is now expected of the state to ensure reasonable livelihood to its every

citizen but the state finds itself incapable to meet such demands. In developed societies too duty to take care of one's family rests with the head of the household but the state in such societies are well capable of ensuring the rights of an individual to earn reasonable livelihood.

Similarly, in every society there is prescribed time period in which one must do certain kinds of activities during one's life span.<sup>9</sup> In the process various institutions interact with an individual member of a society. In the underdeveloped (simple) societies family, kinship, caste, religion and other social institutions ensure that an individual does what he is expected to do in a given age group. In developed societies, social institutions lose their efficacy in ensuring the performance of socially prescribed roles of a given age-set. The role is taken over by economic institutions and state legislations.

Chart 1.3 clearly shows that the socially recognised duties and rights correspond in developed (complex) and underdeveloped (simple) societies. In developing societies, however, whereas the socially recognized duties exists, there is absence of corresponding rights of the citizen.



THESIS

Y. 9  
 THESIS  
 362.8680954  
 K642 Re

8



TH2631

TH-2631

Chart 1.3: Showing occurrence of socially recognised duties and corresponding rights by types of society

Types of Societies	Socially recognised duties	Corresponding rights
Underdeveloped (Simple)	+	+
Developing (Transitional)	+	-
Developed (Complex)	+	+

This is not to equate simple societies with technologically and economically developed/complex societies. The two are indeed different. But when they are viewed in terms of socially recognised duties and corresponding rights, there is complementary relationship between the two in both types of societies. The historical and anthropological evidences show that in simple society, social institutions took care to ensure a reasonable livelihood for an individual. In all developed societies, the same is ensured either by legislative mechanism (example - socialist republic) or by creating favourable economic environment (for example, advanced capitalist countries where demand and supply curve of the labour market show mutually comparable trend). As an example of developing society, the Indian case can be cited where neither the economy is capable of providing work to its teeming millions nor legislative provisions exist to ensure Right to Work as a Fundamental Right. A reference of it being only feebly made in Directive Principles of State Policy of our Constitution (Article-41).

The scarcity of resources whether natural or artificial, in developing societies and the rising expectations of the masses have put extra strain on every segment of a society - the individual - the society and the state. Resettlement appears as a major social process when all the segments of society find itself in strain and incapable of performing the functions which it is expected to do. It is, therefore, a process of tension management in developing societies.

Resettlement thus conceived applies to a section of rural lower middle classes of all developing societies who are compelled or lured to seek employment in the organised sector - the income, benefits or service conditions of which force them to maintain their families in the villages and be content with only occasional visit to home once in a while. Therefore, the petty shopkeeper, wage earners, self-employed skilled/unskilled workers in the cities coming individually or in groups to earn their livelihood in the cities and thereby maintain their families in their respective villages that can be viewed as subject matter of resettlement. They come from a class which provides them at least some social and economic security on the basis of which the individual migrating worker can leave his family in his village-home. The class of people among the ex-servicemen being dealt with here also belong to the similar group and therefore have been chosen as typical category where resettlement applies.

In the underdeveloped societies, motivation to move out of the villages is less because of the lack of job opportunities in the urban areas. Although the urbanward migration of male married workers exist as a major migration process of developing societies, even in the underdeveloped societies such migration does take place by the induction of the rural menfolk to the ranks of its army. Then, one may ask a hypothetical question - Does an ex-serviceman of underdeveloped society require resettlement measure? The answer is in the negative as he will not feel deprived once he is retired because he will be the ideal reference group for the people among which he will return to live both socially and economically.

In developed societies too resettlement as a major social process relating to job and career does not exist because of the growth of industrialisation and urbanisation and lack of any surplus labour in the villages which can be used to play a subsidiary role in the cities. Even those working among the ranks in the armed forces enjoy for most of their career to live with their respective wives and children. The term of service is longer and after retirement there is no waiting period for the second job, if wanted.

Resettlement therefore finds its existence only in the developing societies as major career processes. In underdeveloped and developed societies there is only settlement.

In the former mainly because those who can take care of their settlement by way of employment/self-employment of any sort are few and therefore not considered as deprived in any sense and secondly, even if few among them require resettlement, state is incapable of or is not in need of providing institutional arrangements for the resettlement of any occupational category. In the latter societies, the labour supply is often less than the employment demand generated. Therefore, choice of work depends upon the personal qualities and interests of an individual. The institutional barriers and socio-economic bottlenecks do not require the state here to make special arrangements for the resettlement of any particular occupational category or the culture system to create special space for those who migrate from the countryside in the hope that they will come back one day to finally settle down there.

#### Scheme of the Study:

In order to appreciate the problems of ex-service personnel, we have tried to understand their status to Indian society through the past. In the second chapter, the panoramic view of soldier's status in society through different stages in our history has been linked to the present. Then, the third chapter is fully devoted to the discussion of the nature of ex-servicemen's problems, their meaning and scope for the present study. The fourth chapter deliberates upon the methods and techniques of the study. The fifth chapter

is about the nature of resettlement of ex-servicemen. The sixth and seventh chapters contain discussion about factors influencing resettlement of ex-servicemen in India. And finally, the eighth chapter deals with the prospects of resettlement as a sociological process as well as a subject matter of sociological study.

-

Notes & References:

1. The effort is special as against the ordinary measures to combat the problem of unemployment in general.
2. Flower & Flower, Oxford Dictionary of English Language, 1975, p.1088.
3. International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, vol.14, Macmillan Co. & The Free Press, 1968, pp.453-54.
4. For an illuminating panoramic view of recent trends in professional Social Work with special reference to India, see Oommen, T.K., Professional Social Work - As I See It, Dept. of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, 1987.
5. International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, op. cit., p.495.
6. Ibid., p.453.
7. Little William, The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Oxford, 1968, p.1856.
8. Ibid. Little explains rehabilitation as:
  1. "To restore by formal act or declaration (a person degraded or attained) to formal privileges, rank and possessions; to re-establish (a) person's good name or memory) by authoritative pronouncement; (b) to re-establish the character or reputation of (a person or thing)".
  2. "To restore previous conditions; to set up again in proper condition.

see p.1693.
9. For example, Principles of Ashram Dharma among Hindus.