University of Strathclyde
Department of Educational and Professional Studies

Community Development as Discourse:
Analysing Discourses, Identities and Social Practices in the US and
the UK

by

Akwugo Emejulu

A thesis presented in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

2010

Copyright Statement

Signed: Date:

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to reconceptualise community development as a discourse and understand how various discursive repertoires influence the available identities for practitioners and community groups taking part in community development activities. Community development is rarely thought of as a discourse and it is from this gap in knowledge that my research is positioned. Throughout this thesis, I analyse how community development discourses are formed, structured and operationalised and I investigate whether the dominant discourses of community development live up to their 'radical' claims by exploring the identity constructions of practitioners and local people.

In order to analyse the discourses of community development, I operationalised a post-structuralist discourse analysis methodology as developed by Hansen (2006). Post-structuralist discourse analysis is concerned with understanding the construction and reproduction of identity within a particular discourse through the analysis of texts. Using Hansen's methodology and method, I selected and analysed 121 American and British community development texts dating from 1968 to 1997.

As a result of my discourse analysis of texts, I argue that there is a serious problem embedded in the discourse of community development. Community development, despite its dominant presentation of itself as unproblematic and essentially 'radical', constructs suspect identities for professionals and local people. Throughout this research, I make one original contribution to knowledge. I demonstrate that community development, since at least 1968 in both the US and the UK, reproduces identities that invest the community development professional with agency and construct local people as a passive and often incorrigible Other. This binary persists whether a community development discourse defines itself as either 'radical' or 'conservative'. This research finding calls into question dominant contemporary portrayals of community development. Rather than being a self-evident good, community development, more often than not, subjects local people to patronising and

unequal identities that reinforce rather than undermine negative stereotypes about the political nous of marginalised groups.

Introduction: Understanding Community Development as Discourse

The goal of my research project is to answer the following question:

What are the dominant discourses of American and British community development and what influence do these discourses have on the constitution of identities for those individuals and groups participating in a community development process?

This research project is about reconceptualising community development as a discourse and understanding how various discursive repertoires influence the available identities for practitioners and community groups taking part in community development activities. For the purposes of my research I am adopting a broad idea of 'community development' by defining it as a political and social process of education and action to achieve self-determination and social justice for marginalised groups (Naples 1998, p.1-10; Sen 2003, p.xlii-lxv; Ledwith 2005, p.1-6; Dominelli 2006, p.101). Thus in my study, community development is not simply reducible to a professional practice, but also includes social actions that seek to challenge and transform political, social and economic institutions and structures. I am defining 'discourse' as a structured system of meanings which give individuals and groups identities and rules of expected behaviour (Derrida 1974; Foucault 1980; Howarth 2000; Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Belsey 2002). Similar to my use of community development, I am also operationalising a broad idea of discourse by employing a post-structuralist definition of this term. By re-conceiving community development as a discourse, I wish to position community development as a social and political construction bounded by power relations, identities and social practices and contested by subjects seeking to preserve, oppose or transform their identities or the rules of behaviour. Studying the tension between how individuals are both subjects within a community development discourse—possible creators of their own identities—but also subjected to a discourse—their identities and behaviours are

structured and ordered by dominant ways of interpreting reality—is the focus of my research.

Community development is rarely thought of as a discourse and it is from this gap in knowledge that my research takes its rationale. In a range of important texts that seek to explain the history, development and politics of community development in the US and the UK, the primary focus is usually on telling a narrative history of community development and describing the successes, challenges and controversies of when community development intersects with specific policy and political change at either the grassroots or institutional levels (Alinsky 1972; Mayo and Jones 1972; Loney 1985; Fisher 1993; Popple 1994; Sen 2000; Stoeker 2000; Henderson and Thomas 2001; Ledwith 2005). In addition, most community development texts seek to compare and contrast competing models of community development by analysing the differing roles and functions of the practitioner and by discussing the various political objectives of the community development process. By constructing community development as a linear, stable and uncomplicated phenomenon, I argue that this approach leads to three inter-related problems when we seek to theorise community development.

Firstly, the dominant way of thinking about community development can lead to a reproduction of the assertion that community development is an unproblematic professional practice that, as a matter of course, promotes the empowerment of the poor and disenfranchised. For example, here is Gilchrist (2004, p.21) describing the role and function of the professional:

> Community development is distinguished from social work and allied welfare professionals through its commitment to collective ways of addressing problems…Community development [professionals are] primarily concerned with meeting the needs and aspirations of community members whose circumstances have left them poorly provided for…with limited means to organise and excluded from mainstream opportunities to participate in activities or decision-making.

Community development is oftentimes preoccupied by its own meaning, legitimacy and relevance—especially in relation other social welfare professionals. This narcissism, as I shall argue throughout my research, can lead to the misrecognition of community groups and the silencing of specific social justice claims that do not correlate with community development's view of itself as a profession. Furthermore, the very act of community development positioning itself as a profession of helping those it deems 'excluded' can set up questionable relationships between the professional and the local people with whom she works.

Secondly, this dominant approach to community development can promote the assertion of normative values. What the majority of community development texts appear to have in common is that community development is often presented as a self-evidently 'good thing' for those who participate in it. For example, Alinsky (1971, p.3) constructs community development as the process of '[creating] mass organisations to seize power and give it to the people, to realise the democratic dream of equality, justice, peace and cooperation'. In a similar construction, Ledwith (2005, p.1) discusses community development in this way:

> Community development begins in the everyday lives of local people…It is founded on a process of empowerment and participation…In a process of action and reflection, community development grows through a diversity of local projects that addresses issues faced by people in community.

The assertion of the normative value of community development—that it will always promote what is 'best' for ordinary people—perhaps obscures more critical reflections on its language, ideas and social practices.

The third problem with the dominant constructions of community development is that they appear to promote a binary in order to support their normative

assertions. A preoccupation in community development texts is with radical and conservative models of practice. Radical practice is usually associated with socialism, feminism or anti-racism and its focus is on revolutionising norms, values and institutional structures (for example see: Alinsky 1972; CDP 1975; Stall and Stoeker 1997; Ledwith 2005; Dominelli 2006). With the exception of a few texts, 'radical' community development is often constructed as authentic, empowering and liberating for citizens (for a dissenting view see Twelvetrees 2000 and Henderson and Thomas 2001). In contrast to this, conservative practice is usually associated with technical and instrumental aspects of professional practice and its focus is on delivering policy objectives (for example see: Specht 1975; Pierce and Steinbach 1987; Rubin 1997; Twelvetrees 2000; Henderson and Thomas 2001). 'Conservative' community development is oftentimes constructed as inauthentic, domesticating and oppressive for community groups. For example, here is Shaw (2008, p.34) reproducing this binary:

> [Community development]…contains within its own terms an unavoidable choice: it can act as a mirror, simply reflecting back an image of 'the world as it is', in the process of reinforcing existing unequal and divisive social relations of power, or it can provide a lens through which existing structures and practices can be critically scrutinised in order to find ways to create a more equal supportive and sustainable alternative— 'the world as it could be'.

The radical/conservative binary is also evident in Stoecker (2001, p.1) where in the US context this discussion is usually focused on 'conservative' community development and 'radical' community organising:

> Community development…is defined as…doing physical development of impoverished communities…within the existing political economic system…[Community development can] disrupt neighbourhood empowerment by purporting to speak on behalf of a community…Community organising works in local settings to empower

4

individuals, build relationships and organisations and create action for social change.

This preoccupation with reproducing the binary of radical/conservative practice can obscure broader reflections on the ideas, language and assumptions embedded within community development and the impact these have on professionals and local people.

My research offers an analysis of how community development discourses are formed, structured and operationalised and it investigates whether the dominant discourses of community development live up to their 'radical' claims by analysing the identity constructions of practitioners and local people. Understanding the shifting definition of what constitutes 'radical' and 'conservative' in a community development context is an important aspect of my work. For the purposes of my research, I am defining radicalism as a challenge to the status quo in terms of the ways in which ordinary people are constructed as possessing deliberative skills and agency. Conservatism is defined as supporting the status quo in terms of constructing a dominant elite as the sole possessors of deliberative skills and agency. I have eschewed typical understandings of radicalism and conservatism in community development and instead use definitions of these two concepts that draw on participatory democratic, feminist and post-structuralist ideas regarding the need for new ways of constructing the political subjecthood, agency and power of those individuals and groups involved in transformative democratic politics (Hayden 1962; Baker 1972; Bookman and Morgen 1988; Mouffe 1992; Hekman 1995; Payne 2007). Furthermore, understanding how various community development discourses operationalise the concept of agency in relation to professionals and local people is crucial to my research. This is because the ability to recognise local people as competent, active subjects who are authors of their lives signal to me a discourse's ability to support democracy, social justice and equality within a given community development process (Mouffe 1992; Gardiner 1995).

In order to analyse the discourses of community development, I have adopted a post-structuralist discourse analysis methodology as developed by Hansen (2006). Post-structuralist discourse analysis is concerned with understanding the construction and reproduction of identity within a particular discourse through the analysis of talk and texts. Post-structuralism asserts that language's primary function is not to describe reality but to ascribe meanings and value-systems about our identities and relationships (Derrida 1974; Foucault 1980; Howarth 2000; Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Belsey 2002). Words are not simply instrumental ways in which to communicate; they insert themselves between us and reality so that they convey specific cultural knowledge and 'truths' which discipline us to think, feel and behave in specific ways.

Using Hansen's three-pronged research method, I have selected and analysed 121 American and British community development texts dating from 1968 to 1997. Firstly, I placed the texts in the context of three politically salient historical moments that have significance for left-wing politics in both the US and the UK:

- The fracturing of the New Left from 1968 to 1975
- The rise of the New Right from 1979 to 1985
- The convergence of left-right politics from 1992 to 1997

Understanding politically salient changes in social movements and state institutions helps to provide the context for the formation and structure of community development discourses during a particular moment in time. The comparison between the US and the UK is helpful to my analysis because of the similarities in the Anglo-American context in terms of constructions of 'community development', the development of the welfare state since 1968 and the structure of political thought and social movements during these moments in time (for example see: Marris and Rein 1972; Loney 1985; Fisher 1992; Faulks 1998 and Katz 2008).

Secondly, by analysing community development texts, I explore the various constitutive building blocks of competing community development discourses. I examine how discourses define and operationalise a number of core concepts ranging from broad political ideals such as 'social justice' and 'equality' to more specific community development ideas such as the following:

a. Community development/community work/community organising/community economic development/community regeneration
b. Community worker/practitioner/professional/organiser/expert/policy maker
c. Local people/the community/ordinary people/the poor/minorities/ the marginalised/community activists

Understanding how particular definitions of key concepts become dominant or marginalised helps to explain how some meanings and definitions become taken for granted, uncontestable and are reproduced over time.

Finally, I analyse how the discourses constitute identities by exploring how the Self and the Other are ascribed particular values. For the purposes of my research, I define the Self as the agent in the community development process whilst I define the Other as the object of the community development process. Exploring how particular meanings and beliefs metastasise on particular identity constructions is an important way of understanding notions of agency, democracy and equality in different community development discourses.

In this thesis, I shall argue that there is a serious problem embedded in the discourse of community development. Community development, despite its dominant presentation of itself as unproblematic and 'radical', constructs suspect identities for professionals and local people. Even though the dominant discourse reproduces the binary of radical/conservative practice, I will demonstrate that there exists an unacknowledged binary of professional/local people that constructs the professional as an active, visionary and technically proficient subject whilst local people are constructed as passive, bewildered and

confused objects to be acted upon by professionals[1]. Throughout this research, I will make one original contribution to knowledge. I will demonstrate that community development, since at least 1968 in both the US and the UK, reproduces identities that invest the community development professional with agency and construct local people as a passive and often incorrigible Other. This binary persists whether a community development discourse defines itself as either 'radical' or 'conservative'. This finding calls into question dominant contemporary portrayals of community development. Rather than being a self-evident good, community development subjects local people to patronising and unequal identities that reinforce rather than undermine negative stereotypes about the political nous of marginalised groups. By constructing local people as passive and confused, this creates a perpetual need for the community development professional and provides a self-fulfilling prophecy about the need for and legitimacy of community development.

I will also demonstrate that the only community development discourses that seek to avoid the problematic binary of professional/local people and construct non-hierarchical and equal identities between professionals and community groups are those related to participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms[2]. Since the emphasis in both participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms is to recognise and support 'indigenous leadership', I shall argue that these discourses seek to avoid making distinctions between professionals and local people and focus instead on creating democratic spaces for the equal participation of everyone.

---

[1] It is ironic, of course, that as part of my discourse analysis I am using the very words-- 'professionals' and 'local people' that I critique in my research. It can be argued that I am in danger of reproducing the very binary I am seeking to deconstruct. However, as I shall demonstrate throughout my research, I am attempting to reconstruct the binary of professionals/local people and embed within it with a more democratic ethos.
[2] Throughout my thesis, I use the term 'anti-racist feminisms' rather than separate notions of 'anti-racism' and 'feminisms' for two reasons. Firstly, the term anti-racist feminisms seeks to position the process of recognising the plurality of the subject position of 'woman' and the political agency of marginalised subjects as a central project of particular strands of feminist thought (for example see: Combahee River Collective 1977; Moraga and Anzaldua 1983; Young 1990; Fraser 1997; Hill Collins 2000). Secondly, I do not use the term 'Black Feminism' because I think this implies an essentialised identity of Black political subjects, something, as my research will demonstrate, that I seek to avoid as it creates problems in the process of identity construction within the discourses of community development.

Given my research findings, I will conclude by arguing that theorists and practitioners need to understand community development as a discursive field of knowledge in which certain ideas, power relations and identities are reproduced over time. By thinking about community development as a discourse, theorists and practitioners can take seriously the challenge of identity construction by considering how we can displace the problematic binary of professional/local people. In order to displace this binary, we need to explore the ways in which community development discourses related to participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms define the relationship between professionals and local people. By focusing on building democratic spaces that create opportunities for everyone to deliberate and take action on issues that are important to them, this might avoid the problems of hierarchy, inequality and injustice that have been reproduced over a 40-year period in community development.

I will develop this argument over the nine chapters of my thesis. Chapter 2 is on methodology and I will discuss three approaches to discourse analysis: conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis and post-structuralist discourse analysis. I explain and justify my chosen methodology and methods of post-structuralist discourse analysis, discuss critiques of this approach and I conclude with a discussion of reflexivity, credibility and authenticity in my research design.

Chapter 3 is the first of six discourse analysis chapters and I will contend that important patterns in the discourses and identities of American community development are established during the 1968—1975 moment in time. In this chapter I identify three discourses for analysis: Democracy, Power and Poverty. Due to the problematic transition from civil rights to economic rights and due to the antagonistic practices of the Power and Poverty discourses, the Democracy discourse is marginalised during this moment in time. The implication of this marginalisation is that the Democracy discourse's particular identity construction of breaking down the Self/Other binary is silenced from the discursive repertoire of community development. As a result, a problematic

Self/Other binary—a radical activist or technical professional Self are invested with agency and the African American/poor Other are constructed as passive, hapless and bewildered—becomes dominant. This hegemonic construction of identity, I will claim in subsequent chapters, is reproduced in American community development discourses from 1968 to 1997.

Like Chapter 3, Chapter 4 in the UK context highlights important patterns in the discourses and identities of British community development during the 1968—1975 moment in time. In this chapter, I will identify two discourses for analysis: Rationalist and Structuralist. The Rationalist discourse is constituted by official state actors whilst the Structuralist discourse is constituted by Marxist community-based professionals also employed by the state. Although these two discourses appear to be in opposition to each other, I shall argue that there are few significant differences between them because they share similar identity constructions in which the British state and the community development professional are invested with agency whilst the 'working class' is constructed as a passive object. I will claim, throughout my research, that this hegemonic construction of identity—similar to the American context—is reproduced in British community development discourses from 1968 to 1997.

In Chapter 5, we return to the US context and move onto the 1979—1985 moment. In this chapter, I will identify three discourses for analysis: Populist, Partnership and Empowerment. Identities which dominated during the 1968 moment in the US continue into this moment. In the context of the growing influence of the New Right, the Democracy discourse's attempt to break down the Self/Other binary is constructed as unfeasible and unfashionable by the dominant Populist and Partnership discourses. These two discourses, constituted by radical community organisers and technical professionals respectively, continue the pattern of constructing the community development professional Self with agency and the poor people Other as passive. The exception to this dominant pattern of identity construction is the Empowerment discourse which is focused on the experiences of minority ethnic women in community development processes. Because the Empowerment discourse is seeking to

breakdown the Self/Other binary I shall argue that this discourse should be seen an inheritor of the Democracy discourse.

Shifting to the UK context during the 1979—1985 moment, in Chapter 6 I shall identify two discourses for analysis: Post-Marxist and Realist. Similar to the 1968 moment, two ostensibly rival discourses share similar constructions of identity. The Post-Marxist discourse is constituted by socialist professionals seeking to respond to a 'crisis' in left-wing politics and the deterioration of urban neighbourhoods. In contrast, the Realist discourse is constituted by 'non-ideological' professionals seeking to reconstruct community development theory and practice in order to make it more relevant to the politics of everyday life of working-class people. I will demonstrate that both discourses adhere to a clear pattern in which the professional Self is the active agent and the working-class Other is a passive object.

In Chapter 7, we reach my final analysis chapter for the US context during the 1992—1997 moment in time. I will identify two discourses for analysis: Coalition and Revitalisation. I shall contend that it is in this moment that we begin to see a new pattern emerging in opposition to the dominant identity constructions. The Revitalisation discourse—which is constituted by official state actors seeking to bring free-market principles to urban regeneration in poor neighbourhoods—adheres to the established pattern of the professional Self invested with agency and the poor people Other constructed as passive. I will argue however, that the Coalition discourse echoes both the Democracy and the Empowerment discourses in its attempt to try to breakdown the Self/Other binary. This attempt to decentre the dominant binary in community development appears to be strongly associated with anti-racist feminist social practices.

Moving to the UK context for the 1992—1997 moment, Chapter 8 is my final analysis chapter. I shall identify two discourses for analysis: Participation and Transformation. I will claim that similar to the US during this moment, we are starting to see fractures between the discourses in terms of identity constructions. The Participation discourse is constituted by official state actors seeking to

transform the community development process into that of entrepreneurship for people living in poverty. This discourse follows the dominant pattern of identity construction in which the professional Self is invested with agency whilst the consumer-citizen Other is constructed as passive. The Transformation discourse, in contrast, is constituted by socialist, feminist and anti-racist practitioners seeking to construct community development as a process of critical consciousness. Although the Transformation discourse partly follows the established pattern of constructing the professional Self invested with agency, the citizen Other is now starting to be constructed as heterogeneous and with some ability to act.

In Chapter 9, I will conclude my research by summarising the main findings and discuss the extent to which my research fulfilled the original aims of my project. Through my analysis of community development discourses from 1968 to 1997 I will have demonstrated and evidenced an important problem embedded in community development discourses. Hierarchical identity constructions that subject both professionals and local people to unequal and unfair subject positions appear to dominate community development. The only exception to this are those discourses associated with participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms which seek to decentre the dominant binary. For community development to effectively address these problems, I shall argue that the discourse must take seriously the challenge and opportunity presented by the principles and practices of participatory democratic and anti-racist feminist community development.

I will now move on to discuss my post-structuralist discourse analysis methodology.

Chapter 2: Methodology

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is to discuss and justify my application of a form of post-structuralist discourse analysis methodology used for analysing texts in this research project. The chapter will begin with a discussion of three major approaches to discourse analysis (DA) in the social sciences: conversation analysis (CA), critical discourse analysis (CDA) and post-structuralist discourse analysis (PDA). I will then turn to discuss in detail my chosen methodology of the research project. I have adopted Hansen's (2006) 'comparative moments' model of PDA in order to analyse three politically salient moments for the left and to understand community development's changing identities and discourses through its responses to these moments. After my discussion of the selection of comparative moments, I will then move on to describe and justify the process of text selection and analysis. In the final section of the chapter I will discuss potential weaknesses in my chosen research methodology and my strategy for rectifying these problems. I will then conclude with a discussion of reflexivity, credibility and authenticity in this research project.

Three Approaches to Discourse Analysis

> The kind of discourse research which is favoured for any particular project involves a complex balancing act between the type of data one wants to collect, the topic, the academic discipline in which one is working and the discursive tradition which seems most appropriate (Wetherell 2001, p.380).

Discourse analysis (DA) is the study of language-in-use; it is the examination of the process by which humans create meaning (Wetherell 2001, p.3; Taylor et al 2000, p.2). In the context of DA, 'human meaning-making' takes the form of communication either through text or talk. DA, however, is a contested methodology because it is an interdisciplinary approach to understanding the sociology of communication, the representation of individual and group identity

and the organisation of social relationships (for example, see: Van Dijk 1993; Schegloff 1997; Billig 1999; Wetherell 2001; Taylor et al 2000). Depending on how the concept of 'discourse' is defined within DA, this particular methodological framework can range from being an examination of a decontextualised slice of text from a conversation to a genealogical history of a given field of knowledge. Thus, I think it is important to see DA as a methodological continuum whereby positivist/technical analysts are located at one end of the spectrum and constructionist/interpretive analysts are positioned at the opposite end. There are three major schools of thought regarding the nature of discourse and the purpose of DA: conversation analysis (CA), critical discourse analysis (CDA) and post-structuralist discourse analysis (PDA). I shall now turn to briefly discuss the epistemological and methodological assumptions on which these approaches are based and I shall also be discussing and justifying my rejection of CA and CDA and my adoption of PDA for the research.

Conversation analysis (CA) represents the technical and positivist approach to DA (Schegloff 1997; Billig 1999). CA is predicated on the assumption that 'discourse' is naturally occurring conversation—discourse is the everyday language that we use to communicate with each other. It is important to emphasise that CA defines discourse very narrowly; discourse is exclusively 'talk'. Discourse is produced when people interact with each other, thus discourse in the CA tradition is small-scale, immediate and ordinary communication between people. 'Discourse' in the CA tradition is an atheorectical concept; it is bounded by, self-contained and controlled by the interactions of ordinary people. Schegloff (1997, p.171), a key proponent of a technical approach to DA argues:

> Is there such a thing as 'the object of inquiry in its own terms?…In my view, if ever there was an object of inquiry furnished internally with its own constitutive sense, with 'its own terms', with a defensible sense of its own reality, it is talk-in-interaction and most centrally ordinary conversation.

This definition of discourse as unproblematic and uncomplicated everyday conversation is important because this particular understanding of discourse forms the object of inquiry for CA. The aim of a CA research methodology is to provide an understanding of the structure and patterns of talk. Its goal is to understand how participants construct a particular reality through their language use and their interpretations of interactions through conversation (Heritage 2001, p.47). CA is therefore concerned with identifying, mapping and examining the 'small details of talk such as short pauses, hesitations, false starts and self-corrections' (Kitzinger and Frith 1999, p.172).

CA is 'data-driven not theory led' in that the researcher documents the small details of talk (pauses, turn-taking, interruptions, etc) and seeks to generalise these findings to a body of knowledge about the structure and organisation of human communication (Taylor 2001, p.312). Importantly, the researcher in the CA tradition is positioned as objective and neutral so as not to impose meaning on the discourse of participants. The objectivity of the analyst is directly linked to the atheoretical nature of discourse. Because discourse is uncomplicated talk which is constituted by self-conscious participants, CA seeks to maintain neutrality in its approach to discourse in order to avoid 'theoretical imperialism' (Schegloff 1997, p.167). Thus by approaching talk in a disinterested way in order to map its structure and patterns, conversation analysts attempt to avoid including 'irrelevant' contextual factors (like the race/class/gender of participants or the positioning of participants and their talk in a specific historical context) that might bias the analysis. This means that for CA, the only thing that is relevant to inform the analysis of talk is the talk itself and a brief contextualisation of the 'organisation of…conversational activities' (Wetherell 2001, p.388).

Although CA is a popular and influential form of discourse analysis, I have not chosen to adopt this methodological approach for my research for a number of reasons. Firstly, because CA defines discourse as talk, its approach does not help me fulfil my research aims. I am not interested in analysing the discourse of interview and focus group transcripts of community development theorists,

practitioners and activists because I want to avoid reproducing normative assertions about the value of community development. In addition, in order to ensure that I am not treating language as unproblematic, I need to use a different methodology that takes a more critical approach to language and the subject positions that are constituted by particular kinds of language use. Secondly, I am interested in examining the broader historical developments of how the language and social practices of community development have changed over time; as a result, I have not chosen to adopt CA. Because CA defines discourse as decontextualised slices of talk, this methodology is not equipped and is not oriented to be able to undertake broader analyses of socio-political transformations in the texts and language of community development. Finally, because CA is derived from a positivist epistemology this is at odds with my understanding of the nature of truth in social science research. As I shall discuss in more detail later in the chapter, I do not think objective reality and neutrality exist. As a researcher, I believe that I always bring a perspective, a history and a particular orientation to the data and rather than seek to deny my subjectivity, as conversation analysts do by attempting to adopt a neutral position in the research process, I would rather find ways in which to incorporate and make explicit my standpoint in my research.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) represents one form of the interpretive approach to discourse analysis. For CDA, 'discourse' is defined as text, talk and communication; discourse is the representation of social life and relationships by different social actors (Van Dijk 1993, p.249; Fairclough 2001, p.91). Importantly, CDA is only interested in certain types of representations of social life—the CDA methodology is oriented to examining the discourses of domination in which representations of social life are used by powerful social actors to produce, maintain and legitimate social inequalities. CDA is interpretative because it seeks to impose meaning on text, talk and communication in order to expose domination, illegitimate power and inequality in elite discourse. 'We pay more attention to "top-down" relations of dominance than to "bottom-up" relations of resistance, compliance and acceptance' (Van Dijk 1993, p.250). Thus a CDA methodology is positioned as a critique of current social relations, as an act of

solidarity with subordinated groups and as a way of exposing power abuse by elites. As Van Dijk (1993, p.252-3) a key writer on CDA maintains:

> Unlike other discourse analysts, critical discourse analysts (should) take an explicit socio-political stance…Their hope…is change through critical understanding…Their critique of discourse implies a political critique of those responsible for its perversion in the reproduction of dominance and inequality.

As a research method, CDA is focused on mapping the production and reception of power and dominance—it examines how elites control access to discourse and how that control of discourse distorts and manipulates popular perceptions of contentious social issues. Thus CDA explores the structure of language—the nature of argument, word choice, storytelling, etc—that furthers the domination of elites. It also examines how subordinated groups are denied access to 'communicative rights' to discourse by elites through the (mis)representations of powerless groups' claim-making as illegitimate, dangerous and/or irrelevant (Van Dijk 1993, p.263-4; Fairclough 2001, p.15-17).

Although CDA is another popular form of DA, I have not chosen to adopt this methodology for my research for a number of reasons. CDA appears to be predicated on a number of a priori assumptions on the nature of discourse that my research is seeking to examine in more detail. It seems to me that CDA constructs discourse in such a way that privileges an objective reality. By orientating itself as critique, CDA assumes that it can sit outside various discourses of domination in order to expose power abuse. However, because CDA does not seek to situate its analyses in counter-power resistance discourses, it seems to rely on objective and normative critiques of power abuse discourses. As I discussed previously, I do not think that researchers have privileged access to objective reality and thus I do not think CDA is an appropriate methodology to adopt for my research. Another a priori assumption in CDA is that there seems to be a fundamental binary of us/them, elites/ordinary people, abusers/victims that initially orientates the interpretive approach to research.

Whilst I do not necessarily take issue with this explicit political stance of CDA, the problem with CDA, for the purposes of my research, is that I wanted to explore *whether* these types of binaries exist in community development discourses and *how* these binaries are constructed and reproduced over time. I think it would be difficult to explore the construction of community development discourses over time working with a methodological frame that assumes a problematic relationship between institutional elites and ordinary people as it may distract my analysis from other and perhaps more important binaries at play in the discourses. Also, with a focus only on discourses of domination, it would be difficult for me to explore community development discourses in a systematic way because community development is constituted by the texts and social practices of both institutional actors and oppositional actors working outside and against institutional structures.

Post-structuralist discourse analysis (PDA) is another form of interpretative DA. However, in the field of DA, PDA appears to be a less popular methodology in comparison to CA and CDA. It is not clear why PDA is an under-used approach to the study of language and texts but one reason seems to be the dominance of CA and CDA and the on-going disagreements among conversation and critical discourse analysts about the nature of 'discourse' and the 'correct' way of studying it[3]. These debates appear to have squeezed out considerations of other approaches to DA that are at odds with both CA and CDA, namely PDA. 'Little room is being allocated in the ring for alternative perspectives on discourse analysis—such as post-structuralism, despite its quite extensive use in other fields' (Baxter 2002, p.828). Indeed despite PDA's extensive use in the humanities (especially in literary theory and history see: Foucault 1980 and Barthes 1993), it remains an under-used methodology for those who undertake DA. Nevertheless, for the purposes of my research, PDA offers an important framework for the study of discourse.

---

[3] For a fascinating and long-running debate about the relative (de)merits of CA and CDA see: Schegloff 1997; Wetherell 1998; Billig 1999; Schegloff 1999; Billig 2000; Baxter 2002

For PDA, 'discourse' is defined very broadly. Discourse is reality—nothing exists outside of our socially constructed systems of meaning. That is not to assert that material objects do not exist, but to argue that the meaning of objects shift depending on a subject's location in a specific social and historical context. Thus the goal of a PDA methodology is to examine how discourse is structured and (re)produced through text and talk and to understand the implications of these structures for the identities of subjects (Wetherell 1998; Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Baxter 2002). Baxter (2002, p.828) positions PDA as a way of understanding:

> the continuously fluctuating ways in which speakers, within any discursive context, are variously positioned as powerful or powerless by competing social and institutional discourses…PDA is not concerned with the modernist quest of seeking closure or resolutions in its analysis of what discourse means, but rather with foregrounding the diverse viewpoints, contradictory voices and fragmented messages that research data almost always represents.

Thus PDA is about telling the story of a discourse and exploring the continuities and fractures of a discourse and the identities of subjects it constitutes and reproduces over time. The research methods of PDA focus on:

> carving out a piece of the argumentative social fabric [of discourse] for closer examination…The genealogical approach…suggests that in analysing our always partial piece of the argumentative texture we look also to the broader forms of intelligibility running through the texture more generally (Wetherell 1998, p.403).

PDA research methods are about understanding the formation and structure of discourse in relation to specific historical developments and examining the interplay between discursive formations and the constitution of identities.

For the purposes of my research, I have adopted Hansen's (2006) particular approach to PDA methodology. In this next section, I will first discuss why I

have adopted Hansen's methodology and methods and how my research benefits from her particular approach to PDA. I will then move on to explain her four key concepts in relation to PDA: 'discourse', 'basic discourses', 'dominant and oppositional practices' and 'identity constructions'.

PDA Comparative Moments Methodology and Method

I am adopting and adapting Hansen's (2006) 'comparative moments' analytical model. Although writing in the field of international relations and foreign policy, I find Hansen's methodological approach to analysing discourse very useful to the aims of my study. Interestingly, in my review of different PDA methodology texts, Hansen's methodology does not seem to have been widely adopted by analysts as yet. However, her text in which she explains and justifies her particular approach to PDA has received good reviews in the leading journal on DA (Carapic 2007) and in one of the leading journals in international relations (Floyd 2007). It is not clear why Hansen's model has not been more widely adopted. One reason could be a problem with academic discipline boundaries: since Hansen positions her text in the field of international relations and foreign policy rather than as a general PDA methodology text or even as an interdisciplinary text, this may be one reason why her methodology has not been more widely adopted by analysts outside the discipline of international relations.

Because I am seeking to understand the formation, structure and operation of community development discourses over time, I have adopted Hansen's methodology as it provides me with a broad definition of 'discourse', the ability to contextualise discourses in relation to historical developments and the ability to understand key transformations in the structure and formation of discourses through texts. Unlike other post-structuralist discourse analysts (for example see Wetherell 1998 and Baxter 2002), Hansen does not privilege conversation and talk as the primary object of inquiry; instead she focuses on texts produced by institutional actors and oppositional groups as the key data for analysis. This refocusing of primary data from talk to text is crucial for my research as I wanted to undertake a comparative historical analysis of community development without relying on the talk of practitioners and activists. Hansen's methodology

is one of the only research approaches I am aware of, in the PDA tradition, which takes this approach to primary data.

Hansen argues that the purpose of PDA is not

> to measure the relative importance of ideas and materiality but to understand them as constructed through a discourse which gives materiality meaning by drawing upon a particular set of identity constructions (Hansen 2006, p.23).

Methodologically, Hansen defines 'discourse' as articulated patterns in the language of texts that construct reality and identities in specific ways. In order to systematically analyse discourse, Hansen argues that we must first identify and understand basic discourses, dominant and oppositional practices and identity constructions.

Basic discourses are defined as articulations of the convergences and disagreements within a particular field of knowledge. Hansen (2006, p.52) argues that:

> Basic discourses point to the main points of contestation within a debate and facilitate a structured account of the relationship between discourses, their points of converge and confrontations; how discourses develop over time in response to events, facts and criticism; and how discursive variations evolve.

Identifying and analysing basic discourses is crucial to Hansen's PDA approach because they are the constitutive building blocks of a discursive field of knowledge. Hansen (2006, p.52) suggests focusing on two or three basic discourses that 'articulate very different constructions of identity and policy and which thereby separate the political landscape between them.' After identifying a few basic discourses and understanding the patterns and repetitions of language, ideas and identities they articulate, it is important to place these discourses into a

historical context and understand 'when and how [they] were formed as well as how [they] succeeded in marginalising other representations' (Hansen 2006, p.53). In doing so, Hansen argues that it will be possible to analyse dominant and oppositional practices between different discourses.

Hansen (2006, p.8) defines dominant practices as taken for granted and uncontested forms of knowledge, meaning and identity within a discursive field of knowledge. Understanding dominant practices is important because they help to signal the structure of norms, values and traditions within a given discourse. By historicising these dominant practices, Hansen argues that it is possible to understand how other competing discourses are marginalised or silenced. Oppositional practices challenge how dominant practices represent identity or interpret events and offer an alternative system of meaning and identity for subjects:

> Understanding official…discourse as situated within a wider discursive field opens up a theoretical and empirical research agenda that examines how…policy representations and representations articulated by oppositional political forces, the media, academe and popular culture reinforce or contest each other (ibid, p.7).

The interplay between dominant and oppositional practices highlights antagonisms between subjects and also helps to show how the identities articulated in each discourse construct the Self and the Other. Hansen's central purpose in her PDA methodology is to understand the significance of particular identity constructions for subjects. She suggests analysing identity constructions through a three-pronged approach by mapping their continuities or transformations across space, in time and in relation to ethical responsibility. Hansen defines her identity constructions in the following ways:

1. Spatial constructions of identity mean that identity is constituted through the construction of boundaries—both physical and abstract—between the Self and the Other.

2. Temporal constructions of identity mean that identity is constituted through a process of change, development or continuity whereby the Other can be analysed as capable of transformation or intransigence.
3. Ethical constructions of identity mean that identity is constituted through the adoption or rejection of moral responsibilities the Self constructs towards the Other (Hansen 2006, p.47-51).

By using this three-pronged approach to understanding identity, Hansen is seeking to triangulate the analysis of identity constructions in order to avoid simple binary constructions of identity.

After discussing her methodology, Hansen offers several approaches to a PDA research method ranging from focusing only on changes in identity constructions or analyses of transformative historical events or a combination of both. I have chosen to adopt her comparative moments method as it offers me the opportunity to explore the discourses and identities of community development from multiple perspectives. Hansen (2006, p.78) defines her comparative moments as 'a small number of clearly defined points in time which are tied to particular events'. Analysing discourse and identity within a structure of comparative moments is helpful because these moments can 'generate knowledge of discursive changes—or repetition…[and] trace how previously important representations have been silenced and written out of the discourse of the present' (ibid, p. 78-9).

Hansen advises that moments should be selected based on their 'political saliency'. In other words, not all moments are created equal; some moments are more important than others. To undertake a discourse analysis using a comparative moments method requires that the moments 'have a striking political saliency—the selection of moments should therefore…be analytically driven by changes in important political structures and institutions' (ibid, p.78). Importantly, Hansen cautions that the comparative moments are not the focus of analysis; they are structuring devices in order to understand the changing nature and relationships of basic discourses: '[Comparative moments studies are] less

explicitly concerned with comparison itself and more with understanding the formation of identities' (Hansen 2006, p.79).

I will now turn to discuss how I operationalised Hansen's comparative moments method and discuss how this PDA approach relates to my research topic and helps me achieve the aims of my study.

Community Development Discourses and Identities: Comparing Contexts and Moments

In this section I shall discuss and justify my selection of three comparative moments and why I think it is important to understand how community development has responded to:

- The fracturing of the New Left: 1968 to 1975
- The rise of the New Right: 1979 to 1985
- The convergence of left-right politics: 1992 to 1997

My choice of these three moments is underpinned by Hansen's principle that comparative moments should have 'political saliency'. Thus my discussion in this section is about elaborating on what political saliency means in the context of community development, political institutions and social movements in the US and the UK from 1968 to 1997. In general, my decision to choose these three moments is driven by key transformations in left-wing political thought that heavily influence the rise of community development as a legitimate form of political protest and institutional intervention in marginalised communities in both the US and the UK. As poverty was 'rediscovered' in the context of relative wealth in the post-war period, as new social movements were advocating for different kinds of social and political rights and as social science was being used as a tool for the rational planning of state-sponsored social welfare, all of these left-wing developments helped to promote community development as a way of deepening democracy on both sides of the Atlantic (Lewis 1963; Gulbenkian 1968; Marris and Rein 1972; Loney 1983; Lemann 1995).

I will now move on to discuss why I have chosen these three particular moments in time.

I have selected the historical moment from 1968 to 1975 for two reasons. Firstly, 1968 and its legacy is often constructed in the United States and the United Kingdom as a transformative historical moment whereby the ideas of democracy, power and justice were radically transformed by the Civil Rights Movement, the New Left and the nascent second-wave feminist movement (Fisher 1990; Popple 1995). Perhaps it is easy to understand why the 1960s and early 1970s were seen as a 'Golden Age' of community development. In the US, the talk and action of both official state actors and political activists was of participatory democracy, equality and a new type of freedom for various marginalised groups (Hayden 1961; Baker 1972; Piven and Cloward 1979; Gitlin 1995; Lehmann 1995; Polleta 2005). In the UK, official state actors and Marxist practitioners also had a high level of consensus about the role of the state to tackle various social problems (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968; CDP 1977; Loney 1983).

The second reason for choosing this historical moment was that this moment can also be interpreted as a paradigmatic shift in the formation and operation of left-wing political thought and practices (Gitlin 1995; Carson 1995; Poletta 2004; Ransby 2003; Payne 2007). The rise of identity politics and the simultaneous crisis of Marxism represent a break from how groups have traditionally organised themselves. Pre-1968 social movements were constituted by redistribution principles in terms of the fair allocation of wealth and resources for marginalised groups (Young 1990; Fraser 1997; Hobson 2003). With the rise of recognition struggles, these redistribution claims were reconceptualised. Alongside the need for the redistribution of wealth and resources, minority ethnic groups, women and other marginalised groups also argued that social justice required the 'recognition of group-specific cultural identities' (Fraser 2003, p.23).

I have selected the rise of the New Right from 1979 to 1985 because this moment also has important implications for community development. From about 1945 to

1975 a Keynesian consensus dominated the politics of the US and the UK. There was a belief by official state actors and in popular opinion that in order to maintain social stability, the role of the state was to redistribute of wealth via the welfare state and support full employment (Fisher 1984; Lehmann 1995; Diamond 1995; Faulks 1998; Katz 2008). However, the double crisis of an oil-shortage fuelled recession and the process of de-industrialisation sparked a white working and middle class backlash against an activist and redistributionist state (Fisher 1984; Diamond 1995). This economic crisis also corresponded with and helped to fuel a growing right-wing assault against the reforms of the previous decades (Fisher 1984; Diamond 1995; Katz 2008). Increasing unemployment, high tax burdens and a large and cumbersome state bureaucracy gave rise to an ideological position of retrenchment with the need for a smaller state focused on individualism, low taxes and free enterprise (Piven and Cloward 1979; Golding 1983; Fisher 1984; Diamond 1995; Faulks 1998; Katz 2008). However, the mere existence of an organised and powerful opposition to left-wing politics is not what I think is most important about including this historical moment in my research. It seems that this moment constitutes not simply a time of backlash and retrenchment; with the election of Thatcher in 1979 and Reagan in 1980, the closure of the state to left-wing influence and the dismantling of social welfare provision constitutes a transformative event in the US and the UK. Understanding the ideological triumph of the New Right and neoliberalism in relation to community development is crucial and is connected to the final historical moment under scrutiny.

My selection of the convergence of left-right politics from 1992 to 1997 is also important for community development. The persistence and dominance of the New Right and neoliberalism have meant that right-wing politics are often perceived as the 'commonsense' approach, the standard by which other views and opinions are judged (for example of this see Fukuyama 1990; Giddens 1994; Etzioni 1993). Community development, as I have defined it, is primarily a left-wing theory and social practice. Thus trying to understand how a left-wing theory and practice has fared during an extended time of right-wing political hegemony is crucial for my research. Furthermore, with the crisis of Marxism

due to the final collapse of Communist regimes and the breakdown of a left-wing consensus due to identity politics, during this moment in time there was no effective opposition to the hegemony of the right (Faulks 1998; Katz 2008). For example, after being in opposition for more than a decade neither the Democrats nor Labour sought to reassert the spirit and legacy of progressive social change which dominated the 1960s and early 1970s but instead sought accommodation within the prevailing neoliberal constraints laid down by their predecessors (for a detailed discussion of this see Faulks 1998 and Katz 2008). Perhaps most importantly, centre-left parties in both the US and the UK adopted a new kind of language that sought to distinguish themselves from traditional left-right politics. 'New' Labour had the Third Way whilst the 'New' Democrats had communitarianism which spoke of rights and responsibilities that citizens had to each other in the context of a small state and a free market (Giddens 1994; Etzioni 1995; Faulks 1998; Putnam 2000; Katz 2008). The shift from equality of outcome to equality of opportunity and the role that the free market played in delivering liberty and freedom marked a fundamental break with traditional left politics which needs to be understood in relation to community development.

I might have easily chosen to focus on other politically salient moments with regards to the structure of state institutions and the operation of social movements. For example, I could have chosen to explore the Settlement House Movement in both the US and the UK. In the 1920s and 1930s, middle class social reformers sought to improve the lives of 'slum dwellers' by establishing 'settlement houses' where reformers would live in poor neighbourhoods and provide basic social welfare services such as literacy classes, health care and legal services (Fisher 1993, p.1-32; Popple 1995, p.7-21). Understanding this movement is important because it set the groundwork for the dominant social practices in community development today: professional intervention in poor communities. I could have also chosen to focus on events such as the militant socialist activities that pressured the state into important concessions such as the New Deal in America and the publication of Beveridge Report in the United Kingdom (Fisher 1993, p.32-66; Popple 1995, p.27-32.). Understanding citizens' relationships to the early welfare state in the US and the UK is important to understanding the

differing evolutions of community development discourses in each country. These politically salient moments and others have all profoundly impacted the structure of communities, the way we understand equality and social justice and the process and purposes of community development. However, I selected my particular three moments because each of these moments capture an important transformation in left-wing political thought in terms of development of identity politics, the collapse of socialism and the rise of neoliberalism. I think these developments have more political saliency than other moments in time because they help us put into context contemporary debates and contradictions in community development in both the US and the UK.

With these three historical moments as the boundary-markers by which to understand my analysis of community development discourses and identities, I will now turn to explore the principles and processes of community development text selection and analysis.

Community Development Text Selection and Analysis

Hansen (2006, p. 82-6) argues that rigorous text selection and analysis is the linchpin for valid and reliable PDA research. She proposes a clear set of criteria for the selection of texts for analysis. In terms of general criteria, she states that all texts selected:

1. Should have a 'clear articulation of identities'
2. Should 'be widely read' within the field
3. Should have the 'formal authority to define a political position' (Hansen 2006, p.85).

Realistically, however, not all texts selected for analysis are able to fulfil all three criteria and thus should meet at least one of the criteria and be balanced by the selection of other texts that fulfil the rest of the criteria:

> Other types of text might score high on one or two of the criteria but low for others…The absence of [certain criteria in some texts]…means that

these types of text should be coupled with [other] texts…to produce a 'full discourse' (ibid, p.85).

Although these three criteria should guide individual text selection, Hansen (2006, p.55) also argues that whole of selected texts is greater than the sum of its individual textual parts. Texts are not self-contained entities; they are relational and interact with each other and in so doing, some texts are granted authority whilst others are marginalised. For Hansen, intertextuality works in two ways: newer texts link themselves through both explicit references to older texts and through implicit references to key concepts and catchphrases. Through the process of intertextuality, a relationship of 'mutual legitimacy' is created—new texts gain legitimacy by citing older texts and the older texts gain legitimacy by being cited (Hansen 2006, p.34):

> Texts are simultaneously unique and united…The inimitability of every individual texts is always located within a shared textual space…The meaning of texts is thus never fully given by the text itself but is always a product of other readings and interpretations…Texts are situated within and against other texts.

Thus the inclusion of texts for analysis should be seen in the wider context of the 'textual space' that the texts occupy and reproduce. Text selection for Hansen is about moving between the individual text and the textual space of a collection of texts in order to piece together and select a valid and reliable sample of texts for the effective analysis of discourses and identities.

Hansen (2006, p.82-5) then suggests three further characteristics texts should have for selection. Firstly the majority of texts selected for analysis should be from the time periods under study. Secondly, primary texts such as books, newspaper articles and speeches directly related to the topic should be given priority for analysis however secondary texts such as academic work should be included in order to understand the social, political and historical context of the discourse and identity. Finally, to supplement the texts directly related to the

topic, conceptual history texts should also be included in order to show how discourses and identities have interacted and changed over time. Hansen (2006, p.83) defines 'conceptual histories' as 'genealogies [that] provide important knowledge of the sedimentation of current representations as well as a critical means through which the so-called objectivity and naturalness of these representations can be contested'.

My selection of texts of community development in the US and the UK from 1968 to 1997 constitutes the primary data for my study. For the purposes of my research, I have defined texts as books, journal articles, policy documents, practitioner training manuals, newspaper and magazine articles and speeches that constitute the discourses of community development. Based on Hansen's method of text selection, I have selected and analysed 121 texts for my study. These texts have been selected based on their clear articulations of discourse and identity (they represent various schools of thought with regard to community development), they are cited widely by other texts (in terms of intertextuality and the linking of texts through extensive citations and the use of interpellation and catchphrases) and they provide a mixture of 'official' discourses (in terms of government policy on community development) and oppositional discourses (in terms of re-conceptualisation of dominant definitions, processes and events) with regard to the field of community development and in relation to the three historical moments. In addition, these 121 texts are a mixture of primary, secondary and conceptual history texts.

Before I illustrate my process of text selection with a few examples I firstly want to emphasise that selecting texts for analysis using Hansen's method does not mean that other relevant texts were explicitly 'excluded' from analysis. The only texts that were excluded from my analysis were those that were unrelated to community development or those published outside my three comparative moments timeframe of 1968-1975, 1979-1985 and 1992-1997. For example, I gave myself a 3-5 year leeway in published dates for primary texts selected because I often found it took that length of time for some primary texts to catch up with and reflect rapid political changes. However, I did not include primary texts for

analysis published more than 5 years before or after 1968 to 1997 as these would have encompassed other moments not directly related to my study[4]. In my text selection, I was trying to move, as Hansen suggests, between the individual text and the textual space created by intertextuality of the many texts that could reasonably be included as part of a given discourse. So, just because a text has not been included in my selection does not mean that it is not relevant to my analysis but that I reached saturation point in my selection of texts and thus I felt confident that I did not need to include it in my analysis. By 'saturation point' I mean 'when repetition or redundancy appears in the data…and it appears that there is no new information to be obtained at this time' (Murnahll and Chenail 2007, p.38).

I also wish to emphasise that the process of text selection and discourse analysis is not a clear-cut process; selection and analysis overlap in my study. I could not select a text for inclusion for analysis without first reading the text and trying to understand its patterns in ideas, language and identities. This process of understanding identity in order to include a text for selection is also the process of discourse analysis. Thus by necessity there will be overlap in my discussion of text selection and my process of discourse analysis.

Turning to my selected texts, I shall now explain my process of text selection in the three different comparative moments. Firstly, I should point out that the different moments in time yielded different resources for my text selection. Some of the primary texts published during the 1968-1975 moment in the US were very difficult to obtain and had to be supplemented by secondary and conceptual history texts to a greater extent than in the later periods of the 1979-1985 and 1992-1997 moments in both the US and the UK.

For example, in the US during the 1968-1975 moment, it was difficult to obtain primary texts of the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC). This was because few texts, with the exception of minutes of meetings and Zinn

---

[4] The only exception to this rule was the 1968 discourses in the US, but I will discuss this unusual case in more detail in Chapter 3.

(1963), were written during this time and those primary texts that did exist (the meeting minutes) were not available to me because they were archived in the US. It is only recently that historians and sociologists have sought to reconstruct the discourse and practices of this organisation. Thus for the discourse associated with SNCC I first selected conceptual histories that fulfilled at least one of Hansen's selection criteria (clear articulations of identity, widely read, or has authority) in order to provide with me an overview of this historical moment and give me a snapshot of the possible identities at play during this moment.

I first selected Polletta (2004) because her text had clear articulations of identity: her book explores the ideas of participatory democracy and indigenous leadership—this represents a clear identity from the 1968-1975 moment in time and contrasts sharply with other identities during this time. From her multiple citations of other texts I moved on and selected Carson (1995), Payne (1989) and Ransby (2003). Through the multiple citations in Ransby (2003) I selected Mueller (1993) and most importantly through Ransby and Payne (1989) I was able to track down and choose a few primary books, articles and flyers such as Baker (1960; 1972), Hayden (1961) and SNCC (1963; 1968). It should be pointed out that 'multiple citations' in the context of my study means more than three references. Thus when an author cited a text as evidence for a claim, or cited the themes/ideas/concepts of a text or cited controversy surrounding a text this signalled to me that the text was important and needed to be read and considered for selection and analysis in my study.

Other discourses during this moment were analysed through the selection of the rest of the texts included in Table 2.1. Unlike the books and articles associated with SNCC, primary texts relating to other discourses were easy to obtain and include in my analysis because they clearly fulfilled Hansen's criteria especially with regard to being widely read (they have multiple citations in other texts) and having authority (they have formal authority to define a political position). Indeed, Carmichael and Hamilton (1967), Alinsky (1968) and Marris and Rein (1972) are considered canonical texts by some community development theorists and practitioners (Polletta 2004; Chambers 2005; Mayo 2009).

In contrast to the US texts during the 1968-1975 moment, obtaining and selecting primary texts for the UK context was much less difficult. Unlike the US, the UK has a very clear and bounded profession and tradition of community work/community development so that obtaining and selecting books and articles in the UK context for this and the other two moments was a much more straightforward task. (This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4. Because the profession of community development was 'created' by the state in the 1960s, a clear professional boundary of texts and practices has been the result of this institutional intervention.) This clear professional tradition of community development in the UK also explains why there are far more US texts than UK texts included in my study. For the UK, texts are corralled under a clear label of community work/community development. This is not the case the US. In the US, community organising/community development is a far more disparate field thus books and articles have been chosen from a wide variety of disciplines encompassing texts related to social movements, social work, urban politics, human geography and urban sociology.

For the texts selected in the UK during 1968-1975 they fulfilled all of Hansen's criteria. I first chose Loney (1983), a conceptual history, because this is the only book written solely about the development and demise of the Community Development Project (CDPs). Thus Loney has authority and articulates clear identities. From multiple citations in Loney, I was then able to select books and articles that represented the two contrasting discourses and identities in this particular section of my study. CDP (1977; 1978) and Jones and Mayo (1974) are primary texts that articulate clear identities and have authority because they represent the range of views of practitioners and activities involved in the CDPs during this moment in time. Gulbenkian (1968; 1973) was chosen because this was the working group tasked by the state to invent the profession of community development; thus these books again fulfil all three criteria.

For the 1979-1985 moment in the US, I began with conceptual histories for a number of different reasons. The Fisher (1993) book fulfils all three of Hansen's general criteria for selection especially in terms of having authority and

articulating a clear identity. The Fisher text is the only book I am aware of that provides a detailed overview and history of community organising/community development/community economic development from the late 1970s to the mid-1980s. This book corresponds exactly with the comparative moment of 1979-1985 and through multiple citations I was able to select primary texts that articulated clear and contrasting identities such as Green and Hunter (1974), Gordon and Hunter (1977), Berndt (1977), Boyte (1980, 1985), Delgado (1986) and Peirce and Steinbach (1987). Through numerous citations from another conceptual history which defined an explicit identity for feminist community organising, Stall and Stoeker (1997), I was able to choose primary and a few secondary books and articles that had authority by being widely cited and read such as Brandwein (1987), Bookman and Morgen (1988), Moraga and Anzaldua (1986), Rivera and Elrich (1991) and those primary texts that articulated a clear identity, Women Organisers' Collective (1990), but were less widely read.

For the 1979-1985 moment in the UK, I was able to easily select a range of primary books and articles during this moment because, as I have previously stated, community work/community development texts in the UK have clear boundaries marking their inclusion in the profession. (In addition to this and as I discuss in Chapter 6, practitioners in the UK began a book series which published texts from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s.) I began first with Mayo (1977) because this edited volume fulfilled all of Hansen's general criteria: Mayo was an evaluator of the CDPs and she co-edited the first two books on community work in the UK, thus this text has formal authority. In addition, this text articulates a clear identity regarding feminist community work. I then chose other texts in the Association of Community Workers (ACW) book series that included Craig, Derricourt and Loney (1982) and Ohri and Curno (1982). To get an alternative construction of discourse and identity, I selected Henderson and Thomas (1980; 1981), Twelvetrees (1981) and Thomas (1983). These three books all articulate explicit identities because they represent a more technical approach to community work/community development and they are widely read—indeed Henderson and Thomas (1980) and Twelvetrees (1981) have published multiple

editions of their handbooks (see for example: Henderson and Thomas (2001) and Twelvetrees (2002).

For the 1992-1997 moment in the US, I began with the conceptual histories that I used in previous moments. Fisher (1993) and Stall and Stoeker (1997), whilst not supplying the discourses and identities for this moment, did however, through their multiple citations, help me choose key texts for this moment. Thus my first selections were Daley and Wong (1994) and Bradshaw, Soifer and Guitierrez (1994) as these books have clear identities with regard to community development with minority ethnic groups and with minority ethnic women. These identity constructions led me to similar ones, as seen in Mondros and Wilson (1994), Miller, Rein and Levitt (1995) and Delgado (1998). For different constructions of identity, I began with a book that doubles as both a primary text and a conceptual history (it was written during the time period under study and it also provides a critical overview of urban policy from the 1960s to the 1990s), O'Connor (1999). This book constructs its identity in relation to official state actors administering social welfare programmes. I combined O'Connor (1999) with others books with similar identity constructions such as Lemann (1994), Putnam (1995) and Gittell and Vidal (1998). For Lemann and Putnam especially, these two texts have high levels of authority and are widely read; the Lemann book provides a conceptual overview of community development policy from 1960 whilst the Putnam book popularised the concept of 'social capital'.

Finally, for the 1992-1997 moment in the UK, I was able to almost exclusively select primary texts in the bounded professional field of community development. By this time, the ACW's book series had come to an end but I was able to choose other books and articles which double as both primary texts and conceptual history texts (they are written during this particular moment but they also provide a critical overview and analysis of community development). I first chose Jones and Popple (1994) as this book had clear articulations of identity about the future of progressive community work in the UK. I then linked these identity constructions with similar ones in Popple (1995), Collins and Lister (1996), Meagher and Tett (1996) and Shaw and Martin (2000). For a contrasting

identity, I chose UNDP (1994), Barr (1996) and Taylor et al (2000) which all have explicit identities but also formal authority since these texts were produced on behalf of the UN, the UK government and the Scottish Office.

To summarise my approach to selecting texts for the US, I chose to begin my selection with conceptual histories of community development and I used Hansen's criteria to inform my process of including texts for my analysis. By reading conceptual histories I was able to understand and analyse the debates and antagonisms between different schools of thought about the nature and purpose of community development. These conceptual histories helped me orientate my analysis and figure out what the language of basic discourses and antagonisms of community development were in each moment in time. After reading the conceptual histories I then moved on to select primary and secondary texts that fulfilled at least one of Hansen's general criteria in relation to community development. By following multiple citations (three or more references to a text) and the use of catchphrases and key ideas I was able to demonstrate the intertextuality of my approach by tracing promising leads of discourses and identities back to primary texts written during the particular historical moment under review. By following multiple citations, the sustained use of catchphrases or seeking out books and articles with fewer citations included in the primary texts, I was able to find other primary texts that had either been excluded from the conceptual histories or from other primary texts. In doing so, this helped to further inform my decision about the constitution of basic discourses and antagonisms. I continued with this process until I reached saturation point in terms of the repetition of patterns in language, ideas and concepts about the role and purpose of community development, practitioners and local people. Based on these repetitions of patterns in the language, ideas and concepts contained within my selection of community development texts, I felt confident about identifying, labelling and analysing basic discourses, dominant and oppositional practices between and within discourses and the construction of identities.

To summarise my approach to selecting texts for the UK, from the beginning I was able to easily select primary texts because community development in this context has a clear field of books and journal articles associated with it. This meant that my selection of texts for analysis was a much more straightforward process. Through the sustained use of key concepts and catchphrases, I was able to link texts that shared and repeated these ideas. By following multiple citations and through the use of Hansen's selection criteria I was able to group texts together as constituting or opposing various basic discourses.

Turning to my analysis of texts, we need to recall Hansen's three-pronged framework: identify basic discourses, analyse antagonisms between dominant and oppositional discourses and examine how the Self and the Other are constructed over time, in space and with regard to ethical responsibility. It is important to emphasise that my analysis of texts was iterative: I was 'looking for patterns in the data but not entirely sure what these [patterns would] look like or what their significance [would] be' (Taylor 2001, p.38). I read and re-read texts looking for patterns in language and identities in order to group them in the appropriate basic discourse category. After reading a large number and wide variety of texts as per the selection criteria I outlined above, I then identified and analysed two to three basic discourses located in each historical moment that articulated divergent discursive practices and identity constructions by analysing repetitions of concepts and ideas. I then grouped texts into different discursive categories by examining how texts construct a number of core concepts ranging from broad political principles such as 'social justice' and 'equality' to more specific community development ideas such as the following:

a. Community development/community work/community organising/community economic development/community regeneration
b. Community worker/practitioner/professional/organiser/expert/policy maker
c. Local people/the community/ordinary people/the poor/minorities/ the marginalised/community activists/ working class people

Using as an example the discourses and identities I analyse in Chapter 3, I will now turn to discuss how I undertook my discourse analysis using Hansen's three-step process of: 1) historicising the discourses by understanding a politically salient moment, 2) identifying and analysing basic discourses, 3) analysing identity constructions.

Firstly, I historicised my selected texts by placing them in one of the three politically salient moments (1968—1975, 1979—1985, 1992—1997). By seeking to understand the nature of the historical event and its repercussions on the state, civil society and community development, this helped me to contextualise specific discursive structures and formations. For example, understanding how the Civil Rights Movement failed to successfully transform itself into a movement advocating the expanded economic rights for African Americans helps to explain the backlash against the Movement in the form of Black Power. This antagonism between the Civil Rights Movement and the Black Power Movement signals an important historical transformation in the practice of American politics. This transformative fracture in left-wing political struggle helps me understand the linguistic context for the use of certain types of concepts and ideas and marginalisation and silencing of others.

Secondly, after placing texts in their relevant historical moment, I then analysed and categorised all texts that constituted various basic discourses. For example, all texts that constructed community development as a process of 'participatory democracy' were grouped together into a single discursive category I called the 'Democracy discourse'. Texts that undermined the concept of participatory democracy and constructed community development in relation to a rival political philosophy were grouped together; I named these two other discourses the 'Power discourse' and the 'Poverty discourse'. I followed this pattern of reading and re-reading texts and grouping similar texts (which shared key concepts, catchphrases and identities) together until I reached saturation point in terms of repetitions in language and identity constructions in my selected texts. After identifying basic discourses and their constitutive concepts, I then examined dominant and oppositional practices between the basic discourses. I

compared how competing terms in one discourse are recognised, marginalised, silenced or misrepresented in another discourse. Returning to my earlier example, understanding how the concept of 'participatory democracy' is misrecognised in the Power discourse is important for understanding both how the nature of community development is contested by rival discourses but also how a specific historical moment can set the context for what is fashionable in political language, ideas and concepts.

Finally, I explored how identity constructions of the Self and the Other play out in each of the basic discourses. For the purposes of my research, I defined 'the Self' as the agent in a particular construction of community development and I defined 'the Other' as the object of inquiry in community development. Understanding the identity constructions in each of the discourses was, I think, the most important aspect of my analysis. By examining the different ways in which basic discourses construct and contest the constitutive nature of identity has been crucial to understanding problems and paradoxes embedded in the language and social practices of community development—especially in relation to the concept of agency. Returning to my example, comparing and contrasting how the Democracy, Power and Poverty discourses construct the identity of the Self and Other by analysing what kinds of language are used to describe and define these identities has been crucial to understanding the constitution of community development discourses during the 1968-1975 moment in time.

With my PDA methodology and method discussed and justified, I will now turn to discuss potential weaknesses in my research design and I shall also examine issues of validity and reliability in my study.

Methodological Problems, Reflexivity, Credibility and Authenticity
This section is divided into two parts. Firstly, I will discuss three major critiques of discourse analysis and explain how I have attempted to address these methodological problems in this thesis. I will then move on to explain how I operationalised reflexivity in my study in order to maintain credibility and

authenticity in my interpretive account of the community development discourses.

The central critique of a discourse analysis methodology is that 'anything goes' in terms of the quality and rigour of analysis offered (Parker and Burman 1993; Van Dijk 1997; Antaki et al 2002). Critical supporters of discourse analysis state 'those using discourse analysis must take analysis seriously for there are basic requirements for analysis, regardless of the particular type of analysis one undertakes' (Antaki et al 2002, p.2). It seems that an on-going problem with discourse analysis is that mere presentation, quotation or summary of texts is not sufficient in providing a rigorous, systematic, rational, compelling and persuasive analysis. Antaki et al (2002, p.6) argue that various examples of DA are not actually analysis as such but summary and circular logic masquerading as rigorous critique. They highlight six potential weaknesses in discourse analysis research: 'under-analysis through summary; under-analysis through taking sides; under-analysis through over-quotation or through isolated quotation; the circular identification of discourses and mental constructs; false survey; and analysis that consists in simply spotting features'. Two of their criticisms are most pertinent to my use of Hansen's methodology: under-analysis through summary and the circular identification of discourses.

Firstly Antaki et al (2002, p.12) contend that 'data cannot be left to 'speak for itself' as if a series of quotes is sufficient in itself to show the existence of the…discourse'. Simply summarising texts or presenting textual data without sufficient commentary and contextualisation is not analysis but description. Secondly, critics argue that:

> The analytic rush to identify discourses in order to get on with the more serious business of accounting for their political significance may be partly responsible for the tendency…to impute the presence of a discourse to a piece of text without explaining the basis for specific claims (Widdicombe 1995 quoted in Antaki et al 2002, p.12)

DA can often privilege circular logic whereby the selective presentation of texts is used to illustrate patterns in the discourse which in turn justify the existence of discourse in texts. I think these are important critiques because they derive from a desire to systematise interpretative and subjective analysis in order to strengthen the reliability and validity of discourse analysis. However, these problems of 'under-analysis' can be resolved. Because I used Hansen's (2006) comparative moments methodology, I sought to contextualise community development discourses and understand how they responded to transformative historical moments. Historicising texts and discourses has helped to counter problems of simple summary since I have tried to understand the interplay between discourse and history in two different national contexts over three different politically salient moments in time.

In terms of circular logic, I think this has also been avoided by my comparative approach. The goal of this research project is not to simply identify and analyse discourses and identities and then pontificate about their importance and influence on community development. Instead, my research is about understanding the significance of how these discourses and identities change over time in different political contexts. Thus the focus of my analysis is not simply to argue for the existence of a particular discourse (as I might have done using a CDA methodology) but to understand the significance of historical transformations in discourses and identities. My work is about documenting the changing constitution of community development: it is about evidencing transformations of dominant and oppositional discourses and their related identities. As a result, I have been able to avoid circular logic because by the nature of questions I am asking I am seeking to evidence and understand the formation, structure and operation of discourses.

My focus on interpretation in my discourse analysis is important because it also helps to avoid the final pertinent critique of this approach:

> The analysis tempts us into trying to close the text to alternative readings. To introduce closure is to do violence to the variety of possible

interpretations that could be given of the texts…and to the variety of possible meanings which were present to those who once wrote or spoke the text (Parker and Burman 1993, p.157).

The problem of asserting objective and fixed truth claims whilst ostensibly interpreting texts is important to avoid. I think I have successfully avoided this problem because my PDA methodology and methods is not seeking to uncover 'hidden meanings' nor is it seeking to make objective truth claims about texts, discourses and identities. My aim in this research is to provide a new, compelling and persuasive interpretation of community development by understanding how its competing discourses and identities have changed over time in response to transformative historical events. Because this project is based on my subjective analysis of texts, other meanings can certainly be derived from my data. Indeed, I do not seek to close down discussions about the constitutive nature of community development but problematise and spark a debate about the dominant interpretations of community development by offering alternative analyses.

I will now turn to discuss my position in this research project and how my reflexivity influences the credibility and authenticity of the analyses offered in this study.

In order for a reader to assess the trustworthiness, logic and quality of my discourse analysis, I need to first provide a reflexive account of my subject position within this project (Taylor 2001, p.319; Baxter 2003, p.50; Tobin and Begley 2004, p.391-393). By acknowledging my subjectivity and by demonstrating how my standpoint has impacted on the research project, the conclusions and ideas generated in this research are able to be contextualised and judged based on the partial truths and subjectivity that I have acknowledged. By identifying how my values, beliefs, race, ethnicity, class and gender have influenced the research process it is possible to better understand how specific conclusions are reached in my research. There is a need for a:

policy of openness with the aim of showing her or his place within the research process. The aim is to position her or himself within the project…This means including some self-description and accounts of his or her own relation to the topic, participants or data (Wetherell 2001, p.19).

This research process has been influenced by my subject position as an expatriate African American feminist living in the UK with significant experience of working in and teaching about community development in both the US and the UK. I decided to undertake a comparative community development discourse analysis, in part, because I want to understand my particular experiences of grassroots-based work in a broader political and historical context. I chose to use a discourse analysis methodology because I wanted to detach my investigations from what I perceive to be the 'mythology' of community development that maintains the idea that community development is some kind of inherently authentic, unproblematic and empowering practice. From my work in the field and in various academic departments, I slowly grew impatient with the uncritical repetition of this mythology. I also grew weary of reading texts that seemed to under-theorise community development. It eventually dawned on me that part of the problem with the community development mythology was that community development has not been systematically re-read/re-considered/re-theorised using a new (at least to the community development tradition) perspective (a notable exception to this is Mayo 2000 and Burkett 2001). It also occurred to me that the problem of the reproduction of this mythology is, in part, due to the unintended anti-intellectualism of some theorists and practitioners. Springing from a desire to be 'practical' and 'useful' for professionals in the field there are a glut of 'how-to' handbooks of practice and I think far too few texts that seek to theorise our traditions, ideas and practices. As a result, my impetus for undertaking this project is to use post-structuralism as a lens to re-evaluate the claims that community development makes. In addition, I also want to unashamedly theorise about community development in order to reassess its claims and social practices. It is important to recognise that my standpoint in this research is that of a critical friend to the theory and practice of community development. I do not wish to delegitimise community development; however I

do want to help support a stronger academic tradition of theorising about the language, ideas and practices of community development. Finally, it is also important to acknowledge how my radical subjectivity influences the types of analyses offered in this project. Throughout this thesis, I shall be making a number of evaluative comments regarding the various American and British community development discourses. These comments are derived both from my analysis of the formation, structure and operation of the discourses and from my personal political commitments with regards to the representation and recognition of marginalised groups. I will be commenting on the legitimacy of those discourses that, in my opinion, fail to recognise marginalised groups in radically democratic ways. Thus it is important to point out to the reader that the conclusions I draw from my research should be considered in light of my particular standpoint in relation to issues related to the recognition of difference and political agency (for example see: Baker 1972 and Mouffe 1992).

I will now move on to discuss how I have maintained the standards of credibility and authenticity in my thesis. An on-going concern for qualitative researchers has been the issue of rigour and how to promote consistency and precision without compromising the epistemological and methodological commitments of interpretative research (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Rodwell 1998; Tobin and Begley 2004). In order to demonstrate the integrity and competency of my project, I have adopted the criteria of 'credibility' and 'authenticity' as a way for readers to evaluate the quality, logic and consistency of my post-structuralist discourse analysis. For the purposes of my research, I am defining credibility as 'the "fit" between [my selected texts] and [my] representations of them' (Tobin and Begley 2004, p.391). In other words, readers can assess the credibility of my project by evaluating whether my selection of texts and my construction of the various discourses are reasonable and logical. Readers can undertake this assessment of my discourse analysis by examining my audit trail: I have outlined in detail my process of text selection and analysis earlier in this chapter. In addition, in Tables 2.1 through 2.6 I have set out the criteria for my text selection and analysis. By being explicit in the process of text selection and analysis I am seeking to demonstrate the:

reasonableness of the inferences and the logic of the theory that evolved from the data…Another researcher using his or her own cognitive process might construct something different with the same data. What is important here is that an outside auditor can discover and follow the logic that took [me] from the initial raw data to the final product (Rodwell 1998, p.100).

A reader will also be able to evaluate the rigour of my discourse analysis through the criterion of authenticity. Authenticity is defined in my research as the ability to 'show a range of different realities …with depictions of their associated concerns, issues and underlying values' (Tobin and Begley 2004, p.392). Thus for my research to be authentic, it must represent the different views and ideas of the authors, texts, and discourses fairly by offering a considered and sophisticated discussion of their key arguments. As I have previously demonstrated, using Hansen's general and specific criteria I have selected and analysed a wide variety of texts which include 'classic', official, oppositional and marginalised texts. My analysis will also make coherent and convincing arguments by presenting detailed examples that both support and problematise my conclusions. By exploring community development identities and discourses in three comparative moments and investigating a range of discursive antagonisms, I will present a richness and variety of data that aims to provide an 'even-handed representation of all viewpoints...[to} ensure that different constructions, perspectives and positions…emerge (Rodwell 1998, p.107). In this thesis I have provided a clear methodological framework, a consistent application of methods, an audit trail for my analysis and an explicit discussion of my subjectivity. As a result, I believe that I have fulfilled the criteria for rigour, credibility and authenticity in this project.

Nevertheless, there is a foundational criticism of my chosen methodology. Without an objective reality and universal truth claims, positivist discourse analysts argue, it is impossible to establish relevance for the conclusions reached by a PDA methodology:

> The relativisation and perspectivalisation of cultural analyses threaten the virtual disintegration of stable meaning and import into indeterminacy and nowhere more than in discourse analysis. Discourse is too often made subservient to contexts not of its participants' making but of the analysts' insistence…The text's centre cannot hold in the face of the diverse theoretical prisms through which it is refracted (Schegloff 1997, p.183).

My use of a PDA methodology does not deny the existence of truth—only that this 'truth' is located and contextualised within a particular discourse at a particular moment in time. Thus truth can only be partial and contingent. I am seeking to make truth claims—but these claims must be understood in the context of the social construction of reality within a community development discursive field of knowledge. Thus the arguments that I make in this study must be judged by their persuasiveness and reasonableness in the context of historical and contemporary understandings of American and British community development.

Finally, because my research makes reference to and engages in a wide body of community development texts, because my analytical framework has been outlined in detail and finally because this research is fully engaged in understanding the political struggle of identity in community development discourses, issues of reliability and validity have been satisfied in my study.

Conclusions

In this chapter I described and justified my use of Hansen's (2006) post-structuralist discourse (PDA) methodology and method that I adopted for analysing the texts, discourses and identities of community development in the United States and the United Kingdom from 1968 to 1997. I outlined three major approaches to discourse analysis and have discussed why, for various reasons due to their definitions of 'discourse' and the nature of data to be analysed, conversation analysis and critical discourse analysis do not help me achieve my research aims. Even though PDA is a less popular methodology in discourse

analysis, this approach as outlined by Hansen has helped me achieve my research aims by operationalising an expansive definition of 'discourse', by focusing on texts as the primary data for analysis and by understanding discourses and texts in relation to particular politically salient moments. I have sought to explain and justify my chosen methods for text selection and analysis and my approach to understanding how discourses and identities respond to important historical developments. By discussing reflexivity in this project and seeking to ground my discourse analysis in the evaluation frameworks of credibility and authenticity, I have provided an audit trail for readers to assess the fairness, logic and reasonableness of my interpretations of American and British community development discourses.

With the detail of my methodology discussed and clarified, I will now turn to analyse community development discourses during the 1968 to 1975 moment in time in the US.

Chapter 3: The Democracy, Power and Poverty Discourses

Introduction

In my last chapter, I discussed three major approaches to discourse analysis. I defined and justified my choice of Hansen's 'comparative moments' model of post-structuralist discourse analysis and I also described and explained my process of selecting and analysing politically salient moments and key texts that constitute various community development discourses dating from 1968 to 1997. This chapter focuses on the competing discourses and identities of community development in the United States from 1968 to 1975; I have identified three discourses for analysis. The 'Democracy discourse' is constituted by the texts, language and practices of community organisers and local people of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), an organisation which formed part of the militant wing of the Southern Civil Rights Movement. For the Democracy discourse, community development is constructed as a process by which to identify and support indigenous leaders to work towards progressive social change. In contrast to this, the 'Power discourse' is constituted by the texts, language and practices of Black Power and Alinksyist community organisers. For the Power discourse, community development is constructed as the way in which revolutionary vanguard activists inculcate an 'authentic' and essentialised sense of identity among the 'community'. Finally, in contrast to both the Democracy and Power discourses, the 'Poverty' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of rational social planners administering the Johnson Administration's War on Poverty programmes. For the Poverty discourse, community development is constructed as a two-pronged process of reform in terms of democratising state-run social welfare programmes and reforming the culture of poverty among 'the poor'. Using Hansen's three-pronged analytical method, I will begin this chapter with a short contextual analysis of this politically salient moment that helped to form and structure the three discourses. I will then move on to discuss the structure and operation of

each of the discourses and the contrasting identity constructions that each of the discourses constitute.

1968: The Problematic Transition from Civil Rights to Economic Rights
In order to understand the formation, structure and operationalisation of the community development discourses during this moment, this section will discuss the growing uncertainty that was altering the politics of the Civil Rights Movement during the mid to late 1960s. It is important to trace how the deterioration of the Movement helped create spaces for different ways of understanding poverty and inequality and new opportunities for the practice of politics. From the mid-19th century to the mid-20th century, the dominant form of African American resistance to social, political and economic inequality had been focused on attaining the formal political rights of citizenship: the right to vote, the right to protest, equal protection under law, the right to due process in the justice system, etc (Hamilton 1974; Carson 1995, p.9-19). This 'civil rights approach' was focused on achieving the goal of equal political participation in American society. The logic of civil rights leaders—from Frederick Douglass to Booker T. Washington to W.E.B. Dubois to Martin Luther King Jr—was that enfranchising African Americans (particularly those living in the South) would make them a significant ethnic voting bloc which politicians of all stripes would have to win their patronage. Here is the historian Hamilton (1968, p.194) describing the political situation of African Americans after Emancipation:

> Blacks were not a political force to be reckoned with in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; therefore they could be ignored or their political progress delayed without discomfiture to the prevailing political order.

Thus the logic of civil rights was that by first building formal political power in terms of voting rights, this would help to secure broader social and economic rights in terms of demanding and achieving equal access to high quality education, employment and housing. This idea formed the basis of the modern Civil Rights Movement dating from 1955 Montgomery Bus Boycott to the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. in 1968. By the mid-1960s, the Civil Rights

Movement was finally successful. The 1964 Civil Rights Act outlawed racial segregation in education, housing and public areas. This legislation mandated equal protection under the law for all citizens and was specifically designed to dismantle the Jim Crow apartheid system in the South. The 1965 Voting Rights Act outlawed discriminatory voting practices by state officials—particularly those in the Southern states—that had prevented African Americans from exercising their right to vote. These twin legal victories combined with President Johnson's expansion of the welfare state in the form of the War on Poverty, was a landmark in American race relations. It is important not to underestimate the significance of the Civil Rights Movement's victories. However, these victories highlighted problems in the logic of the Movement.

By 1965, the transition from 'civil rights to silver rights' (shifting protest from political rights to economic rights) was proving problematic for the Movement (Raab 1966, p.46). This is because when most successful social movements are institutionalised by the state, they find it difficult to maintain their momentum or to reorient themselves to new goals (Tarrow 1994, p.142-146). By 1968, translating political rights into social and economic rights for African Americans seemed all but impossible for the Movement. This problem was due to two inter-connected reasons: the 'leadership gap' in terms of effectively articulating demands for new rights and a shift in the practice of black resistance in America. Firstly, the leadership of the Civil Rights Movement was not designed to deal with the transition to demanding social and economic rights. Since the dominant politics of African American resistance had been focused on securing political rights, the leadership was composed of two types of protest elites: lawyers and orators (Hamilton 1974, p.192). Lawyers such as Thurgood Marshall (who as part of the legal team of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, helped to win the landmark 1954 *Brown v Board of Education* case and would eventually go on to become the first African American Supreme Court Justice) were geared towards an elite battle with lawmakers and bureaucrats that was focused on changes in the justice system and interpretations of Constitutional law. Orators such as Martin Luther King Jr. and John Lewis (who was chairman of the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee) were geared towards

building a moral argument for political equality for African Americans and disrupting the status quo through protest politics. Once political equality had been achieved in law, the leadership of the Movement did not have the capacity to transform into advocating for different kinds of rights. This leadership gap was recognised by Martin Luther King Jr. (1967, p.158-9) in the year before his assassination:

> Many civil rights organisations were born as specialists in agitation and dramatic projects; they attracted massive sympathy and support; but they did not assemble and unify the support for new stages of struggle…We unconsciously patterned a crisis policy and programme, and summoned support not for daily commitment but for explosive events alone.

By using the twin approach of legal arguments and non-violent direct action to push against a closed door to gain political rights, the Movement finally broke down this door. However, the Movement leadership did not know how to reorganise themselves to start pushing against other closed doors related to social and economic rights. Here is Lewis (1998, p.364) reflecting on the problem of reorienting the Movement to these difficult new goals:

> We now had the right to vote. We now had the right to eat at lunch counters. We could order that hamburger now…*if* we had the dollar to pay for it…That was the challenge ahead of us now…We needed to deal with the subtler and much more complex issues of attaining economic and political power.

Thus, the crisis of leadership in the Movement helped to create a space for the transformation in the politics of black resistance.

As civil rights organisations struggled to reorient the Movement beyond formal political rights, the goals of African American popular protest were also shifting. Expectations of African-Americans were raised with the passage of the Voting Rights and Civil Rights Acts, however, no dramatic change in the social, political

and economic life of African Americans was evident. Black people were more likely to be: living in poverty, unemployed or underemployed, living in substandard housing and subject to systematic police brutality in comparison to their white counterparts (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967, p.33-39; Kerner Commission 1967, p.7-20). The slow pace of change in terms of social and economic equality led to two inter-related problems: an increase in violent rebellion and an increased sense of futility in participating in formal politics. Thus at the very moment when black people finally secured enfranchisement, there was a popular turning away from that type of political practice to other forms of protest. For example, in response to persistent economic inequality, a string of urban riots broke out across the US starting in 1964 (the same year the Civil Rights Act was passed by Congress), which then peaked in the wake of Martin Luther King Jr.'s assassination in 1968 (Carson 1995). Here is an interesting framing of the riots by a liberal social commentator during this time:

> A recipe for violence: Promise a lot; deliver a little. Lead people to believe they will be much better off, but let there be no dramatic improvement. Try a variety of small programs, each interesting but marginal in impact and severely underfinanced. Avoid any attempted solution remotely comparable in size to the dimensions of the problems you are trying to solve (Wildavsky 1968, p.8).

This rejection of the non-violent strategy of the Civil Rights Movement through mass rioting was linked to the growing perception of the illegitimacy of the existing political institutions. Because there did not seem to be the same sense of urgency on the part of the federal government and white America to tackle African American economic inequality as there was in securing basic political rights, many African Americans began defining the current political establishment as the main obstacle to revolutionary change in American society. For example, here is Lewis (1965 quoted in Lewis 1998, p.363) articulating his frustration about the lack of change in the economic lives of black people in days after the passage of the Voting Rights Act:

The lack of concern on the part of the American public and the lack of concern and courage of the federal government breeds bitterness and frustration. Where lack of jobs, intolerable housing, policy brutality, and other frustrating conditions exist, it is possible that violence and massive street demonstrations may develop.

Thus 1968 is a moment of transition when an influential form of politics—nonviolent direct action—was moving out of favour and being replaced with violent struggles and a growing sense of disillusionment with establishment politics. In terms of community development, we can see these broad debates playing themselves out in the formation of the three discourses I have identified for analysis. The militant wing of the Civil Rights Movement took a particular approach to community development through the process of identifying and supporting local leadership to organise non-violent protest activities and voter registration drives. As I shall demonstrate, the Democracy discourse is formed and structured by these practices and was moving out of favour during this moment in time (Baker 1960; 1972; Hayden 1961; SNCC 1963 ; Zinn 1963; Payne 1989, 2007; Mueller 1993; Carson 1995; Poletta 2003, 2004; Ransby 2003;).[5] The shift away from the strategy and tactics of the Civil Rights Movement and reconceptualisation of community development as a process of building power for disenfranchised groups helps to form and structure the Power discourse (Alinsky 1971; Carmichael and Hamilton 1967; Carson 1995; Ransby 2003; Poletta 2003, 2004; SNCC 1968). Finally, the activist welfare state seeking to define community development as the process expanding federal social welfare programmes and the participation of poor people in service planning and delivery as set out in Johnson's War on Poverty, helps to form and structure Poverty discourse (Marris and Rein 1972; Brager and Specht 1973; Lemann 1995).

[5] As I explained in Chapter 2, the Democracy discourse is primarily oral, thus I have reconstructed this discourse through the use of secondary and conceptual history texts. The implications of this oral discourse will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

However, to fully appreciate the influence of these events on the discourses I have identified, I will now turn to the second and third steps of Hansen's method: I will analyse each of the discourses and their particular constructions of identity. I will begin first with the Democracy discourse and its constitution of militant identity.

The Rise and Fall of the Democracy Discourse

> Black people who were living in the South were constantly living with violence. Part of the job [community organising] was to help them to understand what that violence was and how they in an organised fashion could help to stem it. The major job was getting people to understand that they had something within their power that they could use and it could only be used if they understood what was happening and how group action could counter violence even when it was perpetuated…by the state (Baker 1972, p.347).

The Democracy discourse is constituted by the ideas, language and practices most closely associated with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and its conception of participatory democracy. SNCC is a key subject and producer of the Democracy discourse because its identity and practices of community organising for civil rights helped develop and sustain a successful social movement leading to key legislative and political reforms such as the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the expansion of the welfare state (for example see: Mueller 1993; Carson 1995; Ransby 2003; Polletta 2004; Payne 2007). However, for the purposes of my research, SNCC's role in legislative changes is perhaps less important than its influence on the thinking and practice of radical democracy. SNCC was founded and sustained by Southern black students and engaged in organising middle and working class African American young people to demand civil rights and undertake high profile non-violent direct action to bring national attention to the American apartheid system (Carson 1995; Ransby 2003; Polletta 2004). Through its practices of working with marginalised and disenfranchised groups, SNCC sparked a new

way of thinking about the construction of radical identity and the organisation of spaces to struggle for progressive social change.

Understanding the construction of participatory democracy in the Democracy discourse is important for my research because this concept distinguishes the Democracy discourse from other competing civil rights discourses which focus on charismatic leadership or expert-driven development. Participatory democracy is defined as the belief that ordinary people have the knowledge, skills and capacity to deliberate, to make decisions and take action on the issues that affect their lives (Baker 1960, p.1-2, Hayden 1961, p.3-4, Carson 1995, p.2-3, Polletta 2003, p.56-63, Ransby 2003, p.240-244). 'The democratic idea [was] that an oppressed group, class or community had the right to determine the nature of the fight to end its oppression' (Ransby 2003, p.300). I argue that the constituent elements of this discourse rest on two key concepts: the construction of 'ordinary people' and the process of decision-making for collective action. Each of the concepts will be discussed in turn below. However, I think it is important to note at this stage that the foundation of participatory democracy is the quality of the social relationships within the collective. By emphasising the process of creating and maintaining a non-hierarchical and non-competitive social relations whereby authority is invested in the group rather than authority being invested in any individual or dominant 'expert', it appears that the Democracy discourse is seeking to construct a moral identity that attempts to balance the process and outcome of radical social change (Hayden 1961, p.26, Polletta 2003, p.122-3, Ransby 2003, p.240-4).

Striving to achieve equality within local groups and throughout society requires a radical re-imagining of the 'community' in the Democracy discourse. The discourse shifts the traditional constructions of leaders and followers through a particular construction of 'indigenous leadership'. For radical social change to take place, ordinary people—those not traditionally considered appropriate or capable—had to be the leaders and strategists of community organisations. For example, here is Tom Hayden (1965 quoted in Polletta 2004, p.72), one of the founders of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), an organisation modelled

on and heavily influenced by the work of SNCC, discussing the need for indigenous leadership:

> What will happen to America if the people who least 'qualify' for leadership begin to demand control over the decisions affecting their lives? The most thoroughly embedded if subtle, quality of American life is its elitism—economic, political, social and psychological.

Thus the goals of community organising and by extension major social movements such as the Civil Rights Movement had to be both building indigenous leadership and the dismantling of the structures that produced the social, political and economic inequality of African Americans and other marginalised groups. The Democracy discourse constructs the process of building a movement of people to articulate and demand social, political and economic rights as equally important as the success of achieving those rights. 'Whatever you seek to achieve as an end must be evidenced in the process by which you seek to accomplish it' (Polletta 2004, p. 61).

Building indigenous leadership requires not only a commitment to democracy but also the adoption of a set of practices to support the decision-making and collective action of local people. Community groups require open and flexible organisational structures to support group-based discussion and decision-making. The concept of 'group-centred leadership' rather than 'leader-centred groups' means that local movements need to be structured as pre-figurative spaces so that people can organise themselves for education and action (Baker 1960, p.1, Ransby 2003, p.27-4, Polletta 2004, p.63-4). For the Democracy discourse, 'pre-figurative spaces' means modelling current social relations which reproduce the desired relationships in a future radical democratic society. 'There was certainly a pre-figurative, utopian dimension to participatory democracy as an organisational process [in SNCC], a sense that building a democratic movement in the here and now would lay the groundwork for a radically egalitarian society' (Polletta 2004, p.205). Thus by eschewing unilateral decision-making and hierarchical leadership local people learn new ways of relating to

each based on equality and respect. Through collective decision-making local people learn how to negotiate, strategise and be accountable to each other. By focusing on group consensus, leadership is invested in the collective rather than in any individual. Finally, the process of deliberation helps to build solidarity and sustain people's commitment to the movement. Here is Ella Baker (1972, p.347), an early supporter and mentor of SNCC, discussing the importance of democratic spaces for developing leadership and agency:

> In the long run they themselves [local people] are the only protection they have against violence and injustice…People have to be made to understand that they cannot look for salvation anywhere but themselves.

Using Hansen's analytical third step, I will now move to discuss the identity constructions of the Democracy discourse. Because the structure of discourse is focused on building non-hierarchical and democratic spaces for deliberation and action, the discourse constitutes the Self and Other in a very interesting way. The Self is constructed as a 'community organiser' whose role is to engage in an explicitly educational process with the indigenous leadership and support them in creating spaces for learning and action (Mueller 1993, p.51-3; Carson 1995, p.133). The Democracy discourse constructs community organisers not as leaders of local movements but facilitators who help build trust and solidarity between people and support people in their own self-directed process for social change. Community organisers 'had to suppress their own egos and personal organisational ambitions as much as possible and to approach local communities with deference and humility' (Ransby 2003, p.274).

Thus the community organiser Self is not the focus within the Democracy discourse; the emphasis is on the process of building spaces whereby community organisers and indigenous leaders encounter each other based on equality and respect in order to take collective action:

> Creating a moral community within the movement was essential to making political change. Mutual trust, respect, equality…enabled

organisers to build the leadership of the politically inexperienced and reinforced their own sense of organising (Polletta 2004, p. 122-3).

For the Self what was important was facilitating spaces for the practice of radical democracy and identifying and supporting indigenous leaders for their own self-directed process of social change. As Baker (1968 quoted in Payne 1989, p.892) argues: 'I have always thought what is needed is the development of people who are not interested in being leaders as much as developing leadership among other people'.

Interestingly, the Self in this discourse is somewhat ambivalent to its racial identity. In the early years of the discourse, from about 1960 to 1965, the Self is multiracial—it represents both African-American and white community organisers who were concerned with building a new form of democracy in America. However, due to the institutionalisation of the Movement and the problems I outlined earlier in the chapter about the reorientation of the Movement from civil rights to economic rights, the constitution of the Self begins to change from 1965 to 1968 and it is reconstructed to be solely African American. This shift in identity is in part due to the antagonistic practices of the Power discourse, which I will discuss later in the chapter. Here is Lewis (1998, p.365-366), who was Chairperson of SNCC during this moment of transition in the constitution of the Self, articulating his ambivalence about this change in identity:

> Though [SNCC's] goal was ultimately to bring about a just and utterly free interracial society…it had to be the black members of SNCC who would steer the way of our organisation. I would never dream of throwing our white members off the boat, but I could see why, at this point in the movement [in 1965], we would have to pull them out of the wheelhouse.

By defining the Self as organisers and facilitators, the Democracy discourse constructs the Other as active agents of the struggle for equality and rights. It is

important to note that the Other in this discourse is black; this further helps blurr the distinction between the Self and the Other in the discourse. For example, here are two examples from Lewis discussing the leadership and agency of local people:

> You don't have to wait until Roy Wilkins [the head of the NAACP] comes to Jackson [Mississippi]. You don't have wait until Martin Luther King comes to McComb [Georgia]. You can do it *yourself.* There is no one more powerful force than *you.* There is no leader as powerful as *you* if you pull together (Lewis 1998, p.188 emphasis in original text).

As we can see the focus in the discourse is on building the collective leadership and agency of local people:

> We were meeting people on their terms, not ours. If they were out in the field picking cotton, we would go in that field and pick with them…Before we ever got around to saying what we had to say, we listened. And in the process we build up both their trust in us and their confidence in themselves (Lewis 1998 quoted in Ransby 2003, p.282).

The goal of working with local people was to help '[develop] a sense of worth and leadership among people who had never been held in high regard in their communities' (Ransby 2003, p.305). Importantly, however, through its emphasis on group-centred leadership the Democracy discourse seems to also be attempting to deconstruct and decentre the Self/Other binary that structures the organisers' relationship with local people. By constructing everyone as a leader, this discourse appears to be trying to displace the category of Other altogether and subsume indigenous leaders into constructions of Self. Again, here is Baker (1972, p.352) reflecting and approving of this process of binary displacement:

> Every time I see a young person who has come through the system to a stage where he could profit from the system…but who identifies more

59

with the struggle of black people who have not had his chance…I take
new hope.

Finally, Democracy discourse's identity constructions contrast with other
competing discourses at this time. Other civil rights organisations that produce
and reproduce competing discourses are constructed as both hypocritical and
ineffective. These organisations are represented as hypocritical because they only
worked with and were staffed by middle-class elites; the voices and experiences
of ordinary people were not represented in these organisations thus calling into
question these organisations' claims for the political equality. Here is a typical
construction which is widely assumed to be an attack on the NAACP, the Urban
League and other black bourgeois organisations:

> Those who are well-heeled don't want to get un-well-heeled…If they are
> acceptable to the Establishment and they're wielding power which serves
> their interest, they can assume too readily that that also serves the interest
> of everybody (Baker 1968 quoted in Ransby 2003, p.305-6).

The Democracy discourse also constructs these rival organisations as ineffective
because of their use of hierarchical structures and dependency on charismatic
leadership. Supporting a charismatic leader is fundamentally anti-democratic
and re-enforces the belief that only some people have the ability and capacity to
be a leader. In a veiled attack on Martin Luther King Jr., and the Southern
Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) Baker (1960, p.1) states:

> [SNCC's] inclination toward group-centered leadership, rather than
> toward a leader-centered group pattern of organization, was refreshing
> indeed to those of the older group who bear the scars of the battle, the
> frustrations and the disillusionment that come when the prophetic leader
> turns out to have heavy feet of clay.

From 1960 to 1968 the Democracy discourse dominated constructions of identity
within the Civil Rights Movement. To be sure, competing discourses did have

influence, the most obvious being that associated with the texts and practices of the moderate and charismatic Martin Luther King Jr. However, as I previously discussed, by 1968 a key historical moment was unfolding to which the Democracy discourse was unable to respond effectively. With the goals of black resistance shifting from civil rights to social and economic rights, the Democracy discourse was marginalised.

This marginalisation was reinforced by the oral character of the discourse. I think that the strength of the Democracy discourse is its fluidity; its structure changes according to different contexts because its internal logic dictates that ordinary people have to define for themselves the terms of their struggle. Crucially, this discourse relied on oral traditions—its focus on dialogue and deliberation as both political education and the building of solidarity—in order to survive. The rise of competing discourses was helped by the strategic use of print media. This is not the case with the Democracy discourse. With the exception of Zinn (1963), promotional materials and retrospective interviews with activists and organisers, few substantial contemporary texts exist which discuss in depth the Democracy discourse's ideas, concepts or practices. The direct voice of this discourse is only found in a few texts at this time; it is only through a recent and self-conscious reclaiming and compiling of data related to this discourse that the ideas, concepts and practices of the Democracy discourse is now better understood (for example see: Carson 1995; Lewis 1998; Polletta 2004; Ransby 2003; Payne 2007).

Thus in 1968 there was a blank textual space that other competing discourses could occupy and dominate with their own hegemonic interpretations of ideas and events. As a result, the Democracy discourse was silenced—written out of the history of community organising and development—by competing discourses. If it was mentioned at all—allusions are made to it in Carmichael and Hamilton (1967, p.41-47)—it is constructed as well meaning but misguided. In the other dominant text the Democracy discourse is misrepresented as both nihilistic terrorism and indulgences of the politically naïve (Alinsky 1971, p.xiv).

These hegemonic misrepresentations of the Democracy discourse have profound implications for the discourses of community development and the identities mobilised within them. It appears to me that an entire tradition of ideas and practices has been marginalised and community development's ideas of radicalism are perhaps not fully informed by its own history. In my later chapters I will point out echoes and traces of the Democracy discourse; however, the discourse never regains dominance within later formations of community development. It is important to note that I am not seeking to essentialise the ideas and identity constructions of the Democracy discourse. However, the way in which this discourse is marginalised during this moment in time matters because, as I shall demonstrate in later chapters, community development does not seem to be able construct identities derived from notions of equality and social justice. This is a key finding for my research project. The marginalisation of the Democracy discourse perhaps helps to explain community development's gradual shift away from issues related to process (building consensus-based, non-hierarchical organisations) towards outcome-focussed work (setting and evaluating targets). This will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 5 and 7. The marginalisation of the Democracy discourse may also help to explain the pattern in the discourses of community development in which the idea of 'indigenous leaders' shifts over time from proactive subjects invested with agency to victims, dupes or those suffering from false consciousness requiring a leader or an expert to show them the path of enlightenment.

However, to fully understand the implications of the marginalisation of the Democracy discourse we must turn now to analyse the competing Power discourse.

The Rise and Rise of the Power Discourse
Using the second and third steps of Hansen's method, I will now turn to analyse the structure of the Power discourse and the identities that it constitutes. I have combined two seemingly contrasting political philosophies—Black Power and Alinskyism— into a single discursive category. Black Power, though a contested concept, is the need to establish traditions, institutions and political influence

that support black self-determination, black economic self-sufficiency and norms and values that foster black self-confidence and black pride. Alinskyism is a form of community development focused on the zero-sum game of taking power from institutional elites for the benefit of community groups. Alinsky and Black Power activists did not share similar goals when they interacted with each other—especially in Chicago during the mid to late 1960s. The ideas and practices of these two concepts seemingly lead community development down different paths. Nevertheless, Black Power and Alinskyism share underlying patterns in language and identity constructions that continue to have important influences on community development identity and discourse today. What unites Black Power and Alinskyism, I argue, is the shift in language from democracy to power, from idealism to real politick and with this shift in language comes a shift in identity: from a fluid and open Self to a hardened and exclusive vanguard Self who dominates a passive Other.

I shall discuss each of the components of the Power discourse in turn. First, I will define the key components of Black Power and then analyse the identity constructions that Black Power constitutes. I will then turn to discuss the key concepts of Alinskyism and analyse those associated identity constructions.

Black Power comes to prominence due to four key events: the frustrations I outlined earlier in this chapter regarding the persistence of black inequality, the perceived political and economic powerlessness of black people in American society, a growing black consciousness and racial pride in a positive 'black' identity and as a backlash the relatively moderate civil rights discourses (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967; Carson 1995; Polletta 2004). Here is Stokely Carmichael, the former Chairperson of SNCC (who deposed John Lewis) and an early adopter of the term 'Black Power' articulating the shift from civil rights to Black Power:

> We [civil rights activists] had nothing to offer that they [black people]
> could see, except to go out and be beaten again…For once, black people

are going to use the words they want to use—not just the words whites want to hear' (Carmichael 1966 quoted in Carson 1995, p.219).

Black Power is required to prevent the damaging effects of white social, political, economic and cultural hegemony over black people:

> The social effects of colonialism are to degrade and dehumanise the subjected black man…White society maintains an attitude of superiority and the black community has too often succumbed to it…Racist assumptions of white superiority have been so deeply ingrained into the fibre of society that they infuse the entire functioning of the national subconscious. They are taken for granted and frequently not even recognised (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967, p.47).

Racism is defined in the discourse as both a socio-economic and psychological condition that causes and perpetuates black inequality and powerlessness. In order to undermine and challenge the white power structure what is required is the development of Black Power. 'The time is long overdue for the black community to redefine itself, set forth new values and goals and organise around them' (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967, p.48). The ultimate focus of Black Power is the creation of new definitions of 'blackness', understanding and reclaiming a silenced but distinctive heritage and tradition and identifying the self-interest of the 'black community' in order to build alternative structures that promote the political and economic power of blacks:

> Whites can only subvert our true search and struggles for self-determination, self-identification, and liberation in this country…Too long have we allowed white people to interpret the importance and meaning of the cultural aspects of our society. We have allowed them to tell us what was good about our Afro-American music, art, and literature… A thorough re-examination must be made by black people concerning the contributions that we have made in shaping this country (SNCC 1968, p.3).

64

The Power discourse's particular construction of self-determination is an important difference from the Democracy discourse. Self-determination as defined in the Democracy discourse was an empty signifier that local people could define for themselves. In the Power discourse, self-determination is linked to conquering the false consciousness of black inferiority and the unnecessary and futile cooperation with whites for black liberation. By subverting this false consciousness, ordinary black people are able to develop racial pride and work towards seizing power from whites to build powerful all-black institutions:

> The myth that the Negro is somehow incapable of liberating himself, is lazy…Negroes in this country have never been allowed to organise themselves because of white interference. As a result of this, the stereotype has been reinforced that blacks cannot organise themselves…If we are to proceed toward true liberation, we must cut ourselves off from white people. We must form our own institutions, credit unions, co-ops, political parties, write our own histories (SNCC 1968, p.1-2).

Thus, the focus in this discourse is the about over-throwing white hegemony and building a power base for black people so they can exercise their self-determination to achieve political and economic justice and equality. In order to achieve these new forms of power requires an embrace of a homogeneous, authentic and racialised identity of blackness: a unified black perspective for understanding the world and building solidarity among all black people.

The Power discourse's emphasis on the concepts of 'power' and 'blackness' has important implications for identity constructions. Using Hansen's third analytical step, I argue that the discourse constitutes the Self as a black revolutionary vanguard whose goal is to destroy white power and exhort black people to develop an authentic revolutionary consciousness derived from Black Power principles. In opposition to the Democracy discourse, the Self in the Power discourse is not an organiser, facilitator nor a democratic educator. Instead, the Self is the leader of the masses of black people. The goal of the vanguard Self is to: 'awaken…[and] educate the black community…to break

open the chains in the minds of people' (SNCC 1966 quoted in Polletta 2003, p.28). The Self is didactic and infused with essentialism about blackness and power. Blackness means beauty, truth, and equality whilst whiteness means privilege, exclusivity and bourgeois values. Power is to be extricated from the 'white' conception of the exercise of inequality to the 'black' conception of building a black perspective to understand and support the black experience in America. 'The most important thing that black people can do is begin to come together and to be able to do that we must stop being ashamed of being black. We are black and we are beautiful' (Carmichael 1966 quoted in Carson 1995, p.217).

A persistent dilemma of the Power discourse, however, is whether blackness is a homogenous identity and experience and whether it forms the basis of effective collective action. Black people are constituted not just by their race but by gender, class, sexual orientation and geographical location. By de-emphasising the intersectionality of these social positions, the Power discourse is seeking to essentialise physical characteristics of a diverse population of people. By essentialising the 'black community' the discourse ignores the broader context of 'race' and how it is made contingent by other social positions. As we shall see in Chapters 5 and 7, it only seems to be anti-racist feminist identity constructions that are able to recognise difference in terms of both the Self and the Other.

Nevertheless, Power discourse's construction of a black revolutionary vanguard Self constructs two distinct Others: the 'bewildered' black community and the naïve 'radical'. The bewildered black community is perhaps the most important identity construction in the Power discourse. The black community is rendered an abstract and homogenous mass that is misguided through false consciousness perpetuated by the white power structure. Unlike in the Democracy discourse that constructs local people as leaders and agents, the Power discourse constructs black people as passive objects devoid of agency who are to be acted upon by revolutionary leaders. Here is the influential political scientist Reed discussing this construction of the 'black mass' (Reed 1986, p.58-66):

The representation of the black community as a collective subject neatly concealed the system of hierarchy that mediated the relations between the leaders and the led…'Community control' called not for direction of pertinent institutions…by their black constituents but for the administration of these institutions by alleged representatives in the name of the black community…Black control was by no means equivalent to popular democratisation.

Furthermore, black people require development—not into leaders—but into a regimented form of 'authentic' blackness so that they can then exercise some unspecified form of power. 'Most [Black Power activists] feel that black people must acquire black consciousness before they can successfully develop the tools and techniques for acquiring black power (Ladner 1972 quoted in Robnett (1997, p.179).

The vanguard Self also constructs the competing Democracy discourse as naïve radicals. In an important hegemonic practice, the Power discourse reconstructs the Democracy discourse as ineffective, foolhardy and harmful to the self-interests of black people. Here are two examples of misrepresenting the discourse as manipulative (because it does not work to promote Black Power) and as ridiculous (because of the emphasis on non-violence) from two early proponents of Black Power:

I got out of that bag of manipulation…I went in there [Lowndes County where Carmichael help to found the first Black Panther Party] with certain ideas. One idea was to organise people to get power. If that's manipulation, so be it (Carmichael 1966 quoted in Polletta 2003, p.28).

Now it is over. The days of singing freedom songs and combating bullets and billy clubs with love. They used to sing 'I Love Everybody'…now they sing: Too much love/Too much love/Nothing kills a nigger like/Too much love' (Lester 1966 quoted in Carson 1995, p.237).

Through these types of misrepresentations, the Democracy discourse was marginalised by the Power discourse and Polletta (2003) attributes these types of antagonistic practices to contemporary claims that participatory democracy alienates minority ethnic groups and working class people through the imposition of a middle-class white culture onto social change organisations.

It is the notion of 'effectiveness' in practice and 'realism' in the analysis of the social relations that marks a key difference between the Power and Democracy discourses. The Power discourse as constructed in Alinskyism continues these discursive patterns. Alinskyism is most closely associated with the texts and practices of Alinsky (1946; 1971) but extends beyond these writings to other followers in this tradition (Chambers 2001; Stoeker 2000). Alinskyism is a self-proclaimed 'non-ideological' approach to organising communities to build organisations capable of ascertaining a collective self-interest by taking power from institutional decision-makers: 'We are concerned with how to create mass organisations to seize power and give it to the people. We are talking about a mass power organisation' (Alinsky 1971, p.3).

To build a mass organisation, to be a 'realistic radical', requires an unsentimental understanding of the world: 'As an organiser I start from where the world is…not as I would like it to be (Alinsky 1971, p.xix). The world is a place of 'power politics moved primarily by perceived immediate self-interests, where morality is rhetorical rationale for expedient action and self-interest' (ibid, p.13). Thus to spark revolutionary changes requires mass-based organisations willing to muck in to this morass of conflicting interests in order to dominate proceedings to win power and influence for community groups.

Like the Black Power discourse, Alinskyism is using elitist language and constructing identities that allow for the domination of an organiser/leader Self and the subordination of the misguided community Other. This realistic radical Self has one belief: 'If the people have the power to act, in the long run they will, most of the time, reach the right decisions' (Alinsky 1971, p.11-12). However, this Self is also a sage. Young people 'have no illusions about the system but plenty of

illusions about the way to change our world. It is to this point that I have written this book' (ibid, p.xiii). This elite construction of Self, similar to constructions in Black Power also construct identical Others: the naïve 'radical' and the alienated and abstracted 'people'.

As in Black Power, the 'people' as constructed in Alinskyism are passive objects to be acted upon by an enlightened organiser who sees the world clearly to build a power-based organisation. The people are thus described as:

> chained together by the common misery of poverty…ignorance, political impotence and despair…They are a mass of cold ashes of resignation and fatalism but inside there are glowing embers of hope which can be fanned by the building of means of obtaining power (Alinsky 1971, p.18-9).

It is the job of the organiser to lead people out of ignorance in order to gain power to exercise self-interest. However, unchaining people from misery is difficult and requires:

> a passive, affirmative, non-challenging attitude toward change among the mass of our people. They must feel…so defeated, so lost, so futureless in the prevailing system that they are willing to let go of the past and change their future.' (Alinsky 1971, p.xix).

In my opinion, this view of 'the people' is problematic because it appears to undermine the Power discourse's commitment to building the power for the powerless. This discourse constructs the people acting based on their self-interest, however, it does not seem possible for a passive object, as constructed above, to possess the ability or the capacity for agency. Because the Other is constructed as passive and ignorant, then the role of the Self must be constructed as a dominant subject leading the people towards enlightenment and power. Indeed, this identity construction may help to explain why later texts which inherit some of the language and practices of the Power discourse devote so much space explaining the techniques of community organising rather than

trying to understand the context and conflicting identities of community groups (see Chapter 5 and 7).

Like Black Power, Alinskyism also undertakes important hegemonic practices of misrepresenting the Democracy discourse in order to gain dominance. In doing so, ideas and practices of the Democracy discourse have been constructed as both dangerous and idealistic within the Power discourse. In an allusion to SDS disintegrating into the Weather Underground and SNCC activists implicated domestic terrorism, here is Alinsky (1971, p.xiv-xviii) mocking the decline of participatory democracy:

> The young have seen their 'activist' participatory democracy turn into its antithesis—nihilistic bombing and murder…There are no rules for revolution…but there are rules for radicals…to know these is basic to a pragmatic attack on the system. These rules make the difference between being a realistic radical and being a rhetorical one who uses tired old words and slogans.

From the quote above it seems that until young radicals give up on the idea of pre-figurative spaces, being a band of brothers and living the values they believe in, they risk becoming ineffective demagogues. This marginalisation of a competing discourse is an important development in the changing discourse and identity of community development since 1968. Community development's construction of 'radicalism' can be seen as misguided. Radicalism, as defined by the Power discourse, is the action of an elite few who dispense wisdom to the benighted mass of people suffering from false consciousness and complacency. Importantly, the goals of this radicalism remain undefined. In the Power discourse, radicalism is as abstract as building alternative institutions or people seizing power. How these ideas are defined, how groups might work to achieve these goals and what society would look like if power was redistributed or new institutions were created remains unclear. What is known is that the people may gain freedom from illusions about themselves and their society. The Democracy discourse's attempts to break down the Self/Other binary and to focus on

building democratic social relationships between individuals involved in struggle has been lost. This alternative perspective on the meaning of 'radicalism' has been written out of the history of community development.

Helping to write the Democracy discourse out of the history of community development is the Poverty discourse. This relatively conservative discourse differs significantly from the two I analysed above but what the Poverty and Power discourses share are similar identity constructions. Using Hansen's second and third steps, I will now turn to analyse the structure of the Poverty discourse and its identity constructions.

The Technical Analysis of the Poverty Discourse

> People were poor because they lacked political power, and the ways for them to escape poverty was to get political power—through the War on Poverty…The best instrument at hand for achieving this goal was the community action programme, and the best way to ensure that community action would be a means of empowerment for the poor was to the guarantee poor people 'maximum feasible participation' in the local community action agencies (Lemann 1995, p.151).

Unlike the anti-establishment Democracy and Power discourses, the Poverty discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of elite subjects wielding official state power. The Poverty discourse is constructed at the same moment as the Democracy discourse (it predates the Power discourses) and is constituted by the same issues of persistent African American poverty and inequality. However, instead of interpreting black inequality as the effect of institutionalised discrimination, the Poverty discourse constructs inequality to be the result of a failure of democratic institutions (public services such as education, housing and employment training) to be responsive to the needs of marginalised groups. Thus the discursive practices of the Poverty discourse are focused on coordinating institutional services through rational scientific planning and community consultation and participation. The Poverty discourse constructs the idea of 'community action' as:

concerned above all with the reorganisation of local social services into an integrated plan to attack the roots of social deprivation. It was to be at once responsive to the people it served, imaginative and adaptive, comprehensively coordinated, informed by a systematic analysis of the causes of deprivation and methodically evaluated (Marris and Rein 1972, p.10).

In an important divergence from both the Democracy and Power discourses, 'community action' is constructed in the Poverty discourse as reform of democratic institutions as well as a transformation of the norms, values and culture of people living in poverty. The concept of reform is a central idea in the Poverty discourse because it strikes at the heart of the way the discourse constructs reality:

> From the first, this movement of reform was concerned with poverty, it arose less from protest or moral indignation at injustice than from a sense of breakdown in the institutions which should be diffusing opportunities for all (Marris and Rein 1972, p.23).

Unresponsive state institutions are not constructed as manifestations of white middle class values and power, but instead the welfare state is constructed as uncoordinated and bureaucratic. One of the causes of poverty is the breakdown of communication between different social welfare services, such as education and housing, and the reliance on outdated practices that are aided by a hierarchical bureaucratic culture of the state. Thus one major goal of reform was to 'alter the opportunity structure in education, employment [and] housing' (Marris and Rein 1972, p.63). By promoting joint planning between different social services, by promoting poor people's participation in institutional decision-making and by creating alternative agencies armed with new ideas which were to be 'ruthlessly evaluated', reform could fulfil the promise of the American dream for the poor.

However, the Poverty discourse constructs reform as also pertaining to the 'culture' of people living in poverty. Whilst avoiding the Victorian language of the undeserving poor, the Poverty discourse, however, does construct poor people as perpetuating a dysfunctional cycle of poverty which undermines any existing opportunities. The cycle of poverty—a lack of opportunities promoting alienation and delinquent behaviour and this behaviour limiting available opportunities—could be tackled by institutions expanding opportunities and by poor people eschewing delinquent behaviour and becoming good citizens through participation in institutional decision-making about their needs and interests. 'Local agencies, drawing on federal funds, which concert the resources of a community in a democratic, coherent attack upon the handicaps of the poor' (Marris and Rein 1972, p.23)

In this discourse, with reform required for democratic institutions to perform more effectively and for the poor to help themselves by being good citizens, clear identities are constructed. Marris and Rein (1972, p.29) articulate the Self in this way:

> A reformer in American society faces three crucial tasks. He must recruit a coalition of power sufficient for his purpose; he must respect the democratic tradition which expects every citizen not merely to be represented but to play an autonomous part in the determination of his own affairs and his policies must be rational.

The Self in the Poverty discourse is not just a reformer but also a professional expert who uses the scientific method to make rational decisions about anti-poverty work. Armed with a scientific analysis about the causes of poverty, the professional uses this exclusive knowledge to create and evaluate planned programmes that will address both the causes and effects of deprivation. Here are two more constructions of this rational professional Self:

We believe that an important characteristic which distinguishes the professional from the non-professional is his ability to utilise knowledge and theory in his work (Brager and Specht 1973, p.vii).

Unlike a popular reform movement, it [the War on Poverty] did not rest on idealism and faith so much as on technique. The professional reformers addressed themselves to the professional rulers rather than the public upon which their power ultimately rested (Marris and Rein 1972, p.58).

Like the Self in the Power discourse, the professional reformer is also an elitist category that is invested with agency. This construction of Self has problematic implications for the Other. The Self as expert is also a democrat who wishes to foster community participation in reform. However, because of Other has been constructed as alienated and delinquent this poses problems for identity in this discourse.

The poor are constructed along suspect lines. On the one hand the poor are a 'leaderless, ill-educated and dispirited people' (Marris and Rein 1972, p.213). Here is Shriver (1966 quoted in Marris and Rein 1972, p.124) one of the administrators of the War on Poverty, discussing the poor: 'The experts said the poor are apathetic, inarticulate, incapable of formulating demands, or assisting and diagnosing their own needs'. Here is another construction of the poor as passive users of services: 'Our primary interest is in the person as they fill the social role of service users…principally in their capacity as consumers of social welfare services (Brager and Specht 1972, p.29). In both formulations, the poor are constructed as passive objects due to their perpetuation of a cycle of poverty. On the other hand, the poor are also citizens with potential agency to run their own affairs, hence the focus on 'maximum feasible participation' of the poor in service planning and delivery. 'Nothing should be done for people that is not done with them…A mandate from established power does not excuse [the reformer] from securing the endorsement and participation of the people themselves' (Marris and Rein 1972, p.31). As I have previously argued, the problem here is in how individuals and groups constructed as passive and

ignorant objects have the capacity to deliberate and negotiate with the expert professional. By constructing the poor in this way, the discourse is unable to reconcile its secondary construction of the Other as a good citizen. As I demonstrated in the Power discourse, by positioning the poor as passive, this enhances the role of the Self and ensures the professional will always act on the incorrigible Other.[6]

Indeed this contradictory construction of the Other has real implications for discursive practices, as a community action project, Mobilisation for Youth, found when trying to promote participation in its decision-making structures. Because the poor where othered as ill-educated, the organisation was sceptical of the participation of any intelligent and articulate poor people as they could not be the 'authentic' representation of the poor or reflect the 'real' interests of this group. Thus they focused their outreach work on those whom they deemed to be less intelligent and inarticulate to participate in decision-making. In response to this seemingly contradictory policy, an influential staffer in the Johnson Administration replied:

> Mobilisation for Youth is going to get hold of a lower level of true and genuine leaders who are—what?—inarticulate, irresponsible and relatively unsuccessful? I am sorry but I suspect that proposition…These are not the principles [to recruit] indigenous leadership (Moynihan 1965 quoted in Marris and Rein 1972, p.214-5).

As in the Power discourse, because the Other has been constructed as a passive and impotent object, the Self must be invested with a dominant role thus rendering the democratic possibilities for action difficult to attain. Whilst it seems rational to look beyond working with community elites, if ordinary people are constructed as hapless delinquents, then it is irrational to support their participation, in spite of any democratic impulses.

---

[6] This problematic construction of the poor might be due to the racialised identities imposed on the Other—however based on my analysis of texts, I have not found any clear indication of equivalising 'black people' and 'poor people'.

Conclusions

1968 can be understood as a moment of transition when the politics of the Civil Rights Movement were moving out of fashion and were being replaced by violent rebellion, a growing disillusionment with state institutions and new forms of technocratic politics. Using Hansen's three-pronged PDA method, I argued that this period of transition also appears to influence the formation, structure and operation of the three community development discourses I identified in this chapter. Rather than community development being infused by democratic egalitarian politics, it is dominated by two discourses—Power and Poverty—that on the surface seem different but ultimately construct community development identities in similar ways. The construction of the Self as a revolutionary vanguard, a realistic radical or a professional expert appears to require the construction of a passive and incorrigible Other represented by either the black community or the poor. In order to sustain the construction of the Self as a subject with a vision, rules, or rationality necessitates the construction of an Other who is the opposite: who is blind, ill-disciplined or irrational. In doing so, the Self creates a perpetual justification for the domination of the Other. The domination of a community development Self is closely linked with the undemocratic and disempowering construction of a hapless and passive Other. This is an important finding in my research and as I shall demonstrate, a key pattern in the language and identity of community development discourses that is reproduced during my two other politically salient moments in 1979 and 1992.

Alternatives to this binary as analysed in the Democracy discourse have been marginalised both through a transformative historical moment whereby the structure of protest shifted but also through the hegemonic practices of the Power and Poverty discourses through the silencing and misrepresentation of the Democracy discourse in texts from this moment. As a result, important approaches to the construction of identity have been silenced in the community development discursive repertoire. As I shall demonstrate in subsequent chapters, the Democracy discourse's ideas of finding and developing indigenous leadership, community organisations as pre-figurative spaces and the process of consensus-based decision-making are marginal ideas in community

development's historical and contemporary identity constructions. Thus alternative constructions of Self and Other—the process of trying to breakdown this binary by subsuming the Other into the Self by constructing the Self as a facilitator and the Other as an active subject who is a leader—are not recognised. The opportunity for community development to provide an alternative to existing political debates and practices is compromised because the dominant identity constructions during this moment in time appear to sustain other hegemonic discourses derived from notions of inequality, hierarchy and elitism.

I will now turn to analyse community development discourses in the United Kingdom during the 1968 to 1975 moment in time.

Chapter 4: The Rationalist and Structuralist Discourses

Introduction

In the last chapter I discussed the formation and structure of three American community development discourses dating from 1968 to 1975. I demonstrated how, in the context of the problematic protest transition from civil rights to economic rights, the language and social practices of the once influential Civil Rights Movement fell out of favour. Filling the vacuum were two discourses, one focusing on zero-sum power plays and the other on rational scientific planning, both of which positioned community development as a hierarchical process of the professional or radical activist Self acting upon a bewildered and confused community Other. In this chapter I will analyse the competing discourses and identities within the Urban Programme's Community Development Projects (CDPs) in the United Kingdom from 1968 to 1975. Unlike community development in the United States, and as I shall demonstrate in this chapter, community development in the UK should be understood primarily as an official institutional practice. From my analysis of texts I will show that community development is typically defined as a contentious state sponsored activity whereby the goals and purposes of community development practice are contested between subjects wielding official state power and professional subjects seeking to redistribute state power to local groups.

Using Hansen's PDA method, I have identified two discourses for analysis in this chapter. The 'Rationalist discourse' is constituted by the texts, language and practices of the Wilson Government's Home Office and the Gulbenkian Foundation which sought to construct and prescribe a framework for a new emerging profession called 'community work' to support the efficient coordination of local government service delivery and counter a destructive 'pathology of the poor'. The 'Structuralist discourse' is constituted by the texts, language and practices of those newly created professional community development workers seeking to reconstruct the identity and practices of both

the community development profession and the role of the state in order to support the redistribution of power, wealth and resources to working class communities. Although the discursive repertoires of the Structuralist and Rationalist discourses appear to be in conflict, I shall demonstrate that there are few significant differences between these two discourses. Although the role of the state and the professional is contested between these two discourses, what remains uncontested is that the state and the professional are constructed as the key subjects invested with agency and the central agents to achieve social change in each of the discourses.

I will begin this chapter by first putting the 1968—1975 moment and its legacy into a distinctive British context using the first step of Hansen's PDA method. Similar to the United States, this is also a transitional moment in the UK; it is constructed as a time of rapid technological, economic and social change whereby 'less resilient' people require support to reconcile themselves to new ways of living and being. This peculiar construction of this time period is significant because the definition of both problems and solutions during this transformative moment in British community development is macro-focussed. As a consequence, it is the state, rather than local people, that is the active subject within British community development discourses of this moment.

I will now turn to examine this moment in the UK in further detail.

The Welfare State and Social Change

> Western social democracy has learnt much about ways of making available to majority groups the benefits of science and technology. It is now urgent—ethically, socially and politically—to do the same for minority groups, and especially for those suffering many inter-related problems and deprivations. This is partly a technical and administrative problem (CDA 1968 quoted in Loney 1985, p.48).

1968 is a politically salient moment in time in Britain because of the emergence of two inter-related issues: a popular perception that rapid social, economic and

technological changes were afoot and a simultaneous call for a technical reform of the state (Hill 1970; Miliband 1973; Hain 1976; Cockburn 1977). 'The decline of the community in industrial society has fragmented social life and left individuals insecure and isolated' (Hain 1976, p.11). Through the slum clearances in the inner-cities and relocating residents to peripheral housing estates, through an increase in immigration from Africa, the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent and the subsequent white working-class backlash encapsulated in Powell's *Rivers of Blood* speech and through the growing automation in the manufacturing and heavy industries and the resulting rise in unemployment, 'social change' was affecting many facets of British life (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.9-14; CDP 1977, p.3-5; Loney 1983, p.8-16). Importantly, institutional actors defined the multifaceted nature of social change as a macro-level process by which global social and economic forces were transforming traditional ways of life. 'The complexity of society, and the seeming autocracy of government and bureaucracy, create real difficulties for the individual, the group and the local community' (Hill 1970, p.11). As a result, the state needed to be reformed in order to help people reconcile themselves to the depth, breadth and rapidity of this change:

> A consequence of the speed of change is that many people are jerked out of one way of life into another perhaps more demanding, and at any rate, unfamiliar [life]…Most people are sufficiently socialised and self-reliant [but expertise is needed] to help people and the providers of services to bring about a more comfortable 'fit' between themselves and constant change' (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.28-9).

I think that this understanding of social change and the solutions offered to ameliorate its effects is crucial to understanding how the discourses of British community development respond to this politically salient moment. This moment in time is not, perhaps surprisingly, linked to rebellion against social hierarchies, unjust war or new forms of democracy as seen in the protest movements in the United States. I do not mean to suggest that social movements—most notably the feminist, trade unionist and anti-war

80

movements—were absent. However, what is particularly striking about this British moment in time is how the energy of popular movements, academics, social policy experts and politicians is channelled into debates about the nature and purpose of state institutions, structures and processes—in order to strengthen democracy and create a more equal society:

> More than ever before, men now live in the shadow of the state. What they want to achieve, individually or in groups, now mainly depends on the state's sanction and support…It is for the state's attention, or for its control, that men compete; and it is against the state that beat the waves of social conflict (Miliband 1969, p.8).

State actors' response, from both the Labour government and civil servants, was to implement rational and technical decision-making processes to address social problems (Titmuss 1968; Loney 1983; Jones 2006). 'The capacity to create and service large organisations has led to a relentless pressure…for coordinated and rationalised decision-making and economies of scale' (Greaves 1976, p.40). This 'professionalisation of reform' would replace capricious and expedient policy decisions and would instead use the expert power of research and evaluation in order to make evidence-based and objective decisions regarding solutions to social problems. Here is the Gulbenkian Foundation (1968, p.12-14) praising this new technical response to social change:

> The change in the role of government from the regulative to the dynamic has produced…positive social policy interventions…The participation of social scientists and social workers in planning is necessary so that the human consequences of technological change may be given their proper weight together with physical and economic consequences.

Decision-making by the state during this moment 'reflect[s] both the concern with more efficient resource development and the commitment to a greater role for social science in the development of social policy' (Loney 1983, p.16). Thus what we see emerge at this time is a renewed 'activist' state armoured with the

power of social science research in order to facilitate the policy process. In this context, the emerging community development profession is from the beginning placed in a space of hierarchical, rational and scientific practices seemingly divorced from the everyday experiences of local people. 'It is ironic that as society as a whole accumulates more and more knowledge, the individual is faced with more and more that he does not and can never understand' (Greaves 1976, p.42). The texts which constitute the Rationalist discourse are drawn from these technocratic responses to social change (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968; Loney 1983).

During this moment, however, the nature and purpose of this activist state is contested. Socialist academics, activists and policy makers, disillusioned with the Labour government, were also concerned with the rapidity of social change in terms of the transformation in the nature of capital and the impact this was having on working class communities. The welfare state, in terms of its bureaucratic structures and resource allocation, was identified as a new and important location for class struggle:

> We have to recognise that alongside struggle at the point of production, in the mines and factories, there is a struggle at the point of reproduction, in schools, on housing estates, in the street, in the family…Struggles around housing or benefits or schools are economic…Those things too must be protected against the…pressure of profit (Cockburn 1977, p.163).

Because the welfare state had increased its sphere of influence over the lives of working class communities (in terms of social services such as housing education and health), socialists define state structures as an important and legitimate site of protest and political struggle alongside the traditional sphere of the workplace. However, similar to capitalist economic relations, it was important to have a clear analysis of the state in order to avoid false consciousness that the state invariably promoted. Socialists argued that the state—rather than being a neutral tool to reform social problems—was actually an apparatus used by the capitalist class to wield power. In order to build a democratic socialist state

capable of redistributing wealth and power, the existing state apparatus had to be dismantled. Here is Miliband (1969, p.32) in his influential articulation of this perspective:

> In the Marxist scheme, the 'ruling class' of capitalist society is that class which owns and controls the means of production and which is able, by virtue of economic power thus conferred upon it, to use the state as its instrument for the domination of society.

The state, rather than being a champion of social reform, could in fact simply further the interests of a powerful elite. Thus, political action in relation to the state was in constant danger of cooption either through resource allocation or ideology. 'The fact that many groups have been absorbed as appendages to the welfare state, rather than alternatives to it, can be explained partly by the absence of a clear theory of social change through community action' (Hain 1976, p.17). Texts which constitute the Structuralist discourse are drawn from these sceptical socialist analyses about the ability of the state to deliver social justice (Baine 1974; Dearlove 1974; ELCU 1974; Mayo 1974; CDP 1977; CDP 1978).

However, I think it is important to highlight the unintentional consensus between the rational social planners and the socialist sceptics of the welfare state. Because these two groups identify similar social problems to be tackled and attribute these problems to macro-level social and economic processes, they end up reaching similar conclusions about the agents of social change. By attributing disruptive social changes to British life to state failure, capitalist development and poor decision-making by politicians and policy makers, the actions of ordinary people appear to be marginalised and downplayed during this moment in time. Instead, the agents of change are assumed to be the state and state actors. Here is Titmuss (1968 quoted in Loney 1983, p.18) providing an example of this phenomenon:

> It is an interesting and overlooked fact that, during the last 20 years, whenever the British people have identified and investigated a social

problem there has followed a national call for more social work and more trained social workers.

In the context of community development, this interpretation of agency is very important. As I shall demonstrate in this chapter, because community development is created and practiced in institutional spaces, this appears to define community development in such a way as to downplay or ignore the experiences, perceptions, contributions and actions of ordinary people in transforming their lives.

With this context of 1968 as a backdrop—social problems and solutions defined and potentially resolved in the context of the state and macro-level processes—I will now, using the second and third steps of Hansen's PDA method, analyse the competing community development discourses and identity constructions during this moment.

The Rationalist Discourse and the Activist State
The Rationalist discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of the Home Office under the Wilson Government, which was seeking to restructure the welfare state, and the Gulbenkian Foundation, which was tasked by the Wilson Government with inventing a new profession to support the Government's planned institutional changes. The state identifies and seeks to resolve persistent urban poverty in the inner-cities using rational scientific approaches to social policy and social planning. The Urban Programme was initiated by the Wilson Government in order to:

> find out how to give cooperation between services a more solid foundation…Familiar activities need to be conducted in new ways in order to make services more accessible and comprehensible to those who will not otherwise see them as relevant…More fundamentally, the project must seek to involve the people living in the area in community schemes (CDA 1968 quoted in Loney 1983, p.2-3).

Modelled on the American War on Poverty programme, the assumption driving the Urban Programme was that poverty persisted among specific groups due to the poor coordination of local government service delivery combined with a social pathology which afflicted people living in poverty. The Community Development Project (CDP) was the flagship initiative of the Urban Programme which sought to use expert-driven research to better understand poverty and inequality which would lead to the more efficient organisation of social services which would in turn engender resilience and self-help among the poor (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968; Loney 1983; Jones 2006). 'Experiment is…needed to discover fresh ways of helping people…to make effective use of the social services' (CDA 1968 quoted in Loney 1985, p.55). Unlike the War on Poverty, the participation of the poor in the decision-making of the state was not an explicit objective of the CDP—ensuring that the poor used services more effectively thus making poor people more self-reliant and relieving pressure on local services was the goal (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.3-5; Loney 1983, p.2-3).

Twelve projects were set up across the UK between 1970-71 to operate for five years to coordinate local services in Coventry, Liverpool, Glamorgan, Southwark, Batley, Newham, Paisley, Cumberland, Newcastle, Birmingham, Oldham and Tyneside (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968; CDP 1977; Loney 1983; Jones 2006). The dominant narrative in the early years of the projects was the promotion of consensual and cooperative partnership-working between service providers in health, education, housing and employment in order to make their services more accessible and holistic for people in poverty:

> The existing services are vertically organised. In varying degrees each exists to meet a particular need or a range of needs, the assumption being that other needs will be met by the clients themselves or by the other services…[People in poverty] need support from the social services which is not offered piecemeal…but which can help them face these problems as a whole (CDA 1968 quoted in Loney 1983, p.53-4).

Cooperative working would help local government to 'discover and develop methods of helping the severely deprived to make a personally constructive use of the social services' (CDP 1969 quoted in Loney 1983, p.55). I think it is important to note at this stage how the focus of attention of the CDP and hence the professionals employed by it is on the state. The Rationalist discourse constructs the state as a key subject invested with agency to resolve the problems of people living in poverty. 'Community work embraces attempts to relate the activities of social agencies more closely to the needs of the people they serve' (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.3). As a result, the state and its agents are the active subjects whilst people living in poverty are to be acted upon by these cooperating and consensual experts. 'The prime objective of Government was to maximise the total supply of welfare…and second to produce a more equitable distribution of welfare' (Home Office 1969, quoted in Loney 1985, p.56).

In an important hegemonic practice, the Rationalist discourse constructs a new type of professional to support the cooperation and trust between service providers. The new community development professional is constructed as a public administrator whose job is to be a 'change agent' both within local government and within poor communities. This administrator finds innovative ways to breakdown bureaucracy and departmentalism in local government which causes inefficiencies in service planning and delivery. This new professional is also a catalyst for change within deprived areas because by 'understanding the relationship of man to his environment and to his fellow man' the professional can help reconcile people to the bewildering changes in their daily lives (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.28). Reconciling people to social change involves building a sense of community and engaged citizenship among marginalised groups in order to understand and try to resolve individual and collective needs:

> There is a more active function [of the work of the community development professional] in stimulating people to meet some local need and trying to identify the leaders in a neighbourhood who could with

support carry other people along with them (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.29).

The construction of the community development professional as a 'technical man' who uses 'social philosophy, psychology and sociology as well as geography and economics' to facilitate social reform allows for a dominant role of the state and the expert and marginalises and subordinates the community (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.28). For example, civil servants setting out the ultimate goal of the CDP describe it as such:

> It is already known that the symptoms of personal, family and community malfunctioning can be diminished by increasing the level of external support…The end [of the CDPs] will be to discover and demonstrate new methods of reaching a minority of the population suffering from multi-deprivation and of enabling them to function more autonomously (CDA 1968 quoted in Loney 1985, p.50).

However, it is important to note how the identity of the community development professional is unclear within the Rationalist discourse. Although the profession's goal is to reform local services and the character of poor people, the identity of this professional is muddled. The Gulbenkian Foundation's (1968; 1972) hegemonic texts on community development demonstrate the contingency of the identity of the professional. The Foundation in some places states that community development workers should be mid-career professionals in education and health, whilst in other places stating that community development workers should be change agents promoting democratic participation and in other places that community development workers should be senior civil servants interested in professional development. The Foundation (1968, p.3) debates whether workers should be deployed in 'new or deprived neighbourhoods or with underprivileged or deviant groups…[or whether the professional should train] other professionals, administrators, planners…about community needs and processes and the importance of associating the consumers in the planning and operation of services'.

87

Ultimately, the Foundation settles on this half-way house construction of the profession:

> Community work…is a function which is or should be exercised by many different people as part of their professional activities or as voluntary workers (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.27).

In other words, a community development worker can be anyone either inside or outside the state seemingly doing anything at the grassroots level. This ambiguity regarding the identity of the community development professional is important as it helps to explain the repetitions, patterns and preoccupations in the Rationalist discourse regarding the identity of the community development worker. The preoccupation with constructing and reconstructing community development workers' identity may well help to explain why so little attention focuses on the construction of the community and why the community is silenced in British community development texts during this politically salient moment.

Unsurprisingly then, this ambiguous and contingent community development professional is engaged in a seemingly baffling and contradictory array of practices constructed as 'community development':

> [Community development is] part of a protest against apathy and complacency against distant and anonymous authority. It is also part of the whole dilemma of how to reconcile the 'revolution of human dissent' into the large-scale organisation and economic and social planning…This boils down to how to give meaning to democracy…The question for community workers is whether organisational structures can be devised and people trained and employed to facilitate citizen participation and to make it more effective, as well as making public and voluntary services more acceptable and usable. In short, community work is a means of giving life to local democracy (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.5).

That community development is constructed as the process of giving meaning to democracy but that democracy appears tied to the structure of service provision is problematic. High quality public service provision is a crucial element of anti-poverty work and the democratisation of decision-making in local government. However, I think democracy is not solely a function of the state nor does the practice of democracy necessarily have to take place in state-sponsored spaces. Again, because the rationalist welfare state is the key subject within British community development it appears to dominate and silence alternative identities for community development professionals and alternative constructions about the nature and practice of democracy during this moment.

Turning to the third step of Hansen's PDA method, I argue the implications for identity construction within the Rationalist discourse are clear. There are two Selves with an uneasy relationship with each other and this relationship helps to marginalise the community Other. One Self is the activist welfare state. The mechanics of the structure of the state—the coordination of local service provision—dominate this discourse. For example:

> [One of the aims of community work is] the democratic process of involving people in thinking, deciding, planning and playing an active part in the development and operation of services that affect their daily lives (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.4).

Allied to this identity is the ambiguous community development professional, which I discussed above, tasked with administrating changes in state structures and in doing so facilitating self-help among the poor. 'Many councils have been very uncertain as to what these community workers should actually do, and the task of their new employees has often been to define their own jobs' (Hain 1976, p.18). By having two divided Selves appears to explain why very little space is devoted to identity construction of the community Other. Very few constructions of the Other exist and those that do reflect the domination of these two Selves and the subordination of the Other. The poor/community are constructed in various ways as passive and/or depoliticised objects:

A community development officer is recommended as a way of communicating with the majority of 'passive' members of the community who do not belong to local groups…It is very hard to help the less articulate members of the community to express their ideas and take action upon them (Hill 1970, p.215).

The Gulbenkian Foundation (1968, p.9-11) alternates its description of community groups as: 'consumers of services', 'underprivileged', 'deviant' or 'depressed minorities'. The overarching construction of the Other, however, is that of being besieged and overwhelmed by the rapidity of macro-level changes and being incapable of responding effectively to these changes. For example:

The demand that those who use services should have a say in their operation is often nullified by growth in size and complexity which makes it less and less possible for the man in the street to exercise an informed judgement about such matters…To press people to assume responsibilities beyond their powers creates disillusionment; but it is essential that they should exercise these capacities up to the limit if local democracy is to have meaning (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.14).

This construction is perhaps not surprising given the assumption within the Rationalist discourse that the poor suffer from a destructive pathology of delinquency and family breakdown which traps them in poverty. 'While community workers can often provide a much-needed boost to activity, groups often become dependent on their expertise and resources, and so fail to fully develop their own potential' (Hain 1976, p.19). However, it is noteworthy that for a social process to both coordinate service delivery and to build poor people's self-reliance, the Rationalist's construction of community development appears to have very little to do with understanding social relationships, culture and democracy at the local level and seems to be in fact focused solely on improved public administration. '[Community work is needed because] discovering how to bring about small and psychological change amongst groups of people in a

locality is (or should be) a precondition of planned physical change' (Gulbenkian Foundation 1968, p.3).

Perhaps the Rationalist discourse's identity constructions and discursive practices are not surprising given that this is the official discourse of the British state in 1968. However, what makes British community development distinctive is that the oppositional Structuralist discourse does not seem challenge these assumptions about professionalism, expertise or the role of the state in people's lives.

Using the second and third steps of Hansen's method, I will now move on to discuss the Structuralist discourse in further detail.

The Structuralist Discourse and the Activist State

> [A new generation of activists] saw behind the façade of 'rights' and 'entitlements' and they began to point out that the welfare state was never intended to fulfil the function ascribed to it in popular mythology…The welfare state was a fraud and a 'con' and a very cheap buy for the ruling class (East London Claimants Union 1974, p.79).

The Structuralist discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of the newly created professionals and the community groups with whom they worked as part of the CDP. Like the Rationalist discourse, the Structuralist discourse is focused on the nature and structure of the state and to a lesser extent the construction of the professional working within institutional structures. The Structuralist discourse is an evolution of the Rationalist discourse within the CDP: by 1971 the dominant discourse with the CDP began to shift from Rationalist to Structuralist as community development professionals entered the field and began researching the nature of poverty and inequality in the twelve prescribed areas across Britain. 'A few months' field-work in areas suffering from long-terms economic decline…was enough to provoke the first teams of CDP workers to question the Home Office's original assumptions' (CDP 1978, p.4).

In an important divergence, instead of interpreting the cause of poverty as the poor coordination of services or as a result of delinquency among people experiencing poverty, these new professionals located the cause of poverty and inequality in capitalism. Here are two examples of the CDP workers providing an alternative explanation of poverty:

> There might certainly be in these areas a higher proportion of the sick and elderly for whom a better coordination of services would undoubtedly be helpful, but the vast majority were ordinary working-class men and women who, through forces outside their control, happened to be living in areas where bad housing conditions, redundancies, lay-offs and low-wages were common-place (CDP 1978, p.4).

> It became clear that the problems of these areas were firmly tied to much more basic structural problems in society… [There is a] recognition that the existence of such 'pockets of deprivation' is useful and even necessary to the normal operations of the economy, that capitalist development will always tend to produce such areas and the solution…is inextricably bound up with the critical problems of the British economy as a whole (CDP 1977, p.5).

Thus in my analysis of the Structuralist discourse it seems that understanding the nature of capitalism, the effects of capitalist (under)development and the impact that this economic and social structure has on the psychology and agency of the working-class becomes the new dominant discourse and practice within the CDP. 'There are no purely local solutions to inequality and disadvantage, since the critical problems…are manifestations of wider processes in society' (Young, 1976, p.118). It is interesting to note the weak response of the Rationalist discourse to its successful marginalisation by the Structuralist discourse. The Home Office simply ignored the CDP; the Home Office continued supporting the CDP until the end of its funding cycle in 1975. The Gulbenkian Foundation does not mention these developments at all. Loney (1983, p.113) and Jones (2006, p.157-8) argue that the Home Office lost interest in the CDP for two reasons. A

key advocate of the initiative within the civil service, Derrick Morrell, died suddenly during the initial implementation of the project and as a result, interest in and enthusiasm for the CDP steadily declined within central government. In addition, the Wilson and Heath governments were distracted by more pressing concerns of ongoing industrial disputes which further eroded interest in the project. Tellingly, whilst this lack of interest in the CDP creates an opportunity for an oppositional discourse to develop it also means that the Structuralist discourse is constructed within a context of a wider marginalisation within central government thus rendering its ideas and practices less effective in influencing state structures and actors.

A key pattern in the language of the Structuralist discourse is the nature and structure of the state. Heavily influenced by Marx (1985), Gramsci (1984) and Althusser (1970) this discourse focuses on the multi-faceted domination and oppression of the working classes by state capitalism. Interpellating Marx, the Structuralist discourse first locates working class oppression in the history of industrial development in Britain (for a detailed discussion of this see: CDP 1977). Because Britain was the first industrialised nation, the British working class has a unique history of being the first group to experience the exploitation of capitalism:

> When more and more areas were being drawn into world capitalism, development in one area often meant decline of another…as capitalists took the profits accumulated in one place and poured them into new plant and projects in new areas so workers in older industries were thrown out of work and forced to leave their homes…to tramp the roads in search of work (CDP 1977, p.16).

A central theme within the Structuralist discourse is the linking of industrial development to the development of housing, employment and social relations—thus illustrating the irresistible march of history, social forces and class conflict necessitating revolution:

The costs of industrial change are borne by local working class communities. These communities grew up in response to the demand for labour from new industries, yet over time changes in these industries have destroyed their [working class communities] original role (CDP 1977, p.37).

However, for proponents of the Structuralist discourse it seems that simply defining the 'real' cause of poverty and inequality and refuting competing explanations of poverty linked to pathology and delinquency is not sufficient to effectively educate, agitate and organise the working class. The Structuralist discourse constructs capitalism not only as an oppressive economic system but also as a generator of dominant traditions, norms and values that suppress potential working class dissent. 'There is the unusually clear-cut element in the CDP of social control, the management of unrest' (Cockburn 1977, p.125). The East London Claimants Union (1974) defines the welfare state as part of the Ideological State Apparatus and the Structuralist discourse constructs the CDP, the welfare state and the concept of 'participation' in local government decision-making as hegemonic counter-revolutionary devices to co-opt and prevent widespread rebellion (Dearlove 1974, p.24-28; Baine 1974, p.67; CDP 1977, p.37-58; CDP 1978, p.37-51): Here are two examples of this framing of the CDP and the welfare state:

> By and large those in government are concerned to ensure that collectivities remain their supporters and subjects…The state desires subjects, clients, supporters and helpers, not masters, customers, demanders and disrupters…Numerous groups and individuals accept and absorb this ideology (Dearlove 1974, p.24).

> Any of this 'participation' would be a sell-out to the system and an attempt on the part of the establishment to absorb our militancy. We do not intend [sic] participating in our poverty (East London Claimants Union 1974, p.89).

Thus, rather than the CDP and the welfare state being constructed as an important concession won by the organised working class through trade union struggle, the welfare state is instead constructed by the Structuralist discourse as a weapon of capitalism which engenders false consciousness and undermines revolutionary tendencies among the working classes. To counter these repressive and ideological state apparatuses, the Structuralist discourse constructs a need for the dissolution of state capitalism and the redistribution of wealth and resources via a democratic socialist state:

> [There is a need to recognise] the contradictory nature of state services and…work towards providing a service in the interest of the working class, not capitalism and the state. [This requires] acting collectively to change the structures through which these services are provided so that both workers and consumers have a service which is geared towards their needs and over which they have control (CDP 1977, p.64).

Unsurprisingly perhaps given the focus on the state and capital, identity constructions are inadequately articulated. The Self as constituted by the Structuralist discourse is implicit but weakly constructed. Certainly the Self is a self-consciousness professional seeking to shed new light on urban poverty in order to educate and inspire the 'working class' to resist the hegemonic practices of the state. Thus the Self appears to be interpellating Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual:

> Partisanship and identification with the concrete problems of the working class and deprived are essential [for the community development professional]. He analyses problems and causes and hopes to join with the people who have these problems to secure improvements (Baine 1974, p.69).

The Self, however, remains ambiguous. Because the Structuralist discourse is an evolution of the Rationalist discourse, it inherits uncertain and contingent constructions of Self. Sitting alongside the Self being an organic intellectual is

also the idea that the professional community development worker is infinitely flexible and can be all things to all people:

> Community work should not aspire to be a profession in a narrow and traditional sense. By its very nature it has an inter-disciplinary, inter-professional, inter-organisational emphasis. Although a form of practice in its own right, it can and should be developed in a variety of settings and organisations (Mayo 1974, p.xv).

Perhaps part of the problem of this weakly articulated Self can be found in constructions of the Other. The Other in the Structuralist discourse is a silenced, homogenised and passive working class. 'We have to attack directly the sense of powerlessness and the habit of acquiescence with which large numbers of people are oppressed. At present, much of the safety of politicians lies in the passivity of the people' (Lishman 1976, p.81). As seen in the British Rationalist discourse and as I demonstrated in Chapter 3 in relation to the American Power and Poverty discourses, the consequence of constructing the Self based on notions of 'authenticity', 'expertise' or 'revolution' appears to be the subordination of the Other. The Structuralist discourse does not seem to deviate from these discursive patterns. The Other is dominated in this discourse due to the subject positions of 'working class' and the allied assumptions about the political powerlessness of this identity. For example, here is Dearlove (1974, p.27) providing another construction of a passive and problematic Other:

> Of course there is apathy, alienation, defeatism and cynicism, together with a vicious cycle of re-enforcing factors which tend to hold people to their position of poverty, but more in terms of political activity there is a strange acceptance of the position of poverty…What is surprising is not that the poor are politically impotent it is that some of the poor manage to become political active for some time.

I think the subject position of 'working class' is a tricky category because it is problematic. On the one hand, the working class are impotent and besieged by

false consciousness as we can see from the quotes above; on the other hand, however, they are the catalyst for social change:

> Workers are residents and consumers [of social welfare] too…It is around this issue [of urban neighbourhood decline] which communities, and workers suffering the effects of industrial decline, must be organised to press for change, if they are not bear the costs (Young 1976, p.125).

This problematic position of a group being both impotent but also the key constituent for action appears to re-enforce an ambivalent Self. This contingent subject position of the Self is then made even more uncertain because of the Structuralist discourse's focus on macro-level processes which seem to rob all subjects—both the Self and the Other—of agency.

The construction of problems exclusively through the lens of class and class conflict also serve to misrecognise the experiences of the Other. The Other in the Structuralist discourse is homogenised as white, industrial and male (this is in stark contrast to the Other as constituted by the anti-establishment Democracy and Power discourses in the US). For example, recall the theme of immigration and how it was constructed as a macro-level problem requiring a state-based solution during this politically salient moment. The experiences of new migrants are misrecognised in the Structuralist discourse as the process of racialisation and discrimination are reconstituted as a problem of capitalism:

> [Immigrants] experienced special types of exploitation and humiliation. Encouraged to migrate in the 'boom' fifties, most found themselves stuck with unskilled, dirty or nightshift work…The host community of the older areas, many of them the disappointed elderly who had been left behind, were not easy neighbours to please. Misunderstandings were fanned into racialism often by national politicians and the media. Immigrants became scapegoats for the very conditions they themselves most suffered from (CDP 1978, p.33).

From the example above we can see how the identity construction of the Other as 'working class' is insufficient to capture the multi-dimensional experience of new migrants because does it reflect the racism and xenophobia of some parts of the white working class. Furthermore, with these dominant constructions of exploitation only taking place in public spaces, the Structuralist discourse also appears to privilege the male experience in the workplace whilst marginalising women's experiences in the home and in the community (for a more detailed discussion of this see Chapter 6). A notable exception to this is Cockburn (1977, p.176) who concludes her influential account of the local state with an analysis of the politicisation and political organisation of women and how this is an important model for future class struggles: 'A striking feature of the instances of working class action…is the key role that women played in them.'

The Self and the Other constructions in the Structuralist discourse are interlinked and self-reinforcing. Contingent constructions of Self as being an organic intellectual or a interdisciplinary professional require a construction of the Other as passive and homogenised but with latent agency. The Other constructed as a passive but potentially active subject make the Self contingent and uncertain. These problematic constructions are made possible by the discursive patterns that privilege the agency of the state and macro-level processes which, as a consequence, undermine the agency of both the Self and the Other.

Conclusions

Using Hansen's three-pronged PDA method, I argued that the dominant discourses of British community development during the politically salient moment of 1968 to 1975 frame social problems and solutions through the lens of the state. Whether through the relatively conservative Rationalist discourse or through the seemingly revolutionary and oppositional Structuralist discourse, potentially destructive macro-level processes are identified to be opposed and it is only the state that is constructed as an effective opposition to these complex socio-economic changes. On the surface these two discourses—Rationalist and Structuralist—appear to be in conflict but a closer analysis shows us that these

discourses share similar ideas, practices and identity constructions due to their preoccupation with the structure of the state.

By locating both problems and solutions at the institutional level means that the state is the active subject in each of the discourses. As a result of this construction of an activist state, working class people are defined as passive and besieged by social and economic forces beyond their control. Ironically, for two discourses whose concern is seemingly the character of community life, social justice and equality, very little attention is paid to the agency and power of working class people to resist and/or change their traditions, their working lives and their social relationships in the face of these new social, technological and economic trends. Indeed, by constructing working class people as pathological or experiencing false consciousness it is not clear that either discourse can construct local people in non-hierarchical or anti-oppressive ways. As a result, the Self is privileged in each of the discourses. However, even the Self is constituted in an unsatisfactorily way because of the emphasis on macro-level processes. The Self is a contingent and ambivalent professional seeking to reconcile the poor to their problems or unchain them from the bonds of the ideological state apparatus. In either case, constructions of the Self are uncertain and some cases contradictory as the fixation on the state crowds out considered analyses of identity.

Interestingly in both the US and the UK community development, 1968 does not represent the triumph of radical democracy, equality and justice: it is simply a continuation of the old battles of reformist and progressive politics. Rather than considering new and different spaces and practices of democracy, community development in each country appears to be fixated on either developing professional expertise to counter the problems of the poor or imposing a homogenising 'revolutionary' ideology that subordinates local people and denies the competing interests and identities of different community groups.

As we turn to a new historical moment it remains uncertain to me whether community development on either side of the Atlantic can effectively respond to transformative moments in ways that are consistent with its purported goals of

democracy and social justice. This failure to respond democratically appears to place community development in a vulnerable position as a new moment unfolds—the rise of the New Right—which seems to undermine community development's purported aims and goals. Perhaps community development's inability to promote democracy during a favourable moment in time when its foundational ideas were politically fashionable helps to explain its weak and ineffective responses during a more precarious moment when community development itself falls out of favour.

I will now shift focus by exploring the second politically salient moment in both the US and the UK covering the period from 1979 to 1985.

Chapter 5: The Populist, Partnership and Empowerment Discourses

Introduction

In the previous two chapters I analysed five community development discourses in the US and the UK during the politically salient moment of 1968 to 1975. I demonstrated how, during that moment, the majority of these basic discourses reproduced unequal and hierarchical relational identities between community development professionals or radical activists and local people. Only one discourse, the Democracy discourse as constituted by SNCC, constructed equalised subject positions between practitioners and local people and this particular discourse was successfully marginalised by the other dominant discourses. This research finding is important as it suggests that the majority of community development discourses may be unable to effectively construct respectful, democratic and socially just identities within their repertoires. Furthermore, those discourses that attempt to do so appear to be consigned to marginal positions within community development. As I turn to explore a different moment in time, I shall evidence how the discursive patterns I analysed in Chapters 3 and 4 continue into and are entrenched during the 1980s.

This chapter focuses on the competing discourses and identities of community development during the rise of the New Right in the United States from 1979 to 1985. I have identified three basic discourses in the texts from and about this period. The 'Populist' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of the 'non-ideological' neighbourhood movement seeking to curb the perceived power of government, corporate and revolutionary left-wing elites through the decentralisation of decision-making and the building of independent grassroots-based organisations. The 'Partnership' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of technocrats and reformed 1960s radicals seeking to reshape community-based organisations into public-private enterprises whereby 'community development corporations' (CDCs) deliver public services and initiate urban regeneration efforts. Finally, the 'Empowerment' discourse is

constituted by the texts, language and practices of second-wave feminist academics and organisers seeking to construct a new feminist praxis and place gender equality at the heart of community development theory and practice. As I shall demonstrate, these discourses emerge in response to the rise of the New Right and the growing public scepticism about the social and cultural changes of the 1960s and 1970s. As I will argue throughout this chapter, in response to the hegemony of the New Right, the three community development discourses during this moment either adopt the dominant language and practices of the New Right or are marginalised by this political movement.

This chapter is organised using Hansen's three-pronged PDA method of analysing a politically salient moment in time, the structure of discourses and then identity constructions. The chapter will begin with a short discussion of the formation and structure of the community development discourses in relation to the rise of the New Right. I shall briefly define and explain the origin of the New Right and then move on to discuss the right-wing backlash against the 1960s reforms in the context of the recession of the late 1970s. Using Hansen's second step, I will then turn to analyse the discursive features and identity constructions of the Populist, Partnership and Empowerment discourses and discuss the implications for social justice and equality.

The New Right in the 1980s
In order to understand the process by which the three basic discourses and identities are formed and structured, I will discuss why 1979-1985 is a politically salient moment in terms of my PDA methodology. To understand the New Right in the 1980s, we need to first look back to the 1964 Johnson-Goldwater presidential race. Goldwater, a Republican, campaigned as an anti-communist, a free-marketeer and above all, an angry man tired of the tyranny of state over the lives of ordinary people. Here is Goldwater (1964, p.1-2) summarising his political philosophy:

> We have lost the brisk pace of diversity and the genius of individual creativity. We are plodding at a pace set by centralised planning, red tape,

rules without responsibility, and regimentation without recourse….It is the cause of Republicanism to resist concentrations of power, private or public…It is the cause of Republicanism to ensure that power remains in the hands of the people.

[…]

We Republicans…define government's role where needed at many, many levels, preferably through the one closest to the people involved. Our towns and our cities, then our counties, then our states, then our regional contacts - and only then, the national government. That, let me remind you, is the ladder of liberty, built by decentralised power.

Goldwater's right-wing populist message about do-gooding elites and technocrats bossing around ordinary people helped to create the political environment which would see the New Right capture the presidency in the 1980 election (Diamond 1995, p.109-111; Katz 2008, p.104-108). For the purposes of my research, I am defining the 'New Right' as a political commitment to populism, libertarianism and traditionalism:

To be right-wing means to support the state in its capacity as enforcer of order and to oppose the state as a distributor of wealth and power downward and more equitably in society (Diamond 1995, p.9).

Goldwater's failed campaign for the presidency articulated a different emphasis on the role of the state which contrasted with the dominant model used during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations in the 1960s. Rather than the role of the state being defined as 'activist' whereby its role is to intervene in the lives of citizens in order to ensure equality of opportunity and (to a lesser extent in the US context) equality of outcome, the New Right defines the role of the state in a much more limited way. The state's role is simply to maintain the societal status quo in terms of morality and class, racial and gender hierarchies. This focus on the status quo is derived from a particular form of individual liberty that informs

the politics of the New Right. Liberty for the New Right means a focus on negative rights—the right of citizens not to be interfered with in getting on in life by other citizens or by the state (Diamond 1995, p.6-9). I think this definition of liberty is important as this focus on negative rights helps to shed light on the key priorities of this political movement. Because the guiding principle of the New Right is negative liberty, this fundamental belief is encapsulated and facilitated by a promotion of laissez-faire capitalism:

> Individuals should conduct economic transactions unregulated, as they please. The state should not intervene to distribute wealth among the social classes but, rather, should allow whatever distribution pattern that emerges through natural market forces (Diamond 1995, p.8).

Laissez-faire capitalism is the symbol and safeguard for negative liberty because it is only in an environment of a decentralised state and a free market that individuals can be radically free to pursue happiness. In addition, the New Right does see defending traditional morality as the only other legitimate action for a limited and decentralised state. Traditional morality is protected and promoted by the state enforcing religious norms and values that regulate sexual practices, gender norms, women's reproduction and state-funded education.

Goldwater's campaign was a political training ground for young student radicals—in the same way that SNCC and SDS were for left-wing radicals—where they learned how to organise an emerging grassroots populist base of supporters (Boyte et al 1986, Fisher 1992, Diamond 1995). The Goldwater campaign invented the practice of 'direct mailing': the targeted political advertising to potential supporters. Direct mailing provided partisan information about different local and national hot-button issues, suggested people vote for a specific candidate, encouraged groups to hold hustings and recruited volunteers to campaigns. In this way, the Goldwater campaign and his subsequent defeat tapped into and legitimised growing anxieties among some white people about the rapid social and cultural changes of the 1960s—as seen in the Civil Rights, anti-war and feminist movements (Diamond 1995, p.113).

By the late 1970s, despite the Watergate scandal, the resignation of Nixon and election of Carter, the New Right was emerging as the dominant political movement in the US. This dominance was bolstered by the recession and a transformation in public opinion that the economic downturn helped to engender. Here are Boyte et al (1986, p.15) in a particularly helpful characterisation of how the recession fuelled this swing to the right in public opinion:

> In the context of a growing economic pie [in the late 1960s and early 1970s], Middle American whites could look with sympathy on the struggles and demands of the black underclass…By the end of the decade [1970s], the pie had stopped growing and economic worries merged with white opposition to federal initiatives like busing…Liberals, sensitive to plight of the poor and minorities at times gave the impression of insensitivity to the contributions of Lithuanians, Italians, Poles, Irish and others.

Thus two issues coalesced to create an opportunity for the New Right to become dominant in the United States at this time: the economic downturn had given many working-class and middle-class whites a justification to oppose expanding the welfare state (and the higher taxes required to make this expansion possible) and white opposition to government programmes and interventions—like rectifying de facto segregation—could be legitimised based on populist principles of decentralised power and decision-making. As a result, Reagan (1981, p.1-2) comes to power in 1980 through the articulation of a New Right politics that is both libertarian and populist and in doing so he clearly sets out the agenda for his Administration:

> We suffer from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history… In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem. From time to time we've been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for,

by, and of the people. Well, if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else…The solutions we seek must be equitable, with no one group singled out to pay a higher price.

Reagan's New Right Administration was committed to reducing government expenditure on social welfare and cutting taxes for the rich in a bid to jumpstart the economy to pull America out of the recession. While there are various programmes to which his Administration was committed—namely anticommunism and increases in military spending—my research and my PDA framing of this particular moment is primarily concerned with the Reagan's radical project of social reform in relation to poverty, inequality and community development.

One aspect of the social programme of the New Right was to reduce poor people's dependency on the state and encourage self-reliance and self-help in poor communities. However, for the Reagan Administration, self-reliance among the poor could only be achieved in two ways: dependence on a bloated and permissive welfare state had to be severed and the culture of poverty and failure among the poor was to be transformed (Block et al 1987; Diamond 1995; O'Connor 1998). As a result, one of the Reagan Administration's key objectives was the dismantling the welfare state and reducing federal spending on anti-poverty programmes in order to promote the work ethic and personal responsibility among people living in poverty. Here are two quotes that encapsulate the New Right's approach to poor people and the welfare state during this politically salient moment:

The chloroform of egalitarianism was spread everywhere in the 1970s. Prior American values of self-reliance, personal liberty and competence were heaved overboard…The welfare state had turned many…toiling Americans into parasites and this new class of busybodies lived as super-parasites, deriving nourishment from the dependence of the welfare clients (Tyrell 1987 quoted in Ehrenreich 1987, p.167-8).

106

In order to move up, the poor must not only work, they must work harder than the classes above them. Every previous generation of the lower class has made such efforts. But the current poor, white even more than black, are refusing to work hard (Gilder 1982 quoted in Fisher 1993, p.171).

As we can see from the quotes above, the focus in social policy shifts from promoting welfare to workfare: the goal is to reduce dependence on the state and build the self-reliance and independence of the poor via work and employment. Reagan's dismantling of the welfare state resulted in a reduction in the level of benefits to poor families and more stringent eligibility requirements for benefit payments in a bid to drastically reduce welfare rolls. Cutting the state also meant that key apparatuses of the previous War on Poverty were abolished. Thus federal funding and support to community development projects and programmes were reduced or withdrawn completely (Block et al 1987; O'Connor 1998). These funding cuts were exacerbated by the fact that specific funding streams were deliberately targeted by the new Administration. This was especially the case for community organising projects in inner-cities and women's health organisations that provided sex education, contraception and abortions (Hyde 1990, p.5; Fisher 1993, p.171). As a result of these sustained and politically motivated funding cuts, many community development organisations were left with a Darwinian choice: adapt to the new social order of the New Right or die out.

Thus I argue that the formation and structure of the three basic discourses I have identified during this moment are shaped in the context of right-wing retrenchment. Depending on how each of the discourses defines the nature of this retrenchment seems to help shape its language, ideas and social practices.

The texts that construct the Populist discourse downplay the New Right as a threat and are thus co-opted by the movement. Texts selected for the Populist discourse include writings from the key architect and proponent of New Populism (Boyte 1980, Boyte 1985, Boyte et al 1986); discuss the history and development of important New Populist organisations such as the Association of

Community Organisations for Reform Now (ACORN), Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) and Communities Organised for Public Service (COPS) (Delgado 1986; Fisher 1993); and include writings from key socialist academics charting the reaction of grassroots organisations to the New Right in an influential left-wing journal called *Radical America* (Green and Hunter 1974; Gordon and Hunter 1977; Hunter 1981).

The texts that construct the Partnership discourse attempt to adapt to right-wing retrenchment by adopting the language and practices of the New Right. Texts selected for the Partnership discourse focus on the historical development of and community development practice within CDCs (Berndt 1977; Peirce and Steinbach 1987; Filner 1999; Stoecker 1996; Stoecker 1997); the CDCs relationship to the New Right (Fisher 1993; O'Connor 1998); and the process of depoliticisation of community development (Kretzmann 1984; Delgado 1986; Fisher 1993).

Finally, the texts that construct the Empowerment discourse recognise and seek to oppose right-wing retrenchment. The texts selected for the Empowerment discourse focus on transformations to the study of feminism, gender and 'women' during this moment (Moraga and Anzaldua 1986; West and Zimmerman 1987) and the operation of a feminist praxis in a community-based setting (Gordon and Hunter 1977; Brandwein 1987; Bookman and Martin 1988; WOC 1990; Rivera and Elrich 1991; Ferree and Martin 1995).

Following the first step of Hansen's method, in this section, I analysed the politically salient moment of the rise of the New Right. I will now, using Hansen's second and third steps, analyse the structure and operation of the three basic discourses emergent at this time and then examine the identity constructions prevalent within them.

The Populist Discourse—Against Ideology
The Populist discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of the self-styled movement of 'New Populism' within the field of grassroots activism

and community organising. Born out of the collapse of SNCC and the National Welfare Rights Organisation (NWRO), the Populist discourse is an inheritor of the Power discourse and in particular the 'non-ideological' approach to community development as articulated by Alinskyism, which I discussed in Chapter 3. New Populism is constructed as:

> a renewed vision of direct democracy coupled with a mistrust of large institutions, both public and private. Such a democratic vision represents a rekindled faith in the citizenry itself, a conviction that, given the means and the information, people can make decisions about the course of their lives; a belief that people can develop a conception of the public interest that does not deny—but rather is nourished by—specific interests. In turn, the building blocks for a revitalised ethos of citizenship are to be found in the voluntary structures of all kinds at the base of American society (Boyte 1980, p.7).

In other words, New Populism is focused on the decentralisation of power to the community-based institutions in order to revitalise the practice of American democracy. It is populist through its insistence that ordinary people have the ability and capacity to make decisions about their lives and the 'public good'.

The social practices of New Populism are constructed as:

> cooperative group action by ordinary citizens motivated both by civic idealism and by specific grievances. They [ordinary people] seek some kind of democratisation of power relations…and they appeal to some implicit popular conviction that there is a broad public good (ibid, p.8).

Through my analysis of patterns in the language of texts, I understand the Populist discourse to be a reaction against the language and social practices of the Black Power and Poverty discourses I identified and analysed in Chapter 3. The Poverty discourse's expert reformers and the Power discourse's Black Power revolutionaries are defined by the Populist discourse as hostile and anathema to

the folkways and traditions of ordinary people because these identity constructions and discursive practices signify distant and unaccountable power and elitist 'ideological' domination. Instead, the Populist discourse constructs itself as a continuation of the American voluntarism tradition and focuses on building alternative and independent community-controlled organisations to represent and affirm the self-interests of citizens. Here is Boyte (1980, p.9), one of the founders of New Populism, discussing the problem of elite domination of ordinary people:

> The left can neither understand nor successfully participate in the citizen ferment [of New Populism] if it sees [community] groups instrumentally—as constituencies to be rallied behind a left or 'progressive' agenda…Citizen activism frequently grows directly from traditional and particular group identities that leftists tend to see as 'backwaters' of parochialism—religious and civic traditions, ethnic ties and family relations. In the course of struggle, people often feel deepened appreciation for their heritage, symbols and institutions close to home—a far cry from the abstract cosmopolitanism of the dominant liberal or left imagination…Dialogue that reshapes left categories means recovering activist traditions outside the liberal, socialist, or communist experience.

It seems that the discourse seeks to oppose and marginalise revolutionary politics within the field of community development. In place of revolutionary politics, the discourse constructs community traditions and folkways as the authentic basis to build powerful grassroots-based organisations for ordinary people:

> Contemporary citizen organising is more down to earth, more practical, above all more enduring and rooted in the social fabric [of community life]. It seeks to build ongoing organisations through which people can wield power. It is accompanied by a sense of the rightness, creativity and vitality in people's traditions, folkways and culture that 60s radicals were prone to scorn or dismiss (Boyte 1979, p.139).

The structure of the Populist discourse hinges on three concepts: the idea of 'democracy', a so-called 'non-ideological majoritarian strategy', and a focus on organisational 'victories' rather than the political education of activists. By analysing each of these concepts, I shall demonstrate how the Populist discourse unintentionally reproduces the dominant New Right political practices.

'Democracy' in the Populist discourse is understood as:

> popular power—control by the majority of people, with equality of resources sufficient to make such control realisable—and of direct participation by freely cooperating men and women (Boyte 1980, p.175-176).

Democracy is defined as government by and for the people—focusing on the self-governing of citizens in the interests of citizens. In order to achieve this ideal self-government the greatest threats to citizen self-rule, the state and the market, must be limited:

> The new populism…reflects a continuous effort…to find a successful radical programme that presents, as an alternative to corporate capitalism, a vision for a more cooperative, democratic and decentralised society (Fisher 1993, p.140).

> Populist politics has always expressed the belief that government is neither the problem…nor the solution…Government should provide the necessary tools and resource so that particular communities can revitalise themselves and become self-reliant' (Boyte 1985, p.2).

At this point I think it is important to highlight how the discourse's construction of democracy perhaps unintentionally echoes the right-wing populist pronouncements of both Goldwater and Reagan. Firstly, from the Boyte quote above, we can see how he imports the language and analysis from one of

111

Reagan's most famous speeches about the problems of 'big government' (which I highlighted at the beginning of this chapter). By constructing the state as a barrier to the realisation of populist democracy—rather than as an arbitrator of equality and justice—the Populist discourse seems to cede a crucial analysis about the state to the New Right. Secondly, because the Populist discourse defines democracy as a numerical majority and an appreciation and respect of community traditions and folkways, this construction reflects a fundamental New Right tenet of small and decentralised government. (This idea of democracy is very different from the focus on participatory and deliberative democracy as constructed by the Democracy discourse in Chapter 3.) It is unclear why the discourse constructs democracy in this way; however, I think this conceptual framing could be due to a disinclination to recreate the perceived ideological dominations of the 1960s from which the discourse is seeking to distance itself.

On its own, having a populist conception of democracy does not necessarily mean that the Populist discourse is reproducing the political practices of the New Right. However, this problematic construction of a numerical democracy is closely tied to the second key concept of the Populist discursive repertoire: the 'non-ideological majoritarian strategy'. This strategy focuses on building mass-based, citizen-controlled organisations that are rooted in neighbourhoods, focused on local issues and targeted on winnable issues (Boyte 1980; Boyte et al 1985; Delgado 1986; Fisher 1993):

> A brand new form of democratic populism is developing in the cities with newly emerging leaders at its head. Aiding these developments is a core of urban organisers [who have learned from the] mistakes of the sixties' movements…Grassroots groups must overcome the divide-and-conquer tactics of the powerful; middle-income people are potential allies, not adversaries; tactics should not alienate the public (Miller 1973 quoted in Boyte 1980, p.93).

This strategy is non-ideological because the organisations are built and issues identified and campaigned on based on the 'authentic' interests and concerns of

citizens rather than organisers' or outsiders' ideological interpretations of community-based problems and solutions. Here are two interesting examples of the shift away from ideology to populist issues:

> In about 1972, we decided that we should take our resources and experiences and put them at the feet of the community…No line, no Ho Chi Minh, Kim Il Sung, Che. We tried to get back to real, everyday things, to a calm style. We switched issues from Vietnam and Cambodia and just moved in with the community (Thompson 1977 quoted in Boyte 1980, p.35).

> Our philosophy is very closely related to our membership's daily life experience. There's no ideology that instructs what we do. People make decisions and they start moving (Rathke 1979 quoted in Delgado 1986, p.190-1).

The strategy is majoritarian because the organisation is composed of a broad-based constituency which is multi-racial and multi-class and issues are fought for which have broad-based appeal in the neighbourhood:

> If we want to develop a majority coalition of Americans who can bust the fat cats who are stealing this country…what we need are independent, mass-based, multi-issue organisations, democratically controlled by their members, taking action on the issues of our time (Miller 1973 quoted in Boyte 1980, p.93).

Through this non-ideological majoritarian strategy, the Populist discourse seeks to further marginalise and silence the Democracy, Black Power and Poverty discourses of the 1960s. The fate of SNCC and NWRO inform the Populist discursive strategies. SNCC, once the model organisation practising and struggling for participatory democracy, had dramatically collapsed in 1968 through ideological divisions and splits between Leninists, Trotskyites and Black nationalists. NWRO exclusively organised welfare recipients, a disproportionate

number of whom were African American women. By 1979 the organisation had floundered because it was unable to expand its base beyond this limited constituency in order to spark a movement for increased federal funding for public services in an era of economic crisis (Piven and Cloward 1979; Delgado 1986; Fisher 1993). Thus, in response to the perceived elitist revolutionary ideology, its destructive effects on grassroots-based organisations and the folly of organising a powerless and easily isolated constituency, the Populist discourse constructs itself as fundamentally different to its forbearers. Here is Rathke (1975 quoted in Fisher 1993, p.148) discussing the positioning of ACORN, the organisation that was born out of the demise of NWRO, away from ideology and minority self-interests:

> We all knew that we had to break out of the single-issue campaign [of welfare rights]. I wanted to build on a majority constituency rather than on a minority, where the next-door neighbours are in it together, not fighting each other.

Thus in the Populist discourse, the purpose of a community-based organisation, the way issues are framed and the way members are recruited are framed in reaction to the social practices of 'failed' community development discourses. I think this is the reason for using a populist understanding of democracy. The non-ideological majoritarian strategy ensures that social problems identified by community development are always framed in terms of the powerful—government and corporations—against the powerless—the (unified and homogenised) people. Potentially divisive issues—especially those related to race and gender are not pursued because it would compromise the unity and consensus of the organisation. Only issues with a clearly defined enemy and a clear path to success are defined as viable for mobilising and campaigning. For example:

> We don't cut issues racially where that isn't relevant. There's no point constructing rhetorical enemies who cannot be defeated. Short of race warfare, black people cannot triumph over whites; but whites and blacks

can win against real estate agencies…Winning is what is important in organising, it's almost an obsession (Campbell and Friedman 1978 quoted in Delgado 1986, p.194).

It seems that by seeking to build a majority to advocate for a particular community issue requires a broad-based definition of democracy and active avoidance of ideological domination. What is important here to note is that by supporting the issues and concerns of a numerical majority, this may well lead to an affirmation of the status quo and a marginalisation of issues that challenge established community traditions. Again, this construction of the non-ideological majoritarian concept appears to have a clear resonance with the New Right political philosophy.

The final concept of the Populist discourse is 'victory' which is constructed in two ways. Firstly, building and maintaining a citizen-controlled organisation becomes its own victory for local people—a perpetual self-justification for the process of organising. Here are two examples of this understanding of victory:

> This idea of being organised in a constituency-based organisation…is more important than the particular issue we work on. Again, we might lose or we might win and still the need to be organised remains (Campbell 1979 quoted in Delgado 1986, p.202).

> The very nature of organisational growth and experiences in the process of producing power models its own ideology…For our members, ACORN is a true education in democracy (Rathke no date, quoted in Boyte 1980, p.95).

A permanent organisation, composed of activists ready to react to abuses of power by the state or corporations and who can also advance their own self-interest, is constructed as the most effective kind of power people can wield. Targeting winnable issues, with a clear enemy and a clear campaign strategy, builds the confidence of citizens and re-enforces the need for a permanent

organisation. People will join and actively participate in an organisation that is perceived to be powerful, formidable and effective:

> [New Populism] tended to focus on organisation-building skills—how an organiser can get people to join and build a neighbourhood programme…Part of the reason was new populist pragmatism, which encouraged winning victories… and avoiding potentially divisive positions…Victories guaranteed that the organisation would survive (Fisher 1993, p.154).

Focusing on a permanent organisation and on winnable issues also creates problems in the discourse. From my analysis of texts, there seems to be little sense of how the process of community organising and victory should be linked to a progressive programme for social change. There does not seem to be a distinctive set of social practices within the Populist discourse that would distinguish it from the formidable New Right organising that is also taking place at this time.

As a result of the structure of this discourse—the focus on a numerical democracy, a non-ideological majoritarian strategy and victory—creates tensions and dislocations within the discourse for which it is unable to resolve. The case of busing, especially in Boston during the late 1970s, illustrates these discursive tensions and the Populist discourse's cooptation by the New Right. Busing, the practice of tackling de facto school segregation by transporting African American children to predominately white schools, was a controversial federal intervention that challenged the will of states and local school boards. Busing was contested by segregated white communities for a number of reasons: the practice constituted an important victory for civil rights campaigners seeking an end to inequalities in educational provision; busing was interpreted as an act of unaccountable power by distant government elites which ignored popular sentiments; and of course racist whites simply did not want their children to attend integrated schools:

116

We have in our midst today a small band of racial agitators, non-native to Boston and a few college radicals who have joined in the conspiracy to tell the people of Boston how to run their schools, their city and their lives (Day Hicks 1965 quoted in Green and Hunter 1974, p.22).

In many ways busing helped spark and sustain the right-wing strain within the New Populist movement by heeding Goldwater's call to re-establish community control and power at the local level. With slogans such as 'Power to the People, fuck the niggers!' single-issue community groups began to organise and mobilise whites against integration (Hunter 1981, p.117). The most effective and high profile these types of populist organisations was Restore Our Alienated Rights (ROAR) which was set up by white business leaders and politicians to stop busing and other federal 'encroachments' in South Boston. ROAR organised and mobilised local whites using the ABCs strategy: anti-abortion, anti-busing and anti-communism (Fisher 1993, p.155). ROAR also used strategies and tactics pioneered in the Goldwater campaign, such as direct mail and phone chains, in order to keep local people informed of events and to mobilise them quickly for demonstrations. By using the language and practices of the Populist discourse to support white supremacy, ROAR was effective in building solidarity among the majority Irish Catholic constituency to successfully resist desegregation of South Boston in education, housing and employment (Green and Hunter 1974; Fisher 1993).

The emergence and success of ROAR demonstrates the discursive dislocations of the Populist discourse. A populist, non-ideological, majoritarian approach can be used for either progressive or reactionary practices. By substituting ideology for folkways, by eschewing the political education of activists for the technique of organising and mobilising a constituency, I contend that the Populist discourse is easily co-opted by the New Right. Through a wish to avoid the ideological dominations of the past, the discourse appears to cede crucial ground in the practices and politics of community development. In a bid to promote democracy, the discourse unintentionally endorses the tyranny of the majority. Indeed, even after the Populist discourse's language and practices are co-opted

117

by ROAR and other right-wing groups, the discourse attempts to construct clear distinctions between 'right-wing' and 'progressive' populism rather than disavowing reified and essentialised community institutions, community leaders and folkways that can sustain injustice and inequality:

> On the individual level neither right-wing nor progressive populism often exits in a pure form. People may have one view on economic issues, another view on social issues and another view on foreign policy…but with all these complexities there are broad values and responses emerging that make two kinds of populism increasingly identifiable (Boyte et al 1986, p.10).

Moving to third step in Hansen's PDA method, I now want to explore the identity constructions constituted by this discourse. The Self is constructed as a community organiser who facilitates the will of the people and helps people make sense of the world and their experiences within it. For example, here is Delgado (1986, p.82) discussing the role of the organiser in this way:

> An organiser is fighting a battle to win not simply campaigns but people's minds…Organisers must use the process of organising to expand the collective experiences of community residents and use [the] organisation to validate redefined collective perceptions of how the world works…Community organisers are social reconstructionists. Their role is to develop the ability of people to understand the world so that they can act in it.

In contrast to the Democracy discourse, the Populist organiser is not necessarily committed to consensus-based decision-making. That would compromise the building of a majority around winnable issues. Instead the Populist organiser is committed to building an organisation that reflects the priorities of a broad-based constituency.

The community organiser Self is also constructed as a technician concerned with mechanics of building and maintaining a community-based organisation. For example: 'the organiser [is] an "expert" who practices a method, almost a "science", of organising' (Fisher 1993, p.153). The Self has been stripped of meaning and is a non-ideological worker perfecting the craft of organisation-building. What that organisation is for, where it is positioned politically and how it frames social problems is downplayed within the discourse. With the Self concerned with process and technique rather than broader ideological and political issues, the Self, ironically, fails to build and mobilise the democratic majority it claims to organise. For example, Adamson (1980 quoted in Delgado 1986, p.195-6) a vocal critic of non-ideological Populist politics argues:

> For young Blacks, if you want to get into what's happening in your community, an ACORN or a Fair Share is not the place to do it…The organisations are inadvertently racist…What they do is they treat everybody the same way. If you don't take into account the fact that there are real differences culturally, you're going to have problems…The hierarchy [of these organisations] is reflective of essentially what society is; it's all white and mostly male.

Two Others are constructed in this discourse: elites wielding unaccountable power and the reified 'people'. As previously discussed, New Populism is a reactionary movement against three types of elites: government, corporate and revolutionary. Interestingly, not a lot of distinction is made between these three very different types of elites because the discourse constructs them as having the same harmful impact: undermining the self-determination of the people:

> While it [New Populism] is critical of elements of the economic system, it sees bigness and unaccountable power, rather than capitalism, as the fundamental problem…Its fundamental analysis is that unchecked power has become concentrated in the hands of a very small number of people who are at the helm of the major corporations of the nation. Because

government remains unaccountable to most people, it too, along with business is part of the problem (Fisher 1993, p.139).

Whether it is domination through privatisation, through the centralisation of state power or through language and ideas, all elites prevent the people from making decisions on issues that are important to them:

> The solution is for people to organise in democratically controlled and administered community organisations built on the democratic values and self-interests of the people (Fisher 1993, p.139).

This construction of the elitist Other is perhaps tactically ambiguous in the discourse in order to facilitate solidarity and organisation building by organisers at the neighbourhood level. However, the othering of elites is problematic not just because it has a knock on effect of homogenising 'the people' but because this construction feeds easily into the reactionary politics of the New Right and makes it very difficult to critique oppressive and dominating community institutions and norms using the language and social practices of the Populist discourse.

The second Other in the discourse is a reified and homogenised 'people'. The people are all the same: they are civic-minded, they share the same interests and they are not in conflict with each other over power and resources. The people are reified through the way in which traditions, folkways and community-based institutions are fetishised in the discourse. Here are two examples:

> Populism…grows from the living fabric of communities seeking to control the forces that threaten to overwhelm them. Populism…is ultimately about values and cultural meanings. Rather than drawing its base from large organisations…in which people are cut off from their family roots and communal ties, populist politics finds its power and vision in the institutions integral to social life: churches, synagogues, neighbourhood organisations, union locals' (Boyte 1985, p.1).

ACORN has a line: rather than organising around racism, we involved our members in campaigns that affect all low and moderate income people, building solidarity…Our people have common problems and they try to help one another, not kick them in the butt because they're black or Catholic or something (Delgado 1986, p.193).

Like the construction of elites, this construction of 'the people' appears to be tactical: by defining everyone as the same and by emphasising the essential goodness of community structures, these constructions aim to make it easier to build solidarity and organise competing groups for collective action. The problem, however, is that the very real conflicts, contradictions and interests between different groups are ignored for the sake of organisation building. As we have seen, controversial issues are avoided or reframed to make them palpable to the majority interests and as a result, crucial minority and single issues are silenced. As I will discuss later, the Empowerment discourse can be seen as a reaction to the silence of race, class and gender issues in the Populist discourse. Ironically, by choosing a phantom and mythical majority, the Populist discourse renders itself a weak, fractured and minority-interest discourse that is vulnerable to cooptation by the New Right.

I will now move on to analyse the structure and identity constructions of the Partnership discourse.

The Decline of Radicalism in the Partnership Discourse
In contrast to the Populist discourse, and as I shall demonstrate in this section of my chapter, the Partnership discourse should be interpreted as a capitulation in the ideas, language and practices of community development. Although problematic and contradictory, the Populist discourse has embedded in its practices flawed but recognisable orientations to democracy, equality and social justice. My analysis of patterns in the language of the Partnership discourse, however, reveals a new and problematic direction for community development in the United States.

The Partnership discourse is constituted by the ideas, language and practices of the funders, collaborators and practitioners of the second and third generation of community development corporations (CDCs). Pioneered in Brooklyn, championed by then Attorney General Robert Kennedy and funded by Johnson's War on Poverty programmes in 1966, CDCs were conceived as innovative approaches to neighbourhood decline and the culture of poverty in inner cities. CDCs would:

> join the resources, expertise and energy of American private enterprise with those of the public sector in a special attack on the problems of the nation's urban areas having the largest concentration of poverty (Economic Opportunity Amendment 1966 quoted in Filner 1999, p.2).

Growing from a dozen first generation demonstration projects in the late 1960s to several hundred second generation projects in the 1970s to between 3,000 to 5,000 third generation projects in the 1980s, CDCs were seen as an innovative solution to two important challenges facing community development: the Reagan Administration's funding cuts to social welfare programmes and the rapid decline and deterioration of inner-city infrastructure (Berndt 1977, p.110-115; Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.19-29).

Indeed the federal funding cuts could not have come at a worse time for the inner-cities of America in the early 1980s. Already weakened by the recession and the out-migration of jobs and the middle class tax base to the suburbs, cities, especially those in the rustbelt, were unable to cope with reduced federal spending. As a result, several cities adopted a policy of 'planned shrinkage': a reduction in social welfare spending in declining inner city areas to encourage the out-migration of poor residents and to entice businesses and the gentrifying middle classes back to urban areas through regeneration and economic development projects (Block et al 1987, p.135; Fisher 1993, p.136-7). As a result of these developments, community-based organisations sought to restructure themselves in order to get access to new funding sources for regeneration work

and to oppose urban policy that was contributing to the decline of neighbourhood infrastructure and services.

The number of CDCs rapidly increases because of the search for new funding sources As a consequence, 'community development' as I have defined and understood it in terms of this research, undergoes a dramatic transformation. By seeking to build viable partnerships between poor communities, the private sector and the state, the Partnership discourse radically reconstructs the language and practices of community development. This transformation is apparent in two key patterns in the language of the Partnership discourse: a new emphasis on pragmatism and the depoliticisation of the practices of community development. CDCs expand out of necessity (due to federal funding cuts) and the discourse articulates a new vision for community development by focusing on the pragmatism of the decision to change what community development means and the way in which it is perceived by institutional actors and the general public. Here is the Partnership discourse reconstructing the meaning and purpose of community development:

> This [CDC] movement…is quintessentially American. It mirrors the qualities of our society that so impressed Alexis de Tocqueville in the 1830s: our penchant for innovative civic associations, our belief that individuals can bring about change, our openness to risk taking and to bridging line of class, ideology and party. CDCs…have become a major component of corrective capitalism; in this free-enterprise nation they are finding ways to open doors to classes and individuals otherwise excluded from the American dream (Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.9).

The Partnership discourse constructs pragmatism as the adoption of the social practices of the New Right especially those related to self-reliance, entrepreneurship and hard work. For example:

> Many of today's CDCs are becoming adept at hooking into the 1980s culture of small businesses, entrepreneurial growth and building capacity

for indigenous economic development in communities long plagued by poverty and dependency (Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.30-1).

Part of the innovation and pragmatism of the Partnership discourse is its restructuring of the language and practices of community development from *social justice for poor people* to *entrepreneurship within poor communities*:

> Community members who become managers, directors of boards [of CDCs] and presidents of businesses learn new skills and become participants rather than observers of the system. Through participation they…learn about the system and therefore become better able to cope with its complexities…[and as a result] residents shed their feelings of inadequacy and helplessness (Berndt 1977, p.34).

By supporting the expansion of capitalism in poor neighbourhoods and by linguistically transforming poor people from the proletariat into capitalists, the Partnership discourse seeks to reconstruct traditional notions of empowerment— thus providing further legitimacy for its dramatic discursive shifts. Rather than empowerment being defined as the redistribution of power, agency and decision-making, the Partnership discourse defines empowerment as the development of an entrepreneurial spirit in order to enjoy and exploit the opportunity of free-market capitalism. For example:

> The conception [of CDCs] was that being poor is not an individual affair but rather a systemic disease that afflicts whole communities. Deteriorated housing, impaired health, nonexistent or low wages, the welfare assault on self-respect…all these feed on each other...[Thus the need for] a community based and comprehensive approach to improving the local economy rather than trying desperately somehow to rebuild each individual (Perry no date, quoted in Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.21-2).

Empowerment is constructed in this discourse as submitting to and joining the status quo rather than trying to oppose or transform it. By understanding and

working 'the system' local people will never again be at the mercy of economic forces that seek to impoverish them.

Furthermore, what makes the Partnership discourse new and different is its othering of its radical forbearers and the subsequent depoliticisation of its language and practices. For example, Pierce and Steinbach (1987, p.8), two writers hired by the Ford Foundation to promote CDCs in order to attract more funding from the federal government and the private sector argue:

> For many Americans, the mention of 'community organisation' conjures up 1960s images of radicals storming city hall, of civil rights marches, anti-Vietnam protest, lettuce boycotts and distrust of anyone in a business suit. In fact, many of today's successful CDCs had their roots in that period. But with rare exceptions, the 1960s are now as much history for them as for the rest of American society

With the acceptance of the new social and economic order of the New Right, the Partnership discourse abandons practices of controversy, dissent and opposition—anything that might compromise the delicate balance of new collaborators and new funders from the private sector:

> In the 1970s we were activists, mostly out of the civil rights movement…We may be tending now, with more Harvard and Wharton [business school] grads, to be approaching development with less 'political' sense. It may be creating a complacency among us…It's harder to fight with Sun Oil or a Bell Tel when you want to look and act like them (Rubin 1987 quoted in Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.34).

Here is another example of the depoliticisation of community development social practices the discourse:

> CDCs have reassessed the marketplace…Now we are understanding what will fly in this climate—and what won't.

[…]

Today you have to find ways to resemble the real for-profit world…otherwise you won't be around.

[…]

We no longer take a 'gimme, gimme' attitude. Now we are learning how to infiltrate into the system. We've learned to be much more creative (Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.29-30).

Moving on to the third step of Hansen's method, I will now demonstrate how identity constructions in the Partnership discourse re-enforce this shift away from recognisable forms of community development towards the adoption of New Right language and practices.

There is a two-pronged construction of the Self in the Partnership discourse: the reformed radical and the technical expert. As a reformed radical, the Self is constructed as a pragmatic, depoliticised and non-threatening activist primarily driven by concern about neighbourhood decline. This concern translates into a need to shift away from 'old-fashioned' approaches to community development as seen in the Democracy, Power and Populist discourses and focusing on non-confrontational activities that build resilience and productive capacities of poor people for self-help. Here are two important articulations of the Self:

In the kind of neighbourhoods we are concerned about, it becomes less and less likely that strategies stressing either consolidation of existing associations or the confronting of an outside enemy make much sense…It seems clear that new strategies must stress an organising process that enhances and builds community and that focuses on developing a neighbourhood's own capacities to do for itself what outsiders will or can no longer do' (Kretzmann 1984, p.3).

126

> [Activists should not be] out in the streets making symbolic statements, when you can be in the boardroom negotiating specific agreements that win for your neighbourhoods (Trapp 1992 quoted in Fisher 1993, p.191).

This chastened activist is also a technical expert who will help poor people build self-reliance. With the technical skill to assemble a wide range of partners to fund complicated regeneration projects, the activist reformer is invested with agency to solve the problems of the poor. Here are two examples of this technician Self:

> The directors of today's community development organisations are savvy and well-schooled in deal making. Many have worked in the private sector or in government. Some have advanced business or law degrees. Quite a few grew up in the neighbourhoods they are now trying to revive. They manifest a special quality…Many would succeed, one mayor told us, at running even the largest private corporations (Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.8).

> They [directors of CDCs] are practitioners with sophistication and technical capacity. They are people programmed for success, trying to instil that notion in communities where failure is the norm (ibid, p.50).

As we have seen with previous discourses, the Partnership discourse invests the Self with agency. The Self is constructed as a subject with the capabilities to tackle the problems in poor neighbourhoods. As a consequence, this discourse constitutes one key Other: the invisible and passive poor. On the one hand, people living in poverty are rendered invisible by this discourse. Local people are removed from discussions about redevelopment and regeneration and replaced with an abstract notion of neighbourhood which is empty of people. By disappearing the poor, the discourse is able to construct itself as pragmatic and non-threatening to its sceptical but much needed government and private sector funders. I am surprised that there are so few references to 'the poor' in this discourse. The focus in this discourse is about the reconstruction of the idea of community development from activism to capitalist development. From the

references to the poor that do exist (there are some scattered throughout the quotes in this section of the chapter), it is clear that the poor are constructed as a passive and objectified mass. The only way that the poor can develop agency is by being acted upon by the Self and learning the technical capitalist know-how to overcome dependency and failure. For example:

> CDCs strive to rebuild dilapidated housing, to kindle a spark of economic vitality, to reverse residents' overwhelming sense of negativism and isolation (Pierce and Steinbach 1987, p.13)

The Partnership discourse transforms foundational ideas, practices and identities within community development. By seeking to reconcile itself to the dominant discourse of the New Right, the discourse, supports, re-enforces and expands the hegemony of this political philosophy.

I will now turn to analyse the final basic discourse during this politically salient moment in time.

The Empowerment Discourse: A Transformational Approach?
The Empowerment discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of second-wave feminist theorists and community organisers seeking to reclaim, revalue and reassert the hidden history and contemporary practices of working class and minority ethnic women activists in grassroots politics and community development. This discourse appears to be oppositional to the New Right, Populist and Partnership discourses because the Empowerment discourse is seeking to transform the nature of politics and by doing so, attempt to undermine dominant discursive practices that misrecognise and subordinate working class and minority ethnic women, their interests and their agency:

> Working class women defy the portrayal of women so common in the popular press as passive, politically disinterested, unskilled or ineffectual…For these women, empowerment begins when they change their ideas about the causes of their powerlessness, when they recognise

the systemic forces that oppress them and when they act to change the conditions of their lives (Morgen and Bookman 1988, p.3-4).

By reclaiming the voices and experiences of women in community development, the Empowerment discourse seeks to construct a feminist praxis whereby a diverse range of working class and minority ethnic women can articulate, analyse and take action on the issues that are important to them and as a result, dismantle the personal, social, and economic structures that foster their oppression:

> The overarching goal of feminist [community] organising is the elimination of permanent power hierarchies between all people which can prevent them from realising their human potential. The objective of feminist approaches is to reduce sexism, racism and other forms of oppression through the process of empowerment which seeks individual liberation through collective activity embracing both personal and social change (Gutierrez and Lewis 1992, p.116).

The Empowerment discourse is a product of, is reproduced by and in turn, helps produce the language and practices of the second-wave feminist movement in the United States. Whilst it is beyond the bounds of my research to provide a detailed analysis the origin and politics of the second-wave movement, it is important to highlight the controversies and tensions within wider feminist politics in order to understand the language, structure and practices of the Empowerment discourse.

The second-wave movement was incubated and fostered by women's experiences in civil rights and New Left organisations of the 1960s. Working in SNCC, SDS and other civil rights, anti-war and student organisations, women (and men) were learning the processes and tactics of organisation-building, community engagement, direct action and leadership development. However, women were also learning how their distinct interests *as women* were ignored, devalued or dismissed and how they *as women* were subordinated in

revolutionary organisations, networks and movements. The second-wave feminist movement was born out of women's frustrations of having to put their particular interests behind class-based or race-based interests deemed more important or more foundational to achieving social justice. The movement was also born out the real life experiences of women activists experiencing sexism and being discriminated against based on the category of gender (for a detailed discussion of the history of the movement see Evans 1980 and Echols 1989).

Part of the process of maturation for the second-wave movement in the 1970s was the on-going struggle to define the nature of the movement: what the category of 'woman' means, whose voices were heard and whose interests and issues the movement reflects. The emergence of different forms of feminisms—Black, lesbian, Chicana—for example, reflects these internal debates. An on-going tension within the movement—which also permeates the Empowerment discourse—concerns the problem of reification of women and their interests. Women of colour critiqued the tendency of some white feminists to ignore, devalue or homogenise women's interests linked to race, caste, ethnicity and class and only legitimise, reflect and take action on white and middle-class issues. For example:

> Black, other Third World and working women have been involved in the feminist movement from the start, but…racism and elitism with the movement itself have served to obscure our participation…It was our experience and disillusionment with these liberation movements…that led to need to develop a politics that was anti-racist, unlike those of white women and anti-sexist, unlike those of black and white men (Combahee River Collective 1977, p.2).

The Empowerment discourse represents an attempt by some feminist theorists and community activists to reconcile these political conflicts within the second-wave feminist movement and construct new identities and practices for feminism. In order to build a new feminist praxis, the Empowerment discourse

seeks to first reconstruct the ideas of politics, power, and ideology and then apply these concepts to the nature of community development.

A key practice of the Empowerment discourse is the redefinition of 'politics' and the nature of political spaces. Building on the concept that the 'personal is political', the discourse reconstructs the binary of public/private spaces. Rather than public spaces being the only legitimate realm for debate and action, private, domestic and community spaces—the spaces that most women occupy and organise their lives around—are also defined as spaces for the practice of politics. Ackelsberg (1988, p.299-301), writing about the legitimacy of politicised community spaces argues:

> What is defined as 'political'—that is, as publicly relevant—determines what is available for open discussion, the categories in which people come to understand their experience and the possibilities they see as resistance...The full effect of these ideological separations [between public and private spaces] limits both the agenda of politics and the range of likely participants…Many women, as a result, have found that the issues of greatest concern to them (safe neighbourhoods, decent jobs, day care and education for their children, availability of health care) have been treated as irrelevant or of secondary significance to politics.

By reconceptualising the spaces where politics is practiced and by politicising private issues not normally defined as part of legitimate political inquiry and debate, the discourse is then able reclaim and redefine women's work in the private sphere as political and worthy of analysis and struggle:

> The basis for women's collective action…was to be found in the daily round of domestic responsibilities…It was in these small groups that patterns of cooperation, communication and analysis were established and that the value of collective effort…was experienced…An emphasis on one's responsibilities to kin was extended to responsibilities for the community (Susser 1988, p.262).

Importantly, the Empowerment discourse also seeks to redefine politics by constructing an intersectional approach to the categories of race, class and gender in its new conception of politics. By recognising how different social categories are reproductive systems of oppression that cannot be separated, the discourse critiques other feminist discourses that do not attempt this intersectionality:

> Efforts are made to bridge differences between women based on such factors as race, class, physical ability and sexuality orientation with the guiding principle that diversity is strength…Feminist practitioners will not only strive to eliminate racism, classism, heterosexism, anti-semitism, ableism and other systems of oppression and exploitation, but will affirm the need for diversity by actively reaching out to achieve it (Gutierrez and Lewis 1992, p.117).

Through the redefinition of politics, political activity and viable political issues, the discourse then reconstructs the nature and practice of power. In my analysis of the patterns in the language of the discourse, dominant understandings of power are constructed as counter-productive and unable to capture how working class and minority ethnic women experience and use their power. Power, as defined in the Power and Populist discourses is often defined as a zero-sum. The amount of power that exists is finite and the only way for powerless people to gain power is to take power away from the powerful. This way of constructing power is to assume destructive and aggressive conflict and confrontation between the powerless and powerful. The Empowerment discourse seeks to redefine the nature of power in order to better understand how women use power:

> Feminism embraces a win-win approach to power…Power is infinite…In such a case I do not lose power if you are also empowered. To convert a situation into a 'win-win' game one must not avoid conflict but rather one must use the creative resolution of conflict (Brandwein 1987, p.117).

Because a key practice of the Empowerment discourse is the reconstruction of spaces and practices of politics, it defines power as a generative and relational process based on the 'web of relationships' working class and minority ethnic women build for themselves for resilience, survival and solidarity in the domestic and community sphere. Thus, the way working class and minority ethnic women obtain and use power is through the practice of empowerment:

> In women-centered organising, power begins in the private sphere of relationships, and thus is not conceptualised as zero-sum, but as limitless and collective…Empowerment is a developmental process that includes building skills through repetitive cycles of action and reflection which evoke new skills and understandings, which in turn provoke new and more effective actions (Stall and Stoecker 1997, p.12).

By grounding power in the private spaces women occupy and by redefining power as the ability to analyse and take action, the Empowerment discourse seeks to construct a new feminist community development praxis in opposition to both the New Right and other competing community development discourses during this politically salient moment. Rather than seeking accommodation to the hegemony of the New Right, the Empowerment discourse attempts to mobilise its new conception of politics in order for working class and minority ethnic women to resist the New Right and counter domination by other competing discourses. By linking public and private spaces and demonstrating how practices in one space impact on the other; by supporting the networks and relationships that women build for themselves and from which they derive solidarity; and by fostering personal and collective empowerment, the discourse seeks to put forward a new way of working with women and a new way to struggle for social justice:

> Women's coming to political consciousness…may be more a phenomenon of relationship and connection…It is in and through networks…that most women engage in collaborative activity and through that activity, can begin to experience themselves as confident, competent beings; citizens in

a democratic polity…Political life is community life; politics is attending to the quality of life in households, communities and workplaces (Ackelsberg 1988, p.306-8).

Thus the Empowerment discourse articulates a new feminist praxis which builds and sustains women's organic networks. These networks in turn support a process of critical analysis and action on issues that are important to women. As a result of this process, a sense of personal and collective empowerment may result. Unlike in the Populist discourse, victory is not of central importance in this discourse. Instead, the Empowerment discourse interpellates the practices of the Democracy discourse whereby the process of collective education and building a sense of agency is of equal importance as the outcome.

Using Hansen's third step of her PDA method, I argue that the oppositional nature of the Empowerment discourse can be seen in its identity constructions. Like the Democracy discourse that I discussed in Chapter 3, the Empowerment discourse is seeking to break down the Self/Other binary between the community organiser and the groups with whom she works. As a feminist organiser, the Self identifies with and may well be a member of the community or group of women that she seeks to organise:

> Since community workers are primarily political actors who view their client constituencies as peers, they do no see professional expertise and occupational status as legitimate bases for socio-political differentiation. Instead, professional expertise and training are aspects of their commitment to the community (Gilkes 1988, p.56).

Because of this breakdown of traditional binary identity constructions, the Empowerment discourse constructs working-class and minority ethnic women with agency and with equal status to the community organiser Self. This is an important research finding and links to my analysis in Chapter 3. Because the discourse does not make a distinction between 'practitioner' and 'community' subject positions, this allows for the construction of identities based on equality,

134

justice and respect. Importantly, the Empowerment discourse interpellates the marginalised Democracy discourse by using its language of community organisers as facilitators and women as indigenous leaders:

> Effective feminist organising with women of colour requires that women of colour be in leadership roles. Too often…communities of colour are targets of feminist efforts rather than active participants…The organiser must be willing to serve as a facilitator…Feminist organisers must recognise ways in which women of colour have worked effectively within their own communities…Feminist organisers should work with these indigenous leaders and learn from them the most effective ways of working with particular communities (Gutierrez and Lewis 1992, p.124-8).

These identity constructions are in direct contrast to the Populist and Partnership discourses that continue the tradition of the Power and Poverty discourses of constructing a dominating expert or activist Self and subordinate community Other.

However, the Empowerment discourse's identity constructions are not without problems. An on-going discursive tension within the wider feminist discourse and within the Empowerment discourse in particular can be seen in the reification and essentialising of the subject position of 'women'. For example, the Women Organisers' Collective (1990, p.13-15) discusses the need for SNCC-style non-hierarchical organisational and leadership structures which are supportive of women's ways of working in community organisations:

> Women are particularly suited for this more egalitarian form of leadership because women have a more collegial style and are more 'sisterly'… We are generally more flexible and open to new ideas. We can admit our imperfections, which takes the pressure off, and we can tolerate criticism. Women tend to fluctuate more and are more dynamic – we don't aspire to obtain leadership positions and then to stay in them until we are thrown out or until we die.

By making this moral judgement about the differences between men and women, the Empowerment discourse seems to develop a new form of binary identity constructions based on women/men instead of the traditional community development binary of practitioner/community.

Interestingly, the Empowerment discourse does attempt to address the issue of reification by looking to the innovative ways in which women work together—rather than relying on suspect pronouncements about biological differences between women and men:

> That feminist strategy [of reification]—which tends to define these [women's] values as rooted in biologically based sex difference…runs the risk of biologistic reductionism, of reinstituting traditional male-female dichotomies in a new guise. A focus on communities and networks offers us another language, one not necessarily burdened with gender-based connotations. (Ackelsberg 1988, p.309).

One key Other is constructed in this discourse: the technical professional. The Empowerment discourse appears to conflate the confrontational Alinskyist organiser with the bureaucratic professional. These two identities are combined, it seems to me, because they both have a similar impact of subordinating working class and minority ethnic women and their interests. Here are two examples of this construction:

> Feminist principles are not encouraged or employed by organisers and feminist practices are used only in isolated settings…There are conflicts between the collective, connected style being emphasised in consciousness-raising groups and the traditional, aggressive Alinsky-style of organising that is taught in most [sic] curriculums (WOC 1990, p.1).

> [Feminist community workers] are also in a position where they are able to make demands upon white institutions to accommodate the needs of Black people. They use their positions to create a 'Black orientation' or a

'Black presence' in these white institutions as a means for Black community empowerment (Gilkes 1988, p.56-7).

Through a focus on technique—whether that be the Populist discourse's focus on organisation building or the Partnership discourse's focus on regeneration or remote institutional actors unable to recognise the distinct interests of working class and minority ethnic women—these experts are constructed in the quotes above as threats to the self-determination of women.

Despite the Empowerment discourse's attempt to construct a new model for community development, to adopt an intersectional approach to race, class and gender and to reconceptualise the nature of power and empowerment, it is not clear how effective it is in opposing the New Right and the other community development discourses during this moment in time. Certainly, the Empowerment discourse is successful in creating a new space for thinking and practising community development and by reclaiming the discursive practices of the previously ignored and devalued Democracy discourse. However, given the subsequent triumph of the New Right in dismantling the welfare state and the growing hegemony of the Partnership discourse as a legitimate and viable 'alternative' to traditional approaches to community development, it is doubtful how successful the Empowerment discourse is in translating its approach in the private sphere into the public spaces that the other discourses occupy.

Conclusions

By operationalising Hansen's post-structuralist discourse analysis method, I have demonstrated that, as the dominant political movement of the late 1970s and the 1980s, the New Right fundamentally transforms the basic discourses of community development. A combination of the recession and a backlash against an activist welfare state helps to feed and sustain the right-wing backlash of American public opinion and bolster the hegemony of the New Right. The three community development discourses during this moment in time, for different reasons, are each ineffective in opposing the New Right.

The Populist discourse retreats by collapsing into itself. By seeking to organise and mobilise a 'majority' the discourse reifies its targeted constituents thus limiting its appeal and ironically ensuring that only a minority of activists would be mobilised to oppose the New Right. As a result, the 'non-ideological' Populist discourse is co-opted by the New Right. The Partnership discourse, on the other hand, capitulates when confronted with the hegemonic practices of the New Right. In order to avoid marginalisation, this discourse adopts the ideas and practices of the New Right through its focus on capitalist development of poor neighbourhoods this in turn re-enforces the hegemony of the New Right. By pragmatically accepting the dominance of the New Right, the Partnership discourse ensures its future survival—but at a very heavy cost for the social practices of community development. The Empowerment discourse creates a new community development praxis whereby feminist theory, recognition of difference and a reconstruction of power and politics are emphasised rather than eschewed. However, it appears that this discourse has been ineffective in countering a New Right movement operating and sustained by traditional politics in public spaces.

Through my analysis of this moment and these discourses, I have identified clear trends in the discursive repertoire of community development. As I demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 4, the majority of community development discourses create disempowering and undemocratic identity constructions and social practices with regards to practitioners and local people. Practitioners are constructed as active agents whilst local people are constructed as homogenised and passive objects to be acted upon by the Self. Whether community development disavows revolutionary politics or adopts an anathema right-wing politics, it cannot seem to escape from a fundamental problem of constructing the Self as an active subject and the Other as a passive object. This is an important research finding because I am evidencing a serious conceptual problem embedded in the language and social practices of community development. Although the Empowerment discourse occupies a marginal position in community development during this moment, like the Democracy discourse in Chapter 3, it provides an alternative conception about the nature of

community development and its relationship to equality and social justice. By constructing local people as active and competent agents and recognising differences among local people, the Empowerment discourse provides an important oppositional stance to the problematic constructions of the Populist and Partnership discourses.

I will now turn to analyse basic community development discourses during the politically salient moment of 1979 to 1985 in the United Kingdom in order to compare the structure and operation of these discourses in the context of the New Right and the crisis in left-wing politics.

Chapter 6: The Post-Marxist and Realist Discourses

Introduction

In the last chapter, I demonstrated how the New Right exerted a powerful influence over the structure and operation of the three American community development discourses and identities during the 1979 to 1985 politically salient moment. I analysed how one discourse downplayed the threat of the New Right and was co-opted by this movement. One discourse sought accommodation with the New Right by adopting its language and social practices and subsequently abandoned key concepts traditionally linked to community development. Only one discourse, linked to anti-racist feminism, attempted to oppose the hegemony of the New Right through a focus on promoting women's empowerment. In this chapter I will examine how British community development discourses fare during the 1979 to 1985 politically salient moment. By using Hansen's PDA method, I have identified two discourses for analysis. The 'Post-Marxist' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of community development theorists and practitioners seeking to reconstruct the dominant Marxist praxis of 'radical' community development in order to shift away from the perceived economic determinism and dogmatism of classical Marxism and construct a new praxis based on more complex analyses of the welfare state and of 'working class' experiences. In contrast this, the 'Realist' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of community development theorists and practitioners who seek to subvert and marginalise the dominant Marxist discourse and instead construct a new community development praxis based on professionalism, expertise and skills in social services planning and neighbourhood based work. In this chapter I shall argue that these two discourses emerge in response to two key developments: a crisis in left-wing politics and the rise of the New Right as embodied in Thatcher's Government.

In contrast to community development in the US during this moment in time, community development in the UK, I will argue, is forced to primarily respond

to a crisis in left-wing politics. Rather than left-wing politics being abandoned by some discourses as I demonstrated in Chapter 5 in the US context, community development in the UK must reconcile itself to the process of Marxism being altered by new social movements such as second-wave feminism and, to a lesser extent, new political philosophies such as post-structuralism and postmodernism. In addition, I will discuss how community development is forced to respond to the deteriorating state of urban neighbourhoods and rising unemployment levels which are a result of the economic crisis of this time—two issues that Marxist community development has been unable to influence or affect during this time. I will also argue that while the New Right does influence this moment, Thatcher's attack on the welfare state should be understood as examples that the two community development discourses use to illustrate the failure of Marxist analyses of the 'state' and the 'working class' to predict, explain or counter these events.[7]

Using Hansen's three-pronged PDA method, this chapter will begin with an analysis of this politically salient moment. I will briefly trace the development of disillusionment with classical Marxism in the UK. I will then move on to discuss community development's crisis of confidence in light of the ambivalent legacy of the CDPs. Finally, using the second and third step of Hansen's method, I will turn to analyse the structure and operation of the Post-Marxist and Realist discourses and identity constructions.

The Crisis of the Left and the Problem of 'Actual Existing Socialism'
In my analysis of this politically salient moment, I contend that the competing discourses of community development during this moment in time are perhaps more influenced by transformations and fractures in left-wing politics than by the resurgence of the Right. Indeed the New Right is only a tangential issue for the British community development discourses during this moment and this is in contrast to what I have shown in the US context in Chapter 5. The reasons for this are varied. Firstly, the New Right became dominant in the US partly because

---

[7] I will discuss the influence of Thatcherism on British community development in far greater detail in Chapter 8.

of the historical absence of a popular socialist movement in America. In place of a socialist movement were the more divided and fractious identity movements of feminism, anti-racism, gay liberation and environmentalism which, as we have seen, were unsuccessful in their attempts to effectively counter the New Right. In the UK, similar to other western European countries, popular socialist politics were going through readjustments because of the rise of new social movements, the emergence of 'Euro-communism' and the crisis of Soviet-bloc regimes. This section of my chapter will focus on the crisis in left-wing politics because that is the dominant theme running through the community development texts that I have analysed.

I argue that this political crisis combined with community development practitioners' sense that they were not making a difference in the lives of ordinary people prompts a fundamental reconstruction of community development discourses during this time. The focus of this crisis of left-wing politics is about a general disillusionment with socialism in light of the on-going repression in the Soviet Union and the need to transform classical Marxism in order to make it less dogmatic and more pluralist in terms of recognising and championing issues related to gender and race (Sim 2001, p.1-3). Whilst it is beyond the scope of my research to provide a detailed history of this crisis, I will focus on the key ideas that help to shape the discourses of community development. The crisis of left-wing politics can be attributed to four interconnected ideas: a backlash against Marxist dogma, the rise of new social movements—especially feminism, the rise of the post-industrial society and the rise of the New Right.

Perhaps the most important influence on the formation and structure of community development discourses is that in broader socialist politics, classical Marxism was moving out of favour. Theorists, party activists and trade unionists were beginning to have doubts about the orthodoxy of theory and practice that Marxism seemed to demand (Gorz 1980; Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Hall 1988; Sim 2001). These sceptics of classical Marxism wished to preserve the critique of capitalism and capitalist societies that Marxism provides, but move beyond the

orthodoxy of traditional Marxist politics and practices. The nature of Marxist dogma is based in both theory and practice. In terms of theory, the 'grand narrative' of Marxism demands that everyday life be understood only in terms of the foundational class conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. As a result of this dogmatic 'logic of history', particular experiences and perspectives—especially those of women and minority ethnic groups—are distorted, silenced or marginalised in order to conform to the demands of Marxist theory. In practice, Marxist dogma was lived out everyday in the bureaucratic hierarchies of 'revolutionary' socialist parties and countries behind the Iron Curtain:

> The image of Marxism that prevails [during this time] is of a system that is authoritarian, totalitarian, control-obsessed and hypocritical. [Critics of Marxism] have given up trying to bridge the gap between theory and reality that in their eyes makes a mockery of Marxism's liberationist political pretensions (Sim 2001, p.3).

The dissonance that many British socialists were seeking to overcome is related to the constituent nature of a future socialist society in the UK. As Hall (1988, p.184-5) points out, one of the only forms of 'actual existing socialism' that has prevailed is Stalinism and that is no way to win people over to the socialist cause:

> The actuality of Stalinism and its aftermath has added the tragic dimension to the language of socialism: the stark possibility of failure. The socialist experiment can go wildly and disastrously wrong…In our struggle to realise a proper kind of socialism, we have to first explain—and not explain away—the other kind: the kind where, in the name of the workers' state, the working class is actually shot down in the streets, as is happening at this very moment to Polish Solidarity in Gdansk.

This questioning of the democratic principles of Marxism is, I think, connected to the second key concept of the political crisis: the rise of new social movements.

Part of British socialists' critique is that Marxist dogma suppresses pluralist ideas of difference especially in relation to the working class. Classical Marxism tends to homogenise the nature of lived experiences of people by ascribing them the subject position of 'working class'. This totalising subject position privileges class above all other identities and also assumes a level of unity, consensus and agreement among ordinary people. Socialist sceptics find the idea of the 'working class' an unhelpful myth that should be abandoned for more realistic and heterogeneous understandings of ordinary people. Here is an influential discussion of the problems of the term 'working class' by Laclau and Mouffe (1985, p.2):

> What is now in crisis is a whole conception of socialism which rests upon the ontological centrality of the working class…The illusory prospect of a perfectly unitary and homogenous collective will that will render pointless the moment of politics. The plural and multifarious character of contemporary social struggles has finally dissolved the last foundation for that political imaginary.

Given both the influence and currency of feminist ideas during this moment in time, the British socialists also seek to decentre the 'grand narrative' of class by adopting feminist ideas in order to create space for different narratives about the nature of oppression, struggle and liberation. Importantly, sceptics contend that feminist ideas articulate a more authentic understanding and analysis of everyday life. Rather than trying to map a theory onto everyday experiences, as classical Marxism seeks to do, feminism uses everyday life as a theory in order to understand the position of women and other marginalised groups in society:

> The lived experience of class exploitation is not the only brand which socialism in the twentieth century must incorporate; it is not the only variant of exploitation which socialism must address…Other types of social experiences will have to be drawn on and build into socialism if it is to become a politics capable of fighting and transforming life on a variety of different 'fronts' (Hall 1988, p.181).

This rise of feminism and other racial, ethnic and nationalist movements provide alternative analyses of the nature of struggle and liberation and this feeds into the next element of the crisis: the rise of the post-industrial society and the decline in importance of the working class. The combination of the rise of new social movements and the process of de-industrialisation helped to decentre the working class in terms of its importance as a political agent in socialist politics. As we have seen, socialist sceptics seek to decentre class in order to create space for new types of understandings of ordinary people. With the worldwide recession and the terminal decline of heavy industry and manufacturing sectors, the actual existing working class was slowly losing its organising principle as capital fled overseas in search of cheaper and less well organised labour (Amin 1994). The loss of employment and the realignment of capital from the production of tangible goods to the production of knowledge and services have meant that the influence and power of a self-conscious working class was drastically curtailed. British socialists were seeking to build a new politics based on the recognition of the declining importance of the working class:

> Any decline in the power of that class has to give Marxist theorists serious pause for thought…The working class no longer formed an unequivocal reference point for socialist action. Not only that, but it was unlikely ever again to do so (Sim 2001, p.5).

> This non-class encompasses all those who have been expelled from production by the abolition of work, or whose capacities are under-employed as a result of the industrialisation…of intellectual work…The majority of the population now belong to the post-industrial neo-proletariat…with no job security or definite class identity (Gorz 1980, p.68-9).

The final aspect of the crisis of left-wing politics is the analysis of the threat of the New Right. Sim (2001, p.4) discusses how many socialists were sceptical of the 'logic of history' to spark revolution and the downfall of capitalism. With the New Right appealing to populist sentiments whilst at the same time seeking to

co-opt the working class into consumption capitalism, British socialists wanted to reconstruct Marxist theory in order to make it more relevant to everyday people—otherwise dangerous political movements would dominate popular politics in Britain:

> There now seems little doubt that…the popular mood shifted decisively against the left…The right has re-established its monopoly over 'good ideas'; 'capitalism' and the 'free market' have come back into common usage as terms of positive approval. And yet the full dimension of this precipitation to the right still lack a proper analysis on the left…Our illusions remain intact, even when they clearly no longer provide an adequate analytic framework (Hall 1988, p.40).

Without renewal, sceptics warn, socialism will become irrelevant to ordinary people (Gorz 1980; Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Hall 1988).

This crisis in broader left-wing politics leads to a crisis of confidence in the theory and practice of community development. These developments in left-wing politics have direct implications for the discourses of community development. Unlike the Structuralist discourse and some of its hard-line Marxist constructions I analysed in Chapter 4, community development discourses during this moment in time are forced to respond to the growing irrelevance of socialist politics and find a new path for theory and practice without relying exclusively on classical Marxism. The crisis of confidence for community development is based on the growing realisation that so-called 'radical practice' has been ineffective in influencing or countering macro-level structural issues that shape the lives of working-class people:

> It seems inevitable that a community worker with a strong commitment to a Marxist position will experience tension between what he believes and what he does. His study of Marx will have informed him that people's lives are shaped by the economic system and the prevailing mode of production. In the field, however…a large part of his work is likely to be

in connection with working class people's relationships to unhelpful institutions and large bureaucracies (Salmon 1978, p.82-4).

The crisis of confidence is also based on the realisation that radical practice has not politicised working-class people to the socialist cause. In fact, at this moment, community development witnesses the exact opposite of its intentions—a rise in right-wing sentiments and in some extreme cases, fascist loyalties in some white working class communities:

> There are few accounts of successful community work achieving the radicalisation of a working class community and there is frequently some vagueness and uncertainty about the activities involved in such politicising efforts. Might this not demonstrate more than inadequate techniques but a mistaken analysis? (Lambert 1978, p.11)

Thus in the context of a reconsideration of classical Marxism and the resulting crisis of confidence in community development, we can understand how the particular formation and structure of community development discourses take shape. Key texts that construct these discourses are drawn from two competing sources: the Association of Community Workers (ACW) and the National Institute for Social Services. The ACW, whilst a broad church, is mostly composed of 'radical' practitioners and theorists who have a historical or ideological connection to the CDPs. By radical, I mean the ACW membership was drawn from socialists, Marxist 'fellow-travellers', feminists and anti-racists and this diverse ideological range exemplify the texts of the Post-Marxist discourse. The series of books edited and written by ACW from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s represent an attempt to construct community development as radical and transformative (Mayo 1977; Wilson 1977; Curno 1978; Lambert 1978; Radford 1978; Salmon 1978; Smith 1978; Blagg and Derricourt 1982; Craig, Derricourt and Loney 1982; Dixon et al 1982; Fleetwood and Lambert 1982; Filkin and Naish 1982). However, by the mid-1970s another competing discourse was emerging to challenge the ACW—this discourse is to be found in the series of texts published by National Institute for Social Services. Focusing primarily on

the development of skills, expertise and practice theory these texts constitute the Realist discourse and remain some of the most popular and widely read community development texts today (Specht 1976; Henderson and Thomas 1980; Twelvetrees 1980; Henderson and Thomas 1981).

Using the second and third steps of Hansen's PDA method, I will now turn to analyse the Post-Marxist and Realist discourses and identities further detail.

The Post-Marxist Discourse: Reconstructing Radicalism?
The Post-Marxist discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of community development practitioners and theorists seeking to build a new form of socialist theory and practice in order to better align the 'radical' rhetoric of community development with a clear practice base in neighbourhoods. I have named this discourse 'Post-Marxist' because this category seems to best capture the project of reconstruction that constitutes this discourse during this moment in time. Buffeted by a crisis in Marxism, ineffectual practice in communities and the popularity of the New Right in working class neighbourhoods, this discourse is uncertain and in flux but ultimately seeking to construct a reinvigorated form of radical professionalism in order to redistribute power and resources to marginalised groups.

However, it is important to recognise that this new form of radicalism is born out of disillusionment with the dominant construction of radical socialist practice. The Post-Marxist discourse should be viewed as an ambivalent inheritor of the Structuralist discourse of the CDPs. Recalling my analysis in Chapter 4, the Structuralist discourse was a two-pronged attempt to link urban poverty to capitalist development and demonstrate that the welfare state (and by extension community development) is part of the Ideological State Apparatus to dissipate revolutionary fervour among the working class. The Post-Marxist discourse is seeking to subvert these key discursive practices and transform them. For example:

In so far as many theoretical contributions don't lend themselves to translation into day-to-day objectives, I regard them as failures…This last point…seems particularly to dog the Marxist perspective with its holistic philosophy and concentration on production, both of which are hard (but not impossible) to relate to the localised and domestic context of community work…What worries me is that so far it has been the 'nihilistic' school which has exerted the greatest influence on fieldwork. Very probably, one reason for this is…its ability to offer a convenient 'explanation' for what most would agree has been a pretty uninspiring performance from community work to date…Community work is portrayed as a means of social control and therefore doomed to fail the working class every time (Smith 1978, p.18-19).

I argue that the Post-Marxist discourse is seeking to reconstruct three aspects of socialist community development: the state, the working class and the site and nature of community practice. I will discuss each of these ideas in turn. Here is a helpful summation of the discourse's attempt of reconstruction of its language and practices:

We suggest that there is work to be done within the community that cannot be collapsed into the problems of industry that is specific to the structure and composition of the modern city and cannot be reduced to the 'class struggle' as it is commonly defined…Therefore community politics should go beyond struggles over traditional forms of class reproduction in the locality and engage seriously with those who perceive their oppressor not as the hidden hand of the market but as the very visible hand of the state (Blagg and Derricourt 1982. p.17-20).

In seeking to reconstruct radicalism, I contend that the Post-Marxist discourse first attempts to redefine the nature of the state. Rather than the state being a monolithic entity that seeks to manipulate, co-opt and suppress the working class in the interests of the ruling class—as argued by the Structuralist discourse—the state is instead constructed as multi-faceted, contradictory and

malleable to the influence and interests of the working class. As Smith (1978, p.21) argues:

> The state…is riddled with contradictions and hence contains possibilities for action. It contains…the seeds of its own future transformation; the form such transformation take will depend…on the means by which working class groups engage with the state.

As I argued in Chapter 4, for community development in the UK, the relationship with the state is perhaps the most important dynamic for practitioners—even more so than the relationship with the working class. Thus, it seems to me that for the Post-Marxist discourse, rethinking the nature of the state is crucial for building new socialist community development practices. By rejecting the Structuralist discourse's dominant interpretation of the state as a tool for the ruling class, the Post-Marxist discourse reassesses community development's role and purpose. Rather than constructing an antagonistic relationship with the state, the focus instead is on understanding and building a relationship with the *local* state in order to take action on issues that are important to community groups, to make local services more accountable and accessible and to redistribute power in local decision-making (Smith 1978; Blagg and Derricourt 1982). This is an important transformation that the Post-Marxist discourse attempts: the focus of community development practice should not be the theoretical 'state' of Marx, Gramsci or Althusser but the actual existing local state that people interact with on an everyday basis through education, health and housing services. This analysis of the local state is not new as it interpellates the marginalised analysis of Cockburn (1977), which I discussed in Chapter 4. However, what is new is that Cockburn's analysis about the state seems to have moved into a mainstream position in community development. Here are two important articulations in the redefinition of the state:

> The particular savageness of Thatcherism has severely dented the credibility of one of the more cherished catechisms of the British Marxist primer, that capitalism 'needs' welfare…The state is not separate from

us…rather it penetrates into every possible sphere of social relations, attempting to establish them as fields of its power…Both the parameters of the state and fields of its struggle are extended…The state has the task of organising those who have been ejected from the economic discourse. The elderly, the young and racial minorities…experience their exploitation…in officialdom, bureaucracy, isolation [and] indifference…such issues must be taken seriously (Blagg and Derricourt 1982, p.19-20).

There appears to be a growth in interest in how to work with clients whose main problem appears to be…the tangled web of state provision devised to alleviate their situational poverty…Many people now need the help and guidance of a worker who can fathom the mysteries of the welfare state (Lambert 1978, p.11-12).

This focus on the operation of the local state—its failures and opportunities for transformation—serve two purposes for the Post-Marxist discourse: it captures the real lived experiences of ordinary people and it gives a meaningful, manageable and realistic scope of practice that community development can undertake. This new construction of the local state is emblematic of a new concept in the community development discursive repertoire during this moment in time: realism. As I demonstrated in Chapter 5 in the American context, realism and pragmatism were used as a way to distance community development from radicalism. Through my analysis of the patterns in the language of texts in the UK context, it is clear that realism becomes the hook by which to construct a new form of radical professionalism: 'It does seem important to define a mode of community work which avoids utopianism…The focus for attention is not some alternative value system hard to imagine in real terms, but these commonly held values which bourgeois society fails to attain— greater equality, lessening poverty' (Lambert 1978, p.14).

For the Post-Marxist discourse, realism provides radicalism with a new meaning and focus. By having a more realistic depiction of the state and by constructing a

new politics for engaging with the local state, the Post-Marxist discourse is able to find a new impetus and legitimacy for radical practice. Here is an interesting articulation of this new realism:

> We have to function in the world of reality rather than in the world of ideas and dreams. In practice we are compelled to adjust to things as they really are. We have to lower our sights and go for that which is attainable. The real world is no world for the ideological purist (Salmon 1978, p.76).

This new and more realistic focus on the local state, local services and participation in local decision-making requires a new way of thinking about working-class people and their interests. The next reconstruction the Post-Marxist discourse undertakes is that of the 'working class'. I suggest that rather than using class as the foundational and totalising subject position by which to understand *all* experiences of local people, the discourse seeks to decentre class in order for it to sit alongside gender and to a lesser extent, 'race', as a means by which to capture more accurately the complex identities and interests of local people.

We can see this decentring of class most clearly in the Post-Marxist discourse's struggle to account for and accommodate the burgeoning second-wave feminist movement. Women's experiences and interests in the private/domestic spaces of community undermine the essentialising tendencies of the inherited Structuralist discourse in its constructions of the working class. As Wilson (1977, p.4), a feminist critic of community development observes:

> Community issues are indeed of central importance to women. The reality of community life, as opposed to the confused and romantic dream-image, is of women living in a direct relationship to the state as mediated through housing departments, schools and the state welfare system which supports the family.

By decentring class, the Post-Marxist discourse employs feminist principles in an attempt to construct a more realistic understanding of local people's lives and interests which in turn helps to re-legitimise radicalism in community-based work:

> If traditional forms of working class action are to be related to the new concerns of the [feminist] politics of personal life, we need to develop organisations capable of linking the two areas, of reconciling the personal and political… Community work has a role to play in…forging the links with feminism [and this] seems to me even more important than making links with the labour movement (Smith 1978, p.33-4).

Feminism's focus on the 'politics of everyday life' provides a way to link new ideas of the local state to a reconstituted 'working class'. Rather than defining, as the Structuralist discourse has done, working class experience through the lens of the workplace and the production of capital, the adoption of feminist principles allows the Post-Marxist discourse to refocus on relationships in community spaces and the experience of collective consumption in private spaces. The politics of everyday life re-legitimises neighbourhood work with local people who would not necessarily describe themselves or their interests as 'working class' but who do recognise that they occupy a marginalised and unequal position in society. As Blagg and Derricourt (1982, p.20) argue:

> Political subjects, such as blacks, young people and women, who cannot be placed within the relations of production, come into prominence. Their position may be profoundly over-determined by class struggle but it is not simply reducible to it. It is necessary therefore that we perceive struggles and antagonisms within the community as possessing characteristics often different from class struggles and class antagonisms.

Indeed, feminism appears to provide the Post-Marxist discourse with new articulations of democracy by attempting to create space for local people to define for themselves the terms of their oppression and liberation:

We start with a person's own specific oppression because that experience is valuable in itself and it is most easy to identify with. The Women's Liberation Movement has taught us to see that process and goal are inseparable. We cannot achieve real liberating change…in a society by working in an oppressive manner; by doing so we will only replace one elite by [sic] another (Dixon et al 1982, p.61).

The focus on the personal politics of women and men's relationships to the local state in the form of the collective consumption of local services helps the Post-Marxist discourse to reconstruct the final aspect of the Structuralist discourse—the purpose and practices of development work. Part of the ambivalent legacy of the Structuralist discourse is a focus on undermining capitalistic economic development. A consequence of this construction is that many community development subjects turned away from community-based work and focused instead on workplace issues:

What Marxist analysis does…is to make connections which show just how the state is bound up with the economic system…It is not surprising then, that some Marxists would prefer to restrict community action to those forms which relate directly to the more familiar area of industrial struggle (Smith 1978, p.21).

By focusing on the local state and by transforming the construction of the 'working class', the Post-Marxist discourse is able to reconstruct radical practices away from the workplace to issues relating to the defence and expansion of local service provision—especially in light of the Thatcher Government's disinvestment of the welfare state. The Post-Marxist discourse ultimately seeks to construct community development as a process to support the transformation of the relationship between ordinary people and the local state: making the relationship less bureaucratic, less hierarchical and more democratic and accountable. In doing so, I argue that the Post-Marxist discourse is seeking to

make radicalism real and relevant to communities and make community development effective and legitimate in the eyes of ordinary people:

> Community workers operate in the domestic sphere. We usually work with the people on whom the promise of personal fulfilment has gone most sour. And we talk a lot about education and personal growth and development. Usually we talk about them in an embarrassed way as a second best to excuse our failure to stop the last rent rise. Maybe we ought to accept, willingly, that community work is partly about such things and to take them on in a more systematic way (Smith 1978, p.33).

However, in my view, this development of 'realistic radicalism' is problematic. Rather than rescuing radicalism from Marxist economic determinism and dogmatism, it appears to me that the Post-Marxist discourse constitutes a capitulation of socialist ideas and practices. It is not clear how radical it is to defend the welfare state or connect people better to service provision. Indeed, it seems that was the entire point of the Rationalist discourse of the Home Office in 1968, discussed in Chapter 4, which had no pretensions to radicalism. The question that remains regarding this discourse is why these rather pedestrian social democratic concepts and practices in relation to the state and the working class are being reconstructed as radical within the Post-Marxist discourse. My analysis of identity constructions, using the third step of Hansen's PDA method, may help to shed light on this question.

An ongoing problem in British community development identity constructions from 1968 onwards is that of the Self. As I analysed in Chapter 4, the Self is preoccupied with its own contingent and contradictory legitimacy as both a professional and a revolutionary. During 1979 moment in time we have a Self that is experiencing an identity crisis which is unsatisfactorily resolved. The Post-Marxist discourse constitutes a break from the Structuralist Self that constructs itself as a professional activist/organic intellectual in aid of a revolution or at least in aid of a radical socialist movement for change. The Post-Marxist Self is a contingent identity that is in the process of turning away from its former radical

activist Self connected to trade unionism and socialist party politics to a professional Self located within state structures. This 'becoming' professional Self is seeking legitimacy within the state and within working-class communities. For example, here are two articulations of this ambivalence:

> If we want to think of ourselves as revolutionaries we must accept that ours is a piecemeal revolution…Community workers have a lot to contribute if they keep in mind that there is the practical side of politics (Radford 1978, p.111-9).

> After several years of debate, community work is still unable to face the transparent reality that it is a profession in all essentials. Professionalism implies limitations on practice, but far more limiting has been the stance of denying ourselves a professional status without saying, what, then, we are. The result has been a kind of collective identity crisis, which, I think accounts…for our lack of results (Smith 1978, p.32).

As I have demonstrated in this section, because the discourse promotes the idea that only reformist, marginal and micro-level change is possible within the confines of 'realistic, pragmatic and radical' community development social practices, it inadvertently constructs 'legitimacy' in such a way as it must marginalise its former radical ideals. The identity crisis which constitutes the identity constructions of the discourse is the realisation that the radical former Self (as constituted by the Structuralist discourse) was misguided and ineffective and the professional Post-Marxist Self is the only legitimate and available subject position during this politically salient moment.

With the Self disillusioned with classical Marxism and seeking to construct a stable (radical) professional identity, the Other is constructed in contradictory terms. With the adoption of feminist and anti-racist discursive elements, the Other in the Post-Marxist discourse is starting to be recognised not as a homogenous working class mass but as mass that is also gendered and racialised. 'The socialist cause is not served by idealising the working class'

(Salmon 1978, p.82). With the recognition of issues relating to the sexual division of labour and institutional racism, the Other is starting to break out of its reified state. However, it seems that one type of reification has been replaced with another. Whilst it is the case that class has been decentred in relation to gender and race, 'women' and 'blacks' are now treated as reified categories. For example, two texts about the 'black community' and 'women' in community development essentialise these subject positions by assuming a unity of experience that may not necessarily exist for all women or all black people (and as a consequence, erase black women's experiences, for example, at the intersection of these two subject positions):

> A fundamental need of the black community in Britain is to freed from the disabling effects of white racism both in the individual and institutional forms…The primary issue for the black community [is racism] (Manning and Ohri 1982, p.3).

> The problems women encounter at home and at work cannot be separated. They are part of the same process. …Women get the worst rewarded and least interesting jobs…this situation is connected to women's role in the home (Lawrence 1977, p.12-3).

Despite these important transformations in the constituent nature of the Other, a consistent pattern has started to emerge within British community development with regards to the Other. The Other is still constructed as 'alienated' or 'bewildered' or 'in need'—in other words the Other remains a passive object to be acted upon by the Self. Here is a typical example: 'Many people now need the help and guidance of a worker who can fathom the mysteries of the welfare state' (Lambert 1978, p.11-12). Here is another example: 'The possibilities of revolutionary change are enhanced by the presence of a growing mass of people who are disaffected…but also incapacitated' (Smith 1978, p.24). It is not clear to me how democratic or socially just it is for community development to construct the community as a passive homogenised object.

157

However, perhaps what is more important than this pattern of constructing the Other as passive is the silencing of the Other in the Post-Marxist discourse during this moment in time. To be sure, the Other is present in the texts and in the discourse but only as a way to discuss the ineffectiveness of Marxist community development practices. For example: 'People have a way of dealing with the revolutionary minded worker. Often they give the impression of going along with his analysis only to ignore it once he has gone' (Salmon 1978, p.75). The level of preoccupation with the constructions of the Self silences considered discussions and constructions of the Other. From my analysis of language of the discourse, what I see is an on-going chauvinism in reaction to the Self being constituted as ambivalent and illegitimate. This in turn, closes down space for different types of constructions of the Other. The Other is simply a foil for the Self rather than a subject and author of social practices within community development. This chauvinism then helps to partly explain why the Post-Marxist discourse attempts to construct its practices as radical. In a bid for legitimacy and recognition, especially during a moment in time in which socialism is in flux and the New Right is growing in popularity, the discourse reconstructs rather reformist ideas, language and practices as radical in order to gain legitimacy with the state and with ordinary people.

Using the second and third steps of Hansen's PDA method, I will now turn to analyse the Realist discourse and its identity constructions.

The Realist Discourse: Constructing a Professional Identity
The Realist discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of community development theorists and practitioners seeking to marginalise the socialist discourse of community development and construct a new technocratic form of community development focused on skills and expertise in service provision and community engagement. Through my PDA analysis of texts I argue that the Realist discourse shares many discursive features with the Post-Marxist discourse and as a result we see an important synthesis between these two competing and ostensibly antagonistic discourses in terms of the construction and reproduction of a 'professional' identity. I have used the term

158

'Realist' to describe this discourse because this concept encapsulates the central claim of the discourse—that socialist community development practice is an unnecessary abstraction and misrepresentation of everyday life and only a focus on the production of 'practice theory' will make community development effective and relevant for the state, practitioners and ordinary people.
As with the Post-Marxist discourse, my analysis suggests that the Realist discourse also seeks to reconstruct key ideas and practices of the inherited Structuralist discourse but not as a way to reform radical practice but to marginalise it. The Realist discourse attempts to marginalise and silence radicalism in community development by constructing a reformed profession and identity to demonstrate that community development is legitimate, viable and effective *without* socialist theories.

There are two important components of the Realistic discourse: the construction of radicalism as ineffective and the construction of an alternative 'non-ideological' form of professional practice. To begin, the Realist discourse constructs radical theory and practice as unrealistic, ineffective and irresponsible. In an influential text, Specht (1975, p.22) argues:

> Community work, as an enterprise, is closer to a profession than a social movement…A social movement ideology will simply not provide community workers with the range of knowledge and skill required to carry out these tasks. If they function with a narrow ideology, community workers will face continuing disappointment and frustration and—in the long run—demonstrate incompetence.

This is an important pattern in the language of the discourse. Radicalism is not simply disagreeable or unnecessary; radicalism is constructed as a threat to effective community development practice. Radicalism is constructed as dangerous to good practice because it prevents practitioners from critically thinking about and developing a coherent practice base that is directly relevant to everyday life in neighbourhoods. In other words, radicalism is all talk and no action, or worse still, radicalism is all rhetoric and irresponsible action:

To the extent that the radical tendency offers no practice theory or practice paradigms, it is unprogressive [sic] and a political and professional distraction. At the very least, analyses without prescription for action are an extravagance both in a political movement and in a human services profession like community work (Thomas 1978, p.242).

In the Realist discourse, radicalism is characterised as a substitute for understanding and working in the real word. Rather than confronting reality, radicals choose to try to fit reality into their pre-determined worldview with disastrous results for community development:

[Community development has] a ragged and changing ideology…This populist ideology…is pervasive and it serves the purposes of helping workers to believe that they are really of and with the people and of facilitating the division of the world into those who are of and with the people and those who are with and of the establishment…Other effects of this ideology include…the elevation of neighbourhood work and a distaste for organisational reform and development; a certain romaticisation of the power and abilities of the people (Henderson, Jones and Thomas 1980, p.6).

Thus for the Realist discourse, radicalism is constructed as both inauthentic and irrelevant because it fits ordinary people's diverse and divergent interests into a false category of homogenous proletariat interests and actions:

[Feminist] concerns with the politics of everyday life…help us see that the political analyses of the radical tendency in community work is cut off from the reality and experiences of working class people…Not only is their [radicals] analysis divorced from practice but the analysis itself is detached from a patience and interest in the events and transactions of everyday working class life (Thomas 1978, p.24).

What is also interesting to note is how both the Post-Marxist and the Realist discourses operationalise feminism for their divergent purposes. Both discourses use feminist analyses of the 'politics of everyday life' in order to legitimise community development practice and infuse it with a sense of authenticity about its role and practices. For the Realist discourse, the invocation of feminism is used as a way to marginalise the idea of radicalism by branding it sexist. Here are two interesting examples of how feminism is used as a way to marginalise a socialist community development praxis:

> [There are] sexist elements in the ideology and motivations of the radical tendency…The concern to make and project community work as a radical alternative may be an expression of professional male machismo intent on distinguishing community work from (female) social work (Thomas 1978, p.24).

> Community work represents for many a search (a poignant and disturbing one) for vitality, masculinity and potency that they have found at another time with social movements (Specht 1975, p.22).

The irony of the Realist discourse invoking feminism is that whilst it certainly is the case that many women experienced institutionalised sexism in socialist organisations, the Realist discourse does not seek to recognise or give voice to women subjects. Feminism is simply used as a tool to undermine a competing discourse and in doing so, the Realist discourse also seeks to strip feminism of its radical implications for community development identities and practices by seeking to align it with its technical social practices. By constructing radicalism as both ineffective and inauthentic, the Realist discourse is able to create space to construct a new professional identity and practices devoid of radicalism but steeped in expertise and technique:

> [Community development is about] the structure and technical aspects of change…[such as] the systematic problem analysis that illuminate the various facets of the problem and identifies various subsystems and actors

who play a part; the identification of programme goals, the building of organisations and communication systems, the design of programmes and of service delivery system and the skills for programme evaluation and review (Specht 1975, p.25).

The effectiveness and legitimacy of community development comes from a clear skills-set of building locally-based organisations, providing services, connecting people to those services and evaluating the impact of this work:
'The legitimacy of a profession has been said to lie in the acceptance of its claims to mastery of method (that is to say technology) not in its expertness in determining ends' (Waddington 1979, p.234).

By developing a coherent set of skills and techniques, community development is able to reconcile its marginal position in both the state and in communities. The Realist discourse constructs concepts of the state and local people that are similar to the Post-Marxist discourse. Rather than an impenetrable tool of the ruling class, the local state is constructed as unwieldy and bureaucratic—and open to influence. The role of the community development professional is to influence the workings of the state at the local level:

> One of the great social problems of our era is the problem of how to make large organisations function in ways that are humane, democratic and efficient…Community work has much to offer in finding new means to deal with the problems of large organisations (Specht 1975, p.23).

As for ordinary people, rather than romanticising the revolutionary fervour of the 'working class', the Realist discourse constructs the role of the professional to use skills to understand and prioritise issues that ordinary people articulate. For example: 'The most fundamental task for community workers is to bring people together and to help them create and maintain an organisation that will achieve their goals' (Henderson, Jones and Thomas 1980, p.1-2).

What is interesting to note at this point is the convergence between the Realist and Post-Marxist discourses. Whether community development should be underpinned by socialist principles or whether it should be stripped of its perceived radicalism, community development still ends up being constructed as a profession whose primary role is to better connect the local state to ordinary people's interests. My analysis of the Realist discourse's identity constructions, following the third step of Hansen's method, helps to demonstrate its similarity to the Post-Marxist discourse.

Like the Post-Marxist discourse, the Realist discourse constructs the Self as a 'becoming' professional. The role of this professional Self is to combine organisational analysis with community-based work in order to influence local services and support micro-based change that ordinary people wish to achieve:

> Community workers are aligned with the people by identification and principles but they are employed on the whole by local and central state agencies. Community workers stand…between the world of welfare professionals in which they gain the means to live and the movement for change to which they belong. They are in the welfare state but not of it but they are also in community groups but seldom, if ever, of them (Henderson, Jones and Thomas 1980, p.6).

Unlike the Post-Marxist discourse, the Realist discourse does not construct this 'becoming' professional identity as a moment of crisis, but as the above quote demonstrates, the Realist discourse recognises the contradictory space in which the professional Self operates. Because the Realist discourse seeks to locate the Self in this contradictory and marginal space between the state and community, this problematic site of community development provides further impetus for the need to develop a professional identity and practice and abandon radicalism in order to legitimise to community development.

Constructions of the community Other in this discourse also share discursive similarities to the Post-Marxist discourse. Part of the Realist discourse's attempt

to marginalise radicalism is that the professional Self will be better able to understand the interests and needs of the community by abandoning Marxist dogma. However, once again I have identified a problem with the treatment of ordinary people—they are constructed as passive objects. As with the Post-Marxist discourse, because the Realist discourse is preoccupied with questions of legitimacy of the Self, the discourse fails to construct the Other based on equality and justice. The Other is a mass requiring the active professional Self for support. For example:

> Community work is concerned with participation and with a spirit and methods of working that include people…It seeks to enable marginal groups to migrate into the 'acting community' of decisions and decision-making (Henderson, Jones and Thomas 1980, p.5).

Earlier I noted how the Realist discourse uses feminist principles as a means to marginalise the Post-Marxist discourse. The Realist discourse however does not seek to recognise or construct a sense of local people as racialised, gendered or classed. Oftentimes the only time the Other is referred to is to undermine the competing Post-Marxist discourse.

> The poor and deprived, do, frequently, feel poor and deprived. But I am not sure that they feel the sense of apathy, hopelessness and despair that is expressed [by socialists] in describing the difficulties of community work (Specht 1975, p.23).

With an emphasis on being realistic and constructing a legitimate professional Self, I argue that in the end the Realist and Post-Marxist discourses share similar identity constructions that have surprisingly similar effects on the way in which the ordinary people Other is constructed. Rather than ordinary people being recognised as active subjects, the Other is homogenised and assumed to be passive. This construction re-enforces the need for a legitimate, active and professional Self.

Conclusions

In this chapter I have argued that the 1979-1985 politically salient moment constitutes a time of crisis and transformation for British community development discourses. The crisis in left-wing politics signal an even deeper identity crisis for community development. With the shift away from key ideas of Marxism including that of the 'working class', the 'logic of history' and the repressive nature of the state, community development finds itself adrift. With the realisation that radical practice is both dogmatic and ineffective, community development discourses are prompted to respond and attempt reconstructions of its identities and practices. I have demonstrated how the way in which the Post-Marxist and the Realist discourses respond to this moment is surprising. Rather than being in conflict with each other, the discourses converge in both their construction of the problem of radicalism and in the construction of solutions. In the end and for different reasons, each discourse characterises professionalism as the solution to the crisis of Marxism and the ineffectiveness of radical practice. What is interesting to note is how the constituent nature of that professionalism and the professional identity of the Self are similar in the ostensibly antagonistic Post-Marxist and Realist discourses. Professionalism seems to be a shorthand for pragmatism and lower expectations about what community development can actually achieve within the confines of its discursive repertoire and social practices. A commitment to working at the grassroots is constructed in each of the discourses as a commitment to rather modest practices: connecting ordinary people better to the local state. In many ways, the discourses' construction of professionalism appears to regress to the Rationalist discourse of the Home Office and the Gulbenkian Foundation that I analysed in Chapter 4. Democratising the local state is, of course, a laudable aim for community development. The issue for me, however, is why this shift to modest and pedestrian goals is characterised in the Post-Marxist discourse as 'radical' and in the Realist discourse as 'innovative' especially given the fact that the ordinary people Other is still being constructed as passive.

As we move into the final moment—the convergence of Left/Right politics in the 1990s—it is important to keep in mind several points regarding the discursive

practices of community development in both the US and the UK. Firstly, from 1968 onwards it has become apparent that the majority of community development discourses fail to construct identities for the Self and the Other based on equality, social justice and respect. Regardless of the political philosophy that informs the discourses, this is a consistent pattern across the language and texts of both the American and British discourses. Related to this, the opportunity for an oppositional discourse to develop which challenges these dominant identity constructions appears to hinge on the discourses' relationship to the state and socialist politics. In the UK in the context of a strong welfare state and popular socialist politics, no discourse has yet developed that seeks to construct non-hierarchical relationships between the Self and the Other. I think this is because community development discourses in the UK all have a similar orientation towards professionalism. Because the state occupies a central role in British community development, the Self is perpetually trying to find a place for itself within state structures. The professional Self is not in control of its identity and is made contingent by its relationship to the welfare state. By trying to construct the Self as competent and legitimate, this dominates the formation, structure and operations of the various discourses—regardless of political leanings. As a result of the focus on professionalism, this leads to the Other being constructed in problematic ways. In order to reinforce the legitimacy of a professional identity, the community Other must be constructed as a passive object. This creates a perpetual need for the professional Self and reinforces the legitimacy of the Self within state structures.

In terms of community development discourses in the US, we can see how a weak welfare state and a weak tradition of socialist politics influence the formation and structure of discourses. Discourses draw on a greater variety of political philosophies to inform their language and they are not primarily focused on arguing for their legitimacy and professional status. However, this does not mean that American community development discourses are able to construct more equal and more socially justice identity constructions for the Self and the Other. As I have demonstrated, the vast majority of discourses in the US fail to generate non-hierarchical identity constructions and based on my analysis

166

I think this is because the Other is needed to be defined as passive in order to provide a justification for the revolutionary, populist or technical fervour of the Self. However, it is important to note that it has only been in the American tradition that marginal discourses have developed which seek to subvert these dominant constructions. The weakness of the state and socialism in the US has created a space for alternative identities. Drawing on ideas of participatory democracy, feminism and anti-racism these oppositional discourses subvert the dominant identity constructions in order to break down this binary opposition and subsume the Other into the Self. It is in the potential of these marginal discourses that I think community development can be reconstructed and reoriented towards democracy, equality and social justice.

As I turn now to examine the 1992—1997 politically salient moment, it will be important to explore whether the trends I have identified are reproduced or challenged in the US and the UK.

Chapter 7: The Revitalisation and Coalition Discourses

Introduction

In the last two chapters I analysed five basic community development discourses during the 1979 to 1985 politically salient moment and I demonstrated how the majority of these discourses produce and reproduce problematic language, social practices and identities that seem to undermine the practice of equality and social justice for community development. In response to both a crisis in socialist politics and the dominance of the New Right, the majority of American and British discourses seek accommodation within an emerging neoliberal politics focused on shrinking and privatising the welfare state. The one exception to these dominant practices is the Empowerment discourse which is constituted by the ideas and social practices of anti-racist feminism. Connected to the Democracy discourse (which I analysed in Chapter 3), the Empowerment discourse is the only discourse I identified and analysed that constructs relational identities for practitioners and local people based on equality and respect. This is an important research finding because it suggests that the language and social practices of anti-racist feminism are crucial to helping community development to fulfil its claims about supporting the equality and self-determination for local people. As I turn to analyse community development discourses in this final moment in time, I will be tracing how the patterns and trends I have identified and analysed in the last four chapters continue into the 1990s.

This chapter focuses on the competing discourses and identity constructions of community development from 1992 to 1997 in the United States. I have identified two discourses for analysis. The 'Revitalisation discourse' is constituted by the texts, language and practices of official state actors in the Clinton Administration and practitioners working in community economic development seeking to build social, political and economic capital in poor communities in order to transform the 'underclass' into an emerging capitalist class. For the Revitalisation discourse, community development is constructed as a tool by which to convey

the principles of neoliberalism and thus reconcile poor people to the new economic reality of limited state support and the importance of self-reliance. In opposition to these practices, the 'Coalition discourse' is constituted by the texts, language and practices of feminist, anti-racist and Alinskyist practitioners seeking to build grassroots-based alliances across differences in identity in order to oppose the hegemonic practices of the New Right and promote progressive social change. For the Coalition discourse, community development is constructed as a process by which to build civil society composed of empowered citizens. As I shall demonstrate, these discourses emerge in response to two important events: the hegemony of the New Right coalition which forced the Democratic Party to move to the right in order to become more appealing to voters and the divisiveness of so-called 'identity politics' which fractured left-wing politics throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

The chapter is laid out according to Hansen's three-pronged post-structuralist analytical method. I will begin with a short analysis of this politically salient moment and the factors that I think have helped to shape and form the Coalition and Revitalisation discourses. I will then move on to discuss the Revitalisation discourse and its particular identity constructions. Finally I will analyse the Coalition discourse and its constitution of identity.

The New Democrats in Post-Reagan America

> The Reagan revolution did succeed where it mattered most—redirecting federal fiscal and economic policies—and the impact on low-income communities was devastating. In addition to the withdrawal of federal aid, the communities suffered from increased income inequality, capital flight, labour setbacks and crippling budgeting deficits…The very idea of community development policy…was challenged by a harsh, individualistic ideology positing that no intervention [in poor communities] would work (O'Connor 1999, p.114).

When Bill Clinton won the presidential election in 1992, his road to success was made possible by the political philosophy and policy priorities of the 'New

169

Democrats'. The New Democrats were a response to the popularity of the New Right philosophy of the Republican Party and the disastrous election defeats that had become all too common for the Democrats since Reagan's landslide victory in 1980. As I discussed in Chapter 5, the New Right is posited on notions of negative rights, a limited state and a free market. However, with rising levels of economic inequality in the US due to the effects of the globalisation of capital, voters were looking for an innovative government response that would protect individuals and businesses from the worst effects of unbridled market forces but also preserve 'American traditional values' of individualism and self-reliance (for a more detailed discussion of this see: Clinton 2004; From 2005; Katz 2008). After twelve years of Reagan/Bush it was clear that a continuation of New Right Republican policies would not provide middle and working class floating voters with effective government protection from globalisation and the subsequent flight of capital and jobs overseas. However, traditional Democrat redistributionist 'tax and spend' policies would not necessarily preserve negative rights and a limited state. Thus the New Democrats identified an opportunity to build a new type of politics that would serve the twin purposes of reconciling the shortcomings of liberalism and conservatism while at the same time repositioning the Democratic Party to make it more appealing to voters. Here is Philpot (1999, p.1), one of the architects of the New Democrats discussing this merging of left and right politics:

> The New Democrat movement emerged in the early 1990s from the realisation that…the old ideologies of liberalism and conservatism were increasingly frustrating voters because of the false choices these imposed…New Democrats have promoted the notion of a new social contract between the state and the individual, arguing that the left's traditional concern for promoting opportunity needs to be married with a greater sensitivity to the responsibilities that citizens have towards the community.

Heavily influenced by the emerging Communitarian agenda of Putnam (1993) and Etzioni (1993), the New Democrats were seeking a compromise between the

left and the right by focusing on equality of opportunity and promoting the idea of free markets as the way for all groups to achieve prosperity. The Democrat Leadership Council (DLC), an internal Democratic Party grouping which represented the New Democrats' policy platform, defined their compromise between left and right as such:

> We believe the promise of America is equal opportunity, not equal outcome…We believe that economic growth is the prerequisite to expanding opportunity for everyone. The free market, regulated in the public interest, is the best engine of general prosperity…We believe the purpose of social welfare is to bring the poor into the nation's economic mainstream, not to maintain them in dependence…We believe that American citizenship entails responsibility as well as rights (DLC 1990 quoted in From 2005, p.3-4).

For the New Democrat Clinton Administration, 'democratic capitalism' and the 'opportunity agenda' were promoted as the most effective way to tackle persistent poverty and address poor people's dependency on the welfare state (Clinton 2004, p.1-2). By seeking to boost economic output whilst at the same time equipping people with the necessary skills to compete effectively in the free market, the New Democrats maintained their commitments to equality of opportunity and self-reliance and as an added bonus, they did not need to increase the size of the federal government to achieve this so-called Third Way: 'In their heart of hearts, most Americans know that the best social programme is a job' (Clinton 2004, p.2).

For community development, the New Democrats' opportunity agenda was implemented via Clinton's urban policy programme. Clinton, in a 'new covenant' with cities, aimed to regenerate poor inner-city areas through his flagship urban initiative, Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC). The EZ/EC attempted to:

move beyond a focus on countercyclical grant-in-aid programs to an emphasis on enabling cities to compete in the global economy…[by fostering] locally initiated, bottom-up strategies that connect the public, business and neighbourhood sectors in community-building partnerships for change (O'Connor 1999, p.115-6).

Under this programme, cities would get targeted funding for regeneration through the creation of designated zones that would offer tax-breaks to promote private sector investment. Within these zones, new types of 'comprehensive' community development projects were promoted: through public-private partnerships community development corporations (CDCs) would get funding to rebuild the local economy by training residents in entrepreneurial skills, building affordable housing and offering social welfare services (O'Connor 1999, p.115-7; Katz 2008, p.127-9). This is an important break with Democrats' progressive past. Rather than the federal government intervening to tackle persistent urban problems such as unemployment, poverty, crime and poor housing, the Clinton Administration chose instead to transfer responsibility for these problems to the private and non-profit sectors through the mechanisms of the CDCs. Clinton effectively privatised urban social problems and solutions.

As a subscriber to the communitarian agenda of Putnam and Etzioni, Clinton did not disavow the 1980s free-market policies of Reagan/Bush; indeed his urban policies can be interpreted as necessary for political survival in a post-Reagan America in the 1990s:

> Clinton's [EZ/EC] initiatives remained modest programmes and they rested on a vision of government's role much different from the one underlying the social programmes of the 1960s and 1970s—closer to Ronald Reagan than to [President Johnson's] Great Society…The federal government provided neither massive funds nor direct services. Instead, it served as a catalyst and impresario (Katz 2008, p.128-9).

The EZ/EC programmes 'have a tough-minded, economic growth-oriented…aura of promoting the work ethic as a solution to poverty' (Lemann 1994, p.4). With Clinton's concern to be seen as 'pro-growth' and not 'pro-government', we can see how the Revitalisation discourse is formed and structured. Texts which constitute the Revitalisation discourse include those in relation to the EZ/EC programme of the Clinton Administration and those concerned with community economic development and building social and economic capital in poor neighbourhoods (Lemann 1994; Zdenek 1994; Putnam 1995; Rubin 1997; Gittell and Vidal 1998; Ferguson and Dickens 1999; O'Connor 1999; Katz 2008).

In addition to promoting their pro-growth agenda, the New Democrats were also concerned with building a 'new' New Deal coalition as an effective counterweight to the formidable alliance of the New Right. As From (2005, p.2), a proponent of the New Democrat philosophy, argues:

> As the 1960s passed into the 1970s, the liberal agenda…ran out of steam, and the intellectual coherence of the New Deal began to dissipate. The Democratic coalition split apart over civil rights, Vietnam, economic change, and culture and values and the great causes of liberal government that had animated the Democratic Party for three decades degenerated into a collection of special pleaders.

Standing in the way of this big tent coalition of liberals, the New Democrats argued, were those 'special pleaders' engaging in divisive 'identity politics' based on the recognition of difference in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, disability. As Gitlin (1995, p.84), a founder of SDS and a critic of identity politics argued:

> Between Left and Right there has taken place a curious reversal. The Left believed in a common human condition, the Right in fundamental differences among classes, nations, races…Today it is the Right that speaks a language of commonalities. Its rhetoric of global markets and

173

global freedoms has something of the old universalist ring. To be on the Left, meanwhile, is to doubt that one can speak of humanity at all.

During this moment in time, identity politics had come to be seen by the New Democrats as a chauvinistic distraction which allowed the Right to solidify its political power and shape popular public opinion (for a detailed discussion of this see: Gitlin 1995; for a dissenting view see Hill Collins 2000).

However, not all progressives defined 'identity politics' as a problem. Instead, the 'recognition of difference' was seen as an essential process for achieving social justice and democracy for marginalised groups. Here is Young (1990, p.4-5) in her influential discussion about recognition as a political right:

> In the past, group-conscious policies were used to separate those defined as different and exclude them from access to the rights and privileges enjoyed by dominant groups. A crucial principle of democratic cultural pluralism…is that group-specific rights and policies should stand together with general civic and political rights of participation and inclusion.

In addition to difference being a political and social right for marginalised groups, difference could be used as a catalyst to build alliances and coalitions that could effectively counter the big tent politics of the New Right. Here is Fraser (1997, p.10) in her influential text about the need to combine recognition and redistribution struggles in order to build an effective politics for social justice:

> The intersection of class, 'race', gender, and sexuality intensifies the need for transformative solutions, making the combination of socialism and deconstruction more attractive still…That combination best promotes coalition building is especially pressing today, given the multiplication of social antagonisms, the fissuring of social movements, and the growing appeal of the Right in the United States. In this context, the project of transforming the deep structures of both political economy and culture

174

appears to be the one overarching programmatic orientation capable of doing justice to all current struggles against injustice.

Thus we can see the Coalition discourse take shape from these broader debates about multiculturalism, identity politics and the process of building solidarity across different identities. Rather than dismiss identity politics, the Coalition discourse seeks to recognise the discrete claim-making of different groups and use difference as a way to forge common bonds across identities in order to build a progressive alliance for social change. Texts which constitute the Coalition discourse include those in relation to feminist, anti-racist and Alinksyist community development practice (Rubin and Rubin 1992; Bradshaw, Soifer and Guitierrez 1994; Daley and Wong 1994; Gutierrez and Lewis 1994; Mondros and Wilson 1994; Rosenthal and Mizrahi 1994; Miller, Rein and Levitt 1995; Delgado 1998; Fabricant and Burghardt 1998; Fisher and Shragge 2000).

Using the first step of my PDA method, I analysed context which influenced the formation and structure of the Revitalisation and Coalition discourses. Using the second and third steps of my method—analysing the language and identities of the discourses—I will now turn to examine the competing discourses in more detail.

The Revitalisation Discourse: Recapitalising Communities
I think the Revitalisation discourse should be interpreted as an inheritor of two previous discourses: the 1968 Poverty discourse and the 1979 Partnership discourse which I analysed in Chapters 3 and 5. Those two discourses were constituted by official state actors and focused on using technical expertise to resolve social problems. As I will demonstrate, the Revitalisation discourse reproduces these linguistic patterns and social practices. Using the second step of my PDA method, I will now examine the language and structure of the discourse. Two interrelated concepts structure the Revitalisation discourse: 'community-building' and 'empowerment'; I will discuss each of these ideas in turn.

Firstly and most importantly, the discourse constructs community as a privatised and marketised space. Communities are geographically defined neighbourhoods that are also emerging markets for capital investment. Thus a key practice of this discourse is to marketise communities: neighbourhoods are primarily constructed as places where the local economy has collapsed and partnerships between government, corporations and local people are needed to rebuild communities. For the Revitalisation discourse, communities are indistinguishable from any other free market in which a variety of goods and services can be bought, sold or traded for profit. Once 'community' is constructed as a market, the discourse then defines all relationships at the neighbourhood level (between local people, professionals, the state and the private sector) in terms of the marketplace—hence the pattern in the language of the discourse on social, political and economic capital. Indeed, as an official working on the Clinton Administration's flagship urban policy of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC) put it:

> There is real money to be made in these markets…The goal here is…to make companies take a second look in our own backyard where there could be profitable business opportunities while also helping rebuild communities that have been left behind [in terms of economic prosperity] (Sperling 1999 quoted in Katz 2008, p.129).

Consequently, 'community-building' in the Revitalisation discourse is constructed as the process of recapitalisation of neighbourhoods: transforming communities from failed markets into a competitive marketplace to be exploited for profit by local people and private businesses. Communities are constructed as 'untapped areas for potential investment…undiscovered territories for many businesses' the goal of communities is to 'inspire private companies to build plants and stores in areas that the economic boom has largely passed by' (Clinton 1999 quoted in Katz 2008, p. 129). With capital flight defined as the key problem facing poor inner-city communities, community development is constructed as a primarily economic regeneration activity of making poor communities more

attractive investment opportunities for private-sector enterprises and building the asset-base for poor people:

> Community development produces assets that improve the quality of life for neighbourhood residents. Although ownership and control of these assets might be preferred, increasing access [to assets] is also important because it too expands opportunity (Ferguson and Dickens 1999, p.4).

What I find interesting about the Revitalisation discourse are the patterns in the language that echo the broader neoliberal discourse of the New Right. This is an important development in the discourse of community development. Unlike the Partnership discourse in Chapter 5, there does not seem to be any ambivalence about the wholesale adoption of the New Right politics in the Revitalisation discourse. The operationalisation of neoliberalism by this discourse is treated as innovative, obvious and commonsense.

Community-building is not simply about tackling social problems or fostering trust and support among local people. The language of the discourse constructs the concept of community-building in terms of the free market: effective community-building takes place when the social, economic and political wealth and assets are recapitalised in a given area:

> Economic development is a process and approach used to create jobs, assets and an investment climate in distressed neighbourhoods and cannot be separated from community development…The key to a comprehensive, coordinated and integrated approach to community development is…maximising the commitment, capacity and efforts of neighbourhood residents and institutions…[and] increasing public and private capital investments in neighbourhoods (Zdenek 1994, p.6).

Thus for the Revitalisation discourse, the concept of 'empowerment' is intertwined with notions of the free market: empowerment is generated when local people begin to define themselves not as citizens but as capitalists searching

for profit. Community-building supports empowerment by giving people a financial stake in their marketised communities. As Rubin (1997, p.87-8) argues:

> Empowerment occurs both for [community development organisations] and for individuals through material ownership of goods, property and social and job skills. Through such ownership individuals gain confidence to fight for more for themselves and for the broader community.

Capitalism empowers people by encouraging and supporting poor people's participation in marketised relationships. By becoming a homeowner or an entrepreneur, poor people and their communities can, for the first time, benefit from rather than be subjugated by the wealth-generating power of free markets:

> To create empowerment requires people to have ownership of material things as well as owning psychologically a better sense of self…Empowerment occurs as people who have been excluded learn that their efforts pay off in material advantages for themselves and their communities…Empowerment through ownership benefits the broader community through strategies to circulate wealth within communities of need (Rubin 1997, p.81-2).

By inculcating people with the concepts and practices of capitalism, community development is supporting poor people's self-reliance and reconciling poor people to the realities of limited state support and the challenges of operating in a context dominated by the free market. As one commentator has recently suggested:

> Only tough medicine would induce recovery [in poor neighbourhoods]. The cold bath of the market, painful (even fatal) to many in the short run…eventually would produce a solid and lasting prosperity that would diffuse work and good wages among the entire population…This was…a necessary discipline…The new urban strategies offered the urban poor their only long-range hope (Katz 2008, p.136).

Finally, in the context of no alternative to the free market, empowerment is defined as being realistic about the limited resources that are now available for community development activities and shifting the responsibility of social welfare from the state to local people:

> The hard truth is that development must start from within the community and, in most of our urban neighbourhoods, there is no other choice. Creative neighbourhood leaders across the country have begun to recognize this hard truth, and have shifted their practices accordingly. They are discovering that wherever there are effective community development efforts, those efforts are based upon an understanding, or map, of the community's assets, capacities and abilities…The key to neighbourhood regeneration, then, is to locate all of the available local assets, to begin connecting them with one another in ways that multiply their power and effectiveness, and to begin harnessing those local institutions that are not yet available for local development purposes (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993, p.3-4).

I will now turn to the third step in Hansen's PDA method: analysing the identity constructions of the discourse. As I pointed out earlier, the identities that the Revitalisation discourse constitute are very similar to that of the Poverty discourse in Chapter 3 and the Partnership discourse in Chapter 5. Unsurprisingly given the emphasis in this discourse on the free market, the Self is constructed as an expert reformer who brings entrepreneurial spirit and skills to the failed markets that are poor neighbourhoods. By coordinating large urban regeneration projects such as house-building or community banking through organisations such as community development corporations (CDCs) or comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs), the Self is constructed as a social capitalist and is invested with agency:

> [Professionals] need the patience and forbearance of community organisers with the business acumen of a free-booting, entrepreneurial

capitalist…The work of development activists [is of] mastering skills in social administration—in budgeting, personnel management, negotiations…It is through skills in these technical matters that community-based development organisations are enabled to do the projects that renew hope and empower those within poor communities (Rubin 1997, p.86).

This social capitalist Self is focused on building the economic assets of poor people and poor neighbourhoods. As I charted in Chapters 3 and 5, the Self is constructed as a subject who acts upon a passive community Other. Here are two further examples of this particular articulation of the Self:

Skilled community organisers and effective community developers already recognise the importance of relationship building…The forces driving people apart are many and frequently cited, increasing mobility rates, the age and not least from the point of view of lower income communities, increasing dependence upon outside, professionalized helpers (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993, p.3-4).

Community development is asset-building that improves the quality of life among residents of low to moderate income communities…Development expands and improves assets that produce all types of services (Ferguson and Dickens 1999, p.6).

With the Self defined as a social capitalist and an asset builder for the poor, the Other is constructed along contradictory lines. Similar to what I have demonstrated in my last four chapters, the community Other in the Revitalisation discourse is characterised as a passive and disorganised object requiring the intervention of the professional Self. In particular, the Other is constructed as lacking social capital—strong bonds of trust and connection to neighbours—and thus needs to be organised to build solidarity and reciprocity before the community can be successfully converted into a functioning marketplace:

> Increasing social capital where it is currently lacking is a challenging
> undertaking…The targeted areas have suffered from years of decline and
> neglect. In many of these neighbourhoods, the most successful and
> competent individuals and businesses move out when they can, often
> leaving social and economic vacuums…These neighbourhoods tend to
> have high rates of crime and violence that generate low levels of trust and
> cooperation among residents…This context makes it quite difficult to
> build strong bonds among residents and to build new bridges to the
> support community (Gittell and Vidal 1998, p.22).

However, the Other is also constructed as a latent capitalist needing the skills
and guidance of the professional to build capacity:

> Learning business skills in a supportive environment empowers
> community members. People are able to form their own enterprises as the
> community-based development organisation can buffer them during
> periods of low business…The goal of the community-based development
> organisation was to help community members overcome the
> disadvantages society has placed on them because they are poor and
> minority (Rubin 1997, p.70).

As I have argued in Chapters 3 and 4 with regard to the Power, Poverty and
Structuralist discourses, when the Other is simultaneously constructed as both a
passive object and a latent subject, it is not clear to me how the discourse is able
to reconcile this problematic construction. If the poor are passive and
disorganised, as the Revitalisation discourse defines them to be, it is difficult to
see how they also possess the capacity to be entrepreneurs. It is only when the
social capitalist Self acts on the poor Other to transform them from passive
objects to emerging capitalist subjects that this problematic identity can be
somewhat reconciled. As I have continually argued throughout my thesis, I am
not convinced about how this hierarchical relationship between the Self and

Other supports the goals of equality and social justice that community development espouses.

Thus my analysis continues to demonstrate a pattern in the language of the community development discourses that systematically produce and reproduce hierarchical and disrespectful relational identities between practitioners and local people. Rather than community development providing an alternative language and social practice for understanding community life and practising social justice, it appears that community development entrenches domination of already marginalised groups.

I will now turn to analyse the Coalition discourse using steps two and three of Hansen's PDA method—analysing the language and identities of the discourse.

The Coalition Discourse: Unity Through Diversity

The Coalition discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of feminist, anti-racist and Alinskyist community organisers and practitioners seeking to build popular community-based alliances based on difference in order to oppose the New Right and promote progressive social change. Here are Miller, Rein and Levitt (1995, p.115-6) articulating the key ideas of the discourse:

> Organising around identity seeks to break conventional ways of 'conducting business' by reframing issues along new principles of justice or equality…This does not reflect left-right ideological splits but conveys a democratic ideology which transcends traditional political dichotomies. The goal is transformational change, not only specific improvements in community or nation.

The Coalition discourse appears to be an amalgamation of the Empowerment and Populist discourses which I analysed in Chapter 5. The Empowerment discourse's key practice was to recognise difference in terms of gender and ethnicity in community organisations whilst the Populist discourse's key practice was building popular grassroots organisations to unite poor and working class people based on class affinities. The Coalition discourse combines elements of

the Populist and Empowerment discursive practices in order to articulate a new discourse concerned with building popular grassroots-based organisations that recognise difference. As I previously discussed, given the divisions on the left due to rise of identity politics, the Coalition discourse is seeking to reconcile the competing claim-making between different identity and issue based groups by building alliances which unite rather than fracture left-wing interests. Here are two examples of this amalgamation of 'recognition and redistribution' interests for the purposes of coalition building:

> Most communities encompass more than one ethnic group and different classes, level of acculturation, educational levels and religious orientations can be present within one ethnic group. An organising strategy that ignores differences contributes to divisiveness and conflict within the community and thus diminishes its strength as a political force (Bradshaw, Soifer and Gutierrez 1994, p.38).

> If traditional community organising is to become a force for change…it must proactively address issues of race, class, gender, corporate concentration and the complexities of a trans-national economy (Delgado 1998, p.3).

Indeed, due to the hegemony of the New Right, broad-based alliances that mirror and effectively counter right-wing coalitions are a central feature in this discourse. As Mondros and Wilson (1994, p.250) argue:

> The absence of coalitions hampers the ability to work across issues, to develop local constituencies for national campaigns and to connect local grievances with the national agenda…There must be attempts to bring middle-class and low-income organisations together around common cause. There is nothing more innately incompatible about this coalition than there is about upper-class businessmen and working-class fundamentalists being part of the Republican Party.

As with the Revitalisation discourse, the same interrelated concepts structure the Coalition discourse: 'community-building' and 'empowerment'. For the Coalition discourse, the concept of community-building is the way to redefine the nature and purpose of community. Rather than constructing community as a neighbourhood or as a geographical place with a homogeneous identity (as the Revitalisation discourse does), the Coalition discourse constructs 'community' as a space that reflects multiple interests, identities, concerns and conflicts. Community is a space that people occupy that is their own—it is not mediated by the state or the market. Instead, community is a free space, a network of individuals and groups with multiple and competing interests and identities:

> Empowered communities are built up from liberated networks in which people are willing to work together because they share multiple overlapping interests and not simply a geographic or an ethnic affinity. Future organising should portray community as a shared environment rich with the possibility for progressive groups to build on each others' success…An important step in forging a broad-based progressive movement is to bring disparate interests into this rich community of cooperation (Rubin and Rubin 1992, p.446).

For the Coalition discourse, the foundation for effective community-building begins with recognising difference. This discourse constructs community as the site of difference and thus the task of community-building is the search for common cause which unites the different identities and claim-making among local people. As advocates of alliances, Rosenthal and Mizarhi (1994, p.10-11) state:

> We believe community-based organisations have a greater impact on issues by joining forces and building coalitions…Local issues usually represent larger patterns: social and economic problems that affect individuals and communities are often intertwined and compounded…Structured correctly, coalitions are open and egalitarian…They are also viable multicultural efforts that integrate

184

minority and majority groups, new immigrants and more settled residents and traditionally powerless groups and those more powerful.

The Coalition discourse appears to be interpellating Mills' (1963) sociological imagination whereby private troubles are transformed into public issues. By recognising and acknowledging difference in terms of identity and interests and then by operationalising difference by building strong and popular alliances that are composed by a broad range of constituents, the Coalition discourse is seeking to equate community-building with the construction of a democratic civil society:

> Just as individuals gain power by joining together, many small, alternative progressive organisations collectively working on a common problem can bring about large change…Activists must overcome the divisive tensions within the progressive movement and share a common vision and mutual respect (Rubin and Rubin 1992, p.457).

For the Coalition discourse, community development is constructed as the process by which to support community-building in terms of encouraging an organised and democratic left-wing voice that speaks to both the discrete interests and the common private troubles of different groups. By building alliances based on difference, the Coalition discourse is constructing ways in which a diverse range of individuals and groups can struggle together for expanded social, political and economic rights. Ultimately, community-building is characterised as a way in which community-based problems can be linked to and explained by the social, political and economic structures of American society which reproduce inequalities. Here is Fabricant and Burghardt (1998, p.56-7) discussing the connection between micro and macro level issues:

> Only by offering a straight-forward economic explanation of this decline [of inner-city neighbourhoods] can a national conversation reopen regarding a redistributive welfare state and the potential to join races, genders and classes…in one common purpose…Progressives must see, as the right saw after the 1964 Presidential election [in which Goldwater was

185

defeated], that only by fighting for a clear economic and social vision can power be re-attained to create genuine redistributive legislation.

The concept of empowerment is inter-related to the process of community-building. Since a key practice of the Coalition discourse is to unite local people across difference and build a progressive alliance as a counterweight to the New Right, the discourse constructs the process by which people organise themselves to redefine private troubles as public issues as empowerment. For the Coalition discourse, empowerment is constructed as a group's sense of its own efficacy. This efficacy is crucial for people to recognise their common cause and for people to link micro-level social problems to the particular ways in which macro-level structures are organised. Here are two articulations of empowerment as efficacy:

> People want not only power but to feel empowered…These people feel bypassed in our society…They are made to feel small and insignificant in all their dealings with government and corporate bureaucracies…Social action organisations are places where they feel competent, capable, in charge and they can act on those feelings (Mondros and Wilson 1994, p.244).

> Community development helps people achieve their potential by improving their daily lives and expanding their sense of efficacy…Through involvement with community organisations, people learn to feel more competent and more effective (Rubin and Rubin 1992, p.13-4).

Empowerment is both the product and a key driver of community-building. By uniting and organising, local people experience a sense of agency and efficacy. This agency and efficacy is then reinforced through building solidarity and reciprocity in the context of a community composed of difference. As Rosenthal and Mizarhi (1994, p.13) explain:

Coalitions allow groups to pursue bigger targets on a larger scale, address power inequities, [and] shape public ideology…Bridging differences, coalitions can help diverse groups develop a common language and ideology with which to shape a collective vision for social change.

Turning to the third step in my PDA method, the Coalition discourse constructs identities for the Self and the Other that oppose the dominant model reproduced by the majority of community development discourses in my research. Rather than constitute a hierarchical binary identity whereby the Self is an active subject and the Other is a passive object, the Coalition discourse instead creates identities that are very similar to those of the Democracy and Empowerment discourses that I analysed in Chapters 3 and 5. Firstly, the Coalition discourse defines the Self as 'facilitator of difference'. Several texts that constitute this discourse are concerned with mediating and reconciling the reality of competing and conflicting interests and identities within and between local people. As a facilitator, the Self is interested using the free space of community as a site for deliberation and dialogue in order to bridge difference. Here are two examples:

> The organiser must approach the community as a facilitator…The organiser [should] take a collaborative approach, promoting democracy, participatory processes in the organising effort. This element is important in empowering individuals… and serves to diminish divisiveness and promote coalition-building between groups (Bradshaw, Soifer and Gutierrez 1994, p.33).

> The need for community organisers who can bridge the cultural gaps among these groups is indeed enormous. We suggest that inter-ethnic cultural competence in working with…communities is one of the most critical and challenging skills that the field of community development should cultivate among current and future professionals (Daley and Wong 1994, p.15).

The Self is not the only active and competent agent constructed in the above examples; nor is the Self constructed as acting on a passive Other. Instead, the Self is positioned as a subject who creates a space for deliberation and dialogue between different groups.

In this discourse, the Other is recognised as heterogeneous, and importantly, the Coalition discourse avoids reifying the Other in terms of racial, ethnic, gender, sexual and ability differences. The identities that are constructed between the Self and the Other are democratic and non-hierarchical and as a result, the Other is defined as an active and competent subject. As I demonstrated with the Democracy and Empowerment discourses, the binary distinction between the Self/Other in the Coalition discourse has been decentred and replaced with an identity where the Self and Other are indistinguishable. The decentring of the identity binary takes place because of the discursive practice of emphasising coalition building and turning private troubles into public issues. Building alliances across difference means that the work of the professional is not about using expertise to act on a passive community but about facilitating dialogue between competent subjects in order to take collective action and to address common problems shared by all marginalised groups. This process of facilitating dialogue, building non-hierarchical relationships and decentring unequal identities, I argue, is due to the Coalition discourse's operationalisation of anti-racist feminist ideas and social practices. Here are two examples:

> [Feminist community development] aims to eliminate the dichotomies that are often created between the community and the power structure and between the organisers and the community…[Feminist community development] views the organiser as an equal with the community. Rather than be an expert at all facets of organising, the organiser both learns from and gives to the community (Bradshaw, Soifer and Gutierrez 1994, p.29-30).

> There is less separation between organisers and leaders in the women-centered model [of community development], as women-centered

organisers, rather than being outsiders, are more often rooted in local networks. They are closely linked to those with whom they work and organise and act as mentors or facilitators of the empowerment process (Stall and Stoecker 1997, p.6).

As we can see in each of the above examples, because the hierarchical binary of Self/Other has been decentred, this creates the space and opportunity for the Other to be recognised and constructed as an active, competent and effective subject. This is an important finding for my research. Anti-racist feminism seems to provide community development with the language and concepts to deconstruct binary identities and the social practices to recognise difference.

Conclusions

By operationalising Hansen's three-pronged PDA method, I have analysed the context and structure of two basic discourses and the identity formations mobilised within them during the 1992 to 1997 politically salient moment in the United States. The Revitalisation discourse constructs the goal of community development to be that of building the resilience of poor communities to take advantage and withstand the vagaries of the free market. By marketising communities, local people and private enterprises are able to build and exploit the social, political and economic capital and assets of a given neighbourhood and in doing so participate in the economic expansion that characterises this moment in time. In opposition to this, the Coalition discourse, constructs the goal of community development to be that of building civil society in which the discrete differences of identity and issue-based groups are recognised but also where these groups can unite to oppose neoliberalism and put forward a politics based on equality and social justice.

It is important to emphasise how the presence or absence of anti-racist feminism significantly affects the identity constructions in the Coalition and Revitalisation discourses. Where anti-racist feminist discursive practices are present, identity constructions are more democratic and equal. By rejecting the hierarchical binaries of Self/Other, anti-racist feminist community development discourses

seek to construct local people as active and competent agents for social change. Where anti-racist feminist discourses and their participatory democratic practices are absent—as in the case of the majority of community development discourses I have analysed in this study—identity constructions are derived from problematic binaries that construct the Self as an active subject and the Other as a passive object.

I will now turn to the final empirical chapter of my thesis and explore how the convergence of Left/Right politics and community development take shape in the British context.

Chapter 8: The Participation and Transformation Discourses

Introduction

In the last chapter, I analysed how two community development discourses in the US responded to the popularity and dominance of neoliberalism in the 1990s. The official discourse of institutional actors did not seek to challenge the assumptions of neoliberalism and instead reconstructed community development as an instrument of free market growth. For oppositional actors, community development was constructed as a way to counter neoliberal policies and build coalitions across difference in order to support a vibrant civil society based on equality and social justice. This chapter focuses on the competing discourses and identities of community development in the UK from 1992 to 1997. Using Hansen's PDA method, I have identified two discourses for analysis. The 'Participation' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of international and domestic institutions, such as the United Nations, the World Bank and the UK government, which seek to reconstruct community development as the means by which the poor become active and entrepreneurial citizens who participate in partnerships with the state and the market in order to tackle social problems. I shall argue that community development, as understood by the Participation discourse, should be seen primarily as a tool for the on-going neoliberal project of shrinking the welfare state and marketising social relationships. In contrast to this, the 'Transformation' discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of socialist, feminist and anti-racist community development practitioners and academics seeking to subvert the neoliberal colonialisation of community development. I shall argue that the Transformation discourse seeks to construct community development as a process of critical consciousness whereby community groups seek new forms of citizenship and radical democracy in order to resist the privatisation of the state and public spaces.

This chapter, like the five before it, is organised in line with Hansen's three-pronged PDA model. I will begin my discourse analysis with a short contextual discussion of the formation and structure of the community development discourses during this politically salient moment. I will briefly discuss the legacy of the neoliberal project under Thatcher especially in terms of the redefinition of key concepts such as the welfare state, citizenship and the market. Using Hansen's second and third steps of PDA, I will then turn to analyse the texts and identity constructions that constitute the Participation and Transformation discourses

Thatcher's Legacy in the 1990s

> The strength of Thatcherism is its ability to ventriloquise [sic] the genuine anxieties of working class experience. The declining economy and reduced living standards are explained by the expensive burden of public services…Frustrations with unresponsive and undemocratic welfare services are equated with the overweening bureaucracy of socialism. The ideology is…a full-throated affirmation of some simple dichotomies: welfare state, collectivism, socialism/freedom, liberty, choice (Golding 1983, p.10-11).

Although forced from office in 1990 after the disastrous introduction of the Poll Tax, Thatcher's legacy was already assured. The three-term Prime Minister presided over the dismantling of the post-war welfare state in the UK, the promotion of monetarist economic policies and the reaffirmation of radical individualism in British politics (Gyford 1991; Cochrane 1993; Burns et al 1994). Whilst it is beyond the bounds of my research to discuss the Thatcher project at length, this section will focus on the legacy of Thatcherism for our understandings of citizenship and the state provision of social welfare during this politically salient moment.

In terms of social welfare, Thatcherism can be understood as a commitment to radical individualism and the limited collective provision of social protection (Golding 1983, p.9-12; Kingdom 1992, p.44-56; Faulks 1998, p.77-80). Thatcherism

interprets individualism in terms of negative rights, maximum individual liberty and meritocracy. Individual liberty is championed because freedom can only be achieved by self-sufficiency and self-reliance—freedom cannot be handed down from or mediated by the state: 'The primary duty of individuals was to themselves: duty to others was not an act of citizenship, but of charity' (Faulks 1998, p.85). Negative rights—the ability not to be interfered with in getting on in life—is what counts in Thatcherism because it is by relying on oneself (and one's family and kinship network) that an individual is able to achieve self-determination. By only looking out for one's self, an individual is able to make free choices and meaningful decisions about the kind of life she wishes to lead. This focus on radical individualism is important as it rejects any notion that individual citizens are connected to or responsible for each other. Thus being a good citizen is a limited proposition—it simply extends to respecting and preserving each citizen's liberty through non-interference. With this radical freedom comes true equality based on merit. Individuals, through hard work and entrepreneurship, should be able to climb the social ladder without any arbitrary support from the state or constraints imposed on them by gender, race or class. Thus in many ways we see that part of Thatcher's legacy in the 1990s—as seen in the policy platforms of both John Major and Tony Blair—is about redefining notions of fairness and equality.

Thatcherism constructs fairness and equality as being determined by the competition between free individuals rather than being controlled and sanctioned by the state:

> The ideal type of citizenship…is one in which the state serves the individual and protects their freedoms in civil society…All citizens have the right to freedom in a negative sense, but have no right to be helped by the state or other individuals to achieve an equal ability to exercise their freedom. In a sense citizens have rights to inequality…and to rise and fall in the market place which does not discriminate on moral or personal grounds (Faulks 1998, p.66-7).

Thatcherism's radical individualism necessitates a decoupling of the responsibility for the collective provision of welfare from the idea of a 'good citizen'. Because fairness and equality can only be ensured when individuals are unconstrained by fellow citizens and the state, the legitimacy of state-sponsored welfare is subverted. Thatcherism rejects the idea of the collective provision of welfare because it interprets the welfare state as promoting dependency and reducing an individual's ability to be self-sufficient. To support the self-determination and equality of individual citizens, the state should not intervene as a corrective to the competition between free individuals. The only institution that can support the radical individualism as envisioned by Thatcherism is the free market. It is in the free market where individuals are given the space and opportunity to innovate and compete in order to get ahead. 'It is impossible to underestimate the importance of the concept of the market in British politics; nowhere is the ideology of individualism more purely distilled' (Kingdom 1992, p.57). Along with the redefinition of fairness and equality, we also see that the other legacy of Thatcherism is the substitution of the state by the market as the primary vehicle to ensure freedom, equality and prosperity.

In terms of policy priorities, we can see how both Major, from 1990 to 1997, and Blair, from 1997 to 2007, reconciled themselves to Thatcher's legacy. Using the language of the market in terms of contracting out public services and redefining citizens into consumers, Major and Blair continued Thatcher's revolution of shrinking the welfare state. This can be seen in Major's Citizen Charter and Blair's idea of active citizenship. For Major, contained within the Citizen Charter was the state's commitment to customer service, the promotion of individual choice and the state's accountability to individual consumers: 'The aim…was…to deliver to citizens, consumer rights as part of a wider commitment to market rights, which would provide assurance of the quality of the services provided through government spending' (Faulks 1998, p.135). The focus of the Citizen Charter is not about strengthening social and political rights but providing citizens the rights afforded to consumers in the marketplace. In doing so, the market would help to regulate freedom of choice and voice for consumers to demand better quality services from an array of social welfare providers. For

Major, the goal is transforming citizens into consumers because it is only free market, as I discussed above, that is able to deliver real liberty to citizens.

For Blair, we can see Thatcher's legacy in terms of his focus on active citizenship and the 'rights and responsibilities' agenda in social welfare provision. Through the Third Way (similar to Clinton's New Democrat communitarian agenda in the US, which I discussed in Chapter 7) the innovations of the free market were combined with a commitment to social welfare to produce more efficient services and encourage individual self-sufficiency. This 'modernisation' of the state can be seen most clearly in Blair's model of welfare reform (which shares many features with Clinton's workfare agenda):

> The welfare system is a proud creation. But reform is essential if we are to realise our vision of a modern nation and a decent and fair society…We aim to break the cycle of dependency and insecurity and empower all citizens to lead a dignified and fulfilling life. We need a 'contract' between citizens and the state with rights and responsibilities (Department of Social Security 1998 quoted in Dwyer 2000, p.7).

It is important to briefly note that oppositional politics were not absent during this moment. As I argued in Chapter 6, from the late 1970s onwards socialist politics was in crisis in the UK, as elsewhere, and this crisis was deepened by the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Bloc from 1989 onwards. The problems with socialism were so severe that Fukuyama (1992) infamously predicted the 'end of history' with the triumph of free market capitalism and liberal democracy. Although the decline of socialism was mirrored with the strengthening of new social movements such as feminism, anti-racism, gay rights and environmentalism, these disparate and fractured movements did not prove to be an effective opposition to the popularity of Thatcherism. Thus, as I argued in Chapter 6, this moment should be seen as a time of continued reorientation and reorganisation for left-wing politics in the UK.

In terms of community development during this moment in time, we can see how the discourses are formed and structured in response to these events. The Participation discourse is constituted by the practices of neoliberal actors. As the UK (and the US) underwent a process of privatisation, other institutions such as the United Nations and the World Bank followed suit. We can see this process of liberalisation of markets and privatisation of state services most clearly in the UK with the contracting out of public services and the creation of a mixed economy for social welfare, in the World Bank's structural adjustment policies and the UN's focus on 'people-friendly markets' (Faulks 1998; Taylor et al 2000). These domestic and international institutional actors were seeking to harness the innovation of the market in order to support the self-determination and liberty of individuals. For these actors, community development is defined as a process by which consumer-citizens learn self-reliance and entrepreneurial skills by participating in the marketplace. In addition, the Participation discourse is also formed by discussions about the nature of citizenship. Since decentralisation of services and decision-making (thus reducing the size of the welfare state) is a key goal of neoliberalism, we see a renewed focus on consumer-citizen's participation where the burden of social protection is transferred to community groups. Thus the Participation discourse is constituted by the language and social practices of official actors in British central and local government and in international institutions such as the United Nations and the World Bank. I have included a number of texts from international institutions as partly constituting the Participation discourse for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the UK community development texts make direct references to the work of the World Bank and the UN as models of practice to be replicated (as in the Participation discourse) or to be opposed (as in the Transformation discourse). This internationalisation of a free market philosophy demonstrates the totalising aspects of neoliberalism that both the Participation and Transformation discourses interpellate in order to support their language and practices (Gyford 1991; Gerson 1993; Burns et al 1994; Lal 1994; UNDP 1994; Barr 1996; Faulks 1998; Taylor et al 2000).

For the Transformation discourse, the dominance of neoliberalism is also a constitutive element of the discourse. Informed by neo-Marxist, feminist and

anti-racist actors, this discourse is about re-legitimising socialism as an effective opposition to neoliberalism, by tempering it with notions of radical democracy and, to a lesser extent, the analyses of various new social movements (Popple 1994; Waddington 1994; Popple 1995; Taylor 1995; Collins and Lister 1996; Meagher and Tett 1996; Mayo 1997; Miller and Ahmad 1997; Shaw and Martin 2000). By emphasising collective forms of citizenship, these actors argue that meaningful individual freedom and participation can only be achieved when citizens ensure the social protection of others. For the Transformation discourse, community development is the process by which local people learn the duties and obligations of citizenship in terms of struggling to democratise the state and in terms of building solidarity for collective social protection. Community development is also the way in which citizens resist and subvert neoliberal practices that seek to reduce the state and privatise public life.

Following the first step of Hansen's PDA method, I outlined the key features of this politically salient moment in time. I will now, using the second and third steps of the method, move on to analyse the Participation and Transformation discourses and identities in further detail.

The Participation Discourse: Privatising Public Life
The Participation discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of official actors in international and domestic institutions seeking to reconstruct citizenship and the relationship between the state, the market and citizens. In the Participation discourse, community development is constructed a tool by which to redefine social relationships in order to reconcile citizens to the new order of marketised and privatised civic life. Through the promotion of state and private sector partnerships and the participation of local people within these structures, the Participation discourse seeks to deliver local people to these new privatised spaces in order for people to learn self-reliance, entrepreneurship and independence from the state. For instance, here is the United Nation Development Programme (1994, p.4-5) discussing the need to combine the market and state:

People should guide both the state and the market, which need to work in tandem, with people sufficiently empowered to exert a more effective influence over both…Changing markets to make them more people-friendly would start by maintaining the dynamism of markets but adding other measures that allow many more people to capitalise on the advantages that markets offer.

The Participation discourse undertakes a series of interrelated practices in order to reconstruct the role of community development. Specifically, it sets up a binary of market/state in order to highlight the inefficiencies of the state and the innovation of the market; it reconstructs citizenship away from positive social rights to negative consumer rights which correspond to the dynamism of the market; and finally it constructs private-public partnerships and participation structures as a way for newly constructed consumer-citizens to benefit from market-based principles in terms of social welfare (UNDP 1994, p.4-5; Barr 1996, p.134-48; Faulks 1998, p.132-7; Taylor et al 2000, p.29-30).

The discourse first constructs a binary of market/state in order to demonstrate the superiority of the market in delivering innovation, efficiency and effectiveness. The state is constructed as both old-fashioned and self-serving. In this new era of globalisation, the state is no longer able to competently deal with issues of social welfare on its own. The state needs the market for support. As the United Nations Development Programme (1994, p.4-5) argues:

Now that so many countries have embarked on strategies of economic liberalisation and privatisation…new partnerships are needed between the state and the market…to accommodate the rise of people's aspirations and the steady decline of the nation-state…The nation-state is now too small for the big things and too big for the small.

The state also needs the market to bring efficiency and innovation to paternalistic bureaucrats who promote the public's dependency on inefficient services as a way to justify their position:

Too often, public sector organisations seem to deliver services that were designed to suit the providers rather than the recipients….There must no longer be a hiding place for sloppy standards, lame excuses and attitudes that patronise the public (Citizen Charter Unit 1992 quoted in Faulks 1998, p.133).

In order to overcome these problems of the state, the Participation discourse focuses on the primacy of the market and its values of individual choice, competition and efficiency that can transform social welfare services:

Individuals should be able to express preference and make decisions about the services they receive from the state or in the market place. The greater the choice, the better the services would be…By making public services more like private industries, services would be rendered more effective and efficient (Faulks 1998, p.133).

Through the marginalisation of the state by constructing it as inefficient and then by establishing the primacy of the market in delivering choice and efficiency for the public, the Participation discourse is able to reconstruct notions of citizenship. Citizenship is effectively privatised in this discourse. Through the prism of the market, the public are transformed into consumers invested with marketised rights and expectations of freedom, choice and quality assurance: 'The consumer making judgements on price and quality in the shopping centre would be the contemporary symbol of economic democracy' (Gyford 1991, p.18). As the state-sponsored Community Development Foundation argues, consumerism leads to efficiency, empowerment and better democracy:

The emphasis on choice and user-run services…has been an important element in community empowerment. The continued interest in user involvement in public services along with the expansion of consumer or citizen's charters has gone some way towards redressing the balance between providers and their 'clients'. Increasingly, professional service

199

provision is seen to include responsiveness to user demand and need (Taylor et al 2000, p.29-30).

In the Participation discourse, however, consumer-citizens should not be interpreted as passive recipients of services. By expanding the opportunities for consumer choice through the mixed economy of welfare and by exercising the right to exit underperforming services, consumer-citizens can vote with their feet if the state fails to meet expectations. Thus an important part of privatised citizenship in the Participation discourse is constructing consumers as willing and able to take on the burden of service provision in order to ensure services meet local needs:

> Communities should analyse what is produced and consumed by local people and then seek to meet these needs more locally. Communities should produce for themselves what it is possible and reasonable for them to produce…If one looked at all the goods and services in a local area and tried to replace them with a community-owned or delivered systems, the amount that could be shifted to local control would be a surprisingly high percentage (ibid, p.36).

Once again, we can see the state being further marginalised as privatised consumer-citizens infused with an entrepreneurial spirit learned from the marketplace take on the role of service provider. With the relationship between the state, the market and the citizens reconstructed, public space is commodified. For the Participation discourse, the highest expression of civic virtue is individual responsibility and entrepreneurship. The link between the citizen and the state has been replaced with that of the consumer and the market and any sense of the collective obligation of citizenship has been dismantled. In this context of a marketised state and a privatised citizen, the Participation discourse redefines the role for community development.

Unlike previous moments in my analysis of the discursive history of community development in the UK, under neoliberalism, community development as a

discourse and as a set of discrete social practices is transformed. Rather than community development being focused on the redistribution of wealth and power to the working class, as in the Structuralist discourse in Chapter 4, or even the more modest and quantifiable objectives of connecting people better to the local state as in the Post-Marxist and Realist discourses of Chapter 6, community development in the Participation discourse is constructed as a process to deliver the public to various neoliberal policy processes. In other words, community development is constructed as a process in which citizens and public spaces are privatised and marketised. Through participation in public-private partnerships, community development supports the inculcation of people to marketised values of citizenship. Here are two examples of this process:

> By facilitating participation, community development supports policies for decent services and public participation in decision-making. Under compulsory competitive tendering, it has a new role in supporting community-based organisations to tender for contracts, bringing services and jobs to areas of high unemployment (Blackman 1994, p.142).

> The task for community development must be to develop new forms of production of goods, information and services, which release the potential and resources of all parts of the community…This will involve new partners in new forms of management and ownership, which provide genuine choice and whose logic flows from the user rather than the administrative demands of the provider. Often there will be scope for users to become producers (Taylor et al 2000, p.35-6).

As the above quotes demonstrate, community development is to be used as a tool for transferring the responsibility for social welfare to these newly created citizen-consumers. Controlling service provision is constructed as an empowering act in which citizen-consumers participate. However, I am sceptical of the discourse's claim that dismantling of the welfare state and universal service provision in the most efficient and effective way of tackling poverty and inequality.

In an important hegemonic practice, the Participation discourse redefines the meanings of 'partnership' and 'participation'. Rather than partnership denoting a cooperative relationship between citizens and participation meaning democratic encounters in a polis, partnership and participation are reconstructed as central features of neoliberal community development. Partnerships are marketised spaces whereby the state and citizen-consumers learn innovative practices from the private sector in order to tackle social problems. In the context of a weak state and privatised citizens, it is the process of learning from the market in terms of choice, competition and efficiency that community development is positioned:

> The possibilities exist for creative partnerships involving statutory, voluntary, private and community sectors in building a raft of…provision within a locality. Where community experience and expertise is limited, such partnerships…may be used to foster and support the emergence of healthy enterprises and minimise risks (Barr 1996, p.145).

Citizen-consumers' participation within partnerships is not so much about democracy but about building in efficiencies to service provision. It is important to note that participation is understood as a very time-limited and constrained activity that is tied to the particular partnership or service provided:

> Participation is a process by which people—especially disadvantaged people—can exercise influence over policy formation, design alternatives, investment choices, management and monitoring of development interventions in their communities…Participation is not a discrete event that may occur only at specific point in a project's history but instead may be realised over the entire lifecycle of a development project (Gerson 1993, p.5).

In this sense, participation is not a 'public good' in itself. Rather, participation is important because it allows citizen-consumers to express needs and this allows for the more efficient planning of services:

> Whilst democracy promotes liberty, it may not promote opulence, which
> depends upon an efficient market economy and which in turn does not
> require a democratic form of government for its maintenance….Mass
> participation through pressure in a democracy may harm rather than aid
> the attainment of both the ends of opulence and liberty…Thus
> [participation]…must depend upon the actual merits of each case, namely
> whether this provides the least cost mode of provision (Lal 1994, p.6).

Despite the Participation discourse's reconstruction of the nature and function of
community development, my analysis of identity constructions, using step three
of Hansen's method, demonstrates similar constructions of the Self and the Other
consistent with other moments in time I have previously analysed.

The Self in the Participation discourse is two-pronged: the Self is constructed in
terms of both policy-makers and conservative community development
practitioners. What these two distinct groups have in common is framing the
socio-economic transformation of the UK since the late 1970s as an opportunity
rather than a threat for citizen-consumers. The Self is constructed as a pragmatist
who sees the reduction in the state bureaucracy and the infusion of market-based
values as a way for opening up previously unaccountable institutions to outside
influence. The neoliberal practices of decentralisation of service provision,
compulsory competitive tendering and the mixed economy for welfare are all
ways to break down the bureaucratic paternalism of the state, make the state
more responsive to local needs and to maximise individual freedom, choice and
aspirations. Here is an interesting construction of the Self as seeking to
strengthen democracy in neoliberal community development projects:

> Placing people at the centre of political and economic change…calls for
> nothing less than revolution in our thinking…Every institution—and
> every policy action—should be judged by one critical test—how does it
> meet the genuine aspirations of the people? (UNDP 1993, p.8)

From the quote above, we can see how the Self is positioned as a democrat and how the focus is on opening up state institutions to the desires of citizen-consumers. The construction of the Self is also based on anti-elitism and populism. Because one of the tenets of neoliberalism is the maximum possible freedom for the individual, the Self is constructed as a champion of individual liberty and choice—defending these freedoms from the tyranny of the abstractions of the state and of society:

> Individual liberty is the foundation—the most important value to be protected…It is dangerous to put the needs of society…above those of any individual…The concept of society…is dismissed because it reifies something which cannot have an identity or will outside of or separate from the individuals that make it up (Faulks 1998, p.55).

Two Others are constructed in this discourse: state bureaucrats and consumer-citizens. As I have previously discussed, state bureaucrats are constructed as paternalistic and self-serving whose only interest is to maintain their own power and influence within various public sector institutions. It is only through the introduction of market principles—in terms of consumer choice, customer service and accountability—that this particular Other can be co-opted and transformed into part of the Self.

In terms of citizen-consumers as Other, as I have demonstrated in previous chapters, the public are constructed along contradictory lines. On the one hand, citizen-consumers are defined as passive objects in the Participation discourse. Despite the radical individualism of the discourse, citizen-consumers are often constructed as objects of policy and intervention rather than as subjects invested with agency. The assumption behind the construction of the people as consumers is that they are currently passive and dependent objects of the paternalistic welfare state:

> Following the Second World War, citizens became increasingly dependent upon the state to solve their problems, and this dependency rendered

citizens impotent in the performance of their responsibilities (Faulks 1998, p.127).

Thus the public need to be transformed, their capacity built, through a process of community development, into self-reliant, independent citizen-consumers who have been weaned off the nanny state. Thus, on the other hand, the Other is also constructed as latent consumers and entrepreneurs who need community development in order to transform from passive objects to active subjects:

> Community development helps to create a pool of skilled and interested local people who can become involved in public life at all levels: managing a school or a housing estate; working with government agencies to plan more sensitive services; or providing information, advice and advocacy to help services users choose the provision they need (Taylor et al 2000, p.26).

Once again, I think there is a problem here with the way the idea of agency is operationalised in the discourse. For citizen-consumers, agency is something to be mediated by and handed down from professionals. Policy makers and community development professionals are *always* constructed as possessing agency and having the power to distribute it among various Others. The public are often defined as lacking agency and thus requiring the action of the Self to transform them into competent subjects. As I have demonstrated in previous chapters, this understanding of agency inadvertently sets up hierarchical relationships between the Self and Other and this hierarchy appears to undermine the Participation discourse's claims of promoting democracy, populism and anti-elitism.

I will now, using steps two and three of Hansen's method, turn to analyse the second discourse I have identified during this politically salient moment.

The Transformation Discourse: New Directions?

The Transformation discourse is constituted by the texts, language and practices of socialist, feminist and anti-racist community development practitioners and theorists seeking to subvert the dominant neoliberal approaches to community development, citizenship and the state. I have chosen 'Transformation' to describe this discourse because it signals a change in the language of radicalism within community development. Rather than community development focusing on revolution or the redistribution of wealth, it is constructed as a way in which local people develop 'critical consciousness' in order to resist neoliberal practices and transform the practice of democracy in the UK:

> The real challenge, and in sharp contrast to the current emphasis on consumer feedback, is the extent to which [community development] can play a role in the repoliticisation of public life within civil society. There is a growing need for the creation of public fora at local, city and regional levels where the focus is on both the politics of everyday life and the management and organisation of the social world (Miller and Ahmad 1997, p.280).

Three key concepts are central to Transformation discourse: citizenship, participation and public space; I will discuss each of these in turn. Firstly, rather than citizenship being defined as consumerism and individualism as we have seen the in the Participation discourse, the Transformation discourse focuses on re-establishing the relationship between citizenship, social welfare and collectivism. The discourse operationalises an expansive idea of citizenship: the focus is on promoting the civil, political and social rights and duties of an individual in a democratic polis. Citizenship is the combination of participation and decision-making about the common good, the collective right to social welfare and the duty to ensure the collective provision of social protection. According to the Transformation discourse, this proactive, positive and collective construction of citizenship is the only way to ensure that people are able to practice their rights and duties in a democracy. A collective sense of citizenship is the only way people have the freedom to participate in public life:

Education for citizenship means...the nurturing of a capacity and willingness to question, to probe…to see through obfuscation and lies…The cultivation of an awareness that the quest for individual fulfilment needs to be combined with the larger demands of solidarity and concern for the public good (Miliband 1994, p.34).

This focus on citizenship as the practice and fulfilment of rights links to the next key concept of the Transformation discourse. Participation is the practice of citizenship in public spaces. Recalling the symbolism of ancient Greece, participation is constructed as citizen engagement in the agora. Thus in opposition to the idea of participation as tied to a particular development project as seen the Participation discourse, the Transformation discourse's oppositional construction of participation is a much broader conceit. Here are Shaw and Martin (2000, p.409) outlining their view of participation:

The politics of the state now needs to be reconstructed in ways which strengthen civil society and political life both outside and inside the state…The democratic state needs civil society…it is in civil society that people learn to be the active citizens they become in the democratic state…Consequently, it in the relationship between civil society and the state the process of reconstructing citizenship and democracy must begin.

Participation is a two pronged process by which people learn to become citizens and it is also the way in which the state is democratised. Because the Transformation discourse is about opposing the privatisation of citizenship and the state, it seeks to redefine citizenship and the practices of citizens in order to democratise the relationship of and spaces between citizens, the state and the market. Here is Taylor (1995, p.107) discussing this point:

People's lives have been privatised. Many things which used to be done collectively can or have to be done individually…There seems less need for any kind of public or even collective involvement…Ways must be found to engage people and convince them that there is a point in making

a commitment to a public sphere which they feel has failed them or is simply seen as irrelevant in a consumerist age.

The normative value that the Transformation discourse attaches to participation is directly linked to the discourse's emphasis on public space. By opposing the privatisation of the state and citizenship, the discourse constructs public space as the site of democratic social relations between citizens and between citizens and the state. Public space is about the ways citizens' voices are heard, how much power they have and how decisions about the common good are made:

> The very notion of citizenship implies the polis, the city, the community, the collective realm, where the performance of obligations, both 'private' and 'public' derives from participation in a political community. It is a two-way relationship and the concept of citizenship has an inextricable connection with the notion of democracy (Waddington 1994, p.10).

With participation and public space constructed in relation to the practice of democracy, public-private partnerships (which I discussed in relation to the Participation discourse) are a problematic concept within the Transformation discourse. On the one hand, partnerships are constructed as potentially influential and democratic spaces whereby local people are able to participate in decisions that affect their lives. 'There are examples of partnerships which have been…part of strategies to tackle paternalism, to empower service users and carers and to reinforce and develop collective approaches to social solidarity and reciprocity' (Mayo 1997, p.8). On the other hand, partnerships can be mechanisms to deliver citizens to neoliberal agendas: 'Participation and partnership were simple euphemisms used to mask the unpleasant realities involved in securing the compliance of community organisations with an externally-imposed agenda' (Collins and Lister 1996, p.38).

Because the language and practices of community development are being colonised by the neoliberal Participation discourse, the Transformation discourse seeks to position community development in such a way as to effectively subvert

both the linguistic and practice-based co-optation of community development. 'Community development can be deployed to diminish the ability of a community to sustain its own voice in the harsh socio-political environment of the 1990s' (Collins and Lister 1996, p.42). In a similar way to the Structural discourse of 1968, the Transformation discourse constructs community development as a process of democratisation in which citizens develop critical consciousness to oppose the hegemonic practices of the marketised state. Here are two examples of this construction of critical consciousness:

> Community workers should not be afraid of looking at ways in which to introduce alternative views and political ideas to the community work process…The development of critical consciousness together with opportunities for activists to synthesise their experiences should be crucial elements in a contemporary radical practice (Cooke 1996, p.21).

> [Community workers should] help people reflect on the contradictions between their everyday lived experience of oppression and the prevailing ideology rather than just accepting the world as it is…This process of praxis based on critical reflection and action enables the community worker…to develop critical dialogue [with groups] which challenge pessimistic and fatalistic thinking about how the world works (Meagher and Tett 1996, p.129).

'Critical consciousness', 'critical dialogue' and 'critical reflection' are important patterns in the language of the Transformation discourse. The discourse appears to be interpellating the earlier Structuralist discourse and its practices of overcoming false consciousness among the working class. The Transformation discourse does not use the term 'false consciousness', but because the discourse does construct community development as a way to foster the critical consciousness of citizens—the need for people to look beyond common sense understandings of the world and understand how they are being co-opted into the undemocratic processes of neoliberalism—I think this amounts to the same practices. Indeed it is during this moment in time that Freire (1970) and Gramsci

(1980) re-enter the language of community development and their ideas are incorporated into the Transformation discourse. Here are two examples:

> Gramsci provides us with an understanding of the key concepts of hegemony, ideology and the role of intellectuals, while Freire has developed the notion of 'conscientization' and the use of particular educational methods to help people to perceive, interpret, criticise and finally transform the world around them (Popple 1994, p.25).

> Freire's view is that in struggling to change their world people also change their understanding of their world. In turn this changes the types of change which they seek and the ways in which they seek it (Collins and Lister 1996, p.32).

As the above quotes demonstrate, the Transformation discourse seeks to position community development as a linguistic and psychological process in which citizens are 'decolonised' in their thinking and actions through critiques of the 'dominant ideology'.

Using Hansen's third step of her PDA method, I will now turn to analyse identity constructions in the Transformation discourse. The Self in this discourse is almost a mirror image to the professional Gramscian organic intellectual Self in the Structuralist discourse that I discussed in Chapter 4. Whilst the Self in the Transformation discourse is not constructed to foment revolution among the working class, the Self is constructed as an educator and facilitator of critical dialogue and action among community groups in order to transform neoliberal political and economic structures. Here are two examples of the Self as a professional facilitator of dialogue and action:

> Progressive community work is a liberating force that recognises the inherent contradictions in capitalism while providing a practice that centres on developing a critical dialogue and increasing political consciousness…Community work…is engaged in liberating the minds

210

and encouraging and supporting the actions of the disadvantaged (Popple 1994, p.33-4).

If the development of a political analysis amongst those with whom we work is still the principal aim of radical community work…[this] can only be achieved by the introduction of systematic reflection and more structured educational opportunities within the community work process (Cooke 1996, p.20).

Despite the construction of the Self as a facilitator of critical consciousness—the discourse is fractured in its constructions of the Other. In some texts, the discourse continues the pattern of hierarchical identities between the Self/Other; whilst in other texts, we are starting to see the breakdown of this binary. Here are two indicative examples of the contradictory construction of the Other:

In a globalising economy it is not uncommon to feel powerless to influence or respond to key decisions that fundamentally effect our current and future lives…Consequently there is no doubt in our minds that there is much that needs to be done to enable people to regain or experience some sense of self-confidence and self-worth (Miller and Ahmad 1997, p.277-8).

New forms of service provision and production are required which not only release resources…but also change the power relationship between producer and user, recognising that service users are producers of their own welfare and not passive recipients (Taylor 1995, p.109).

From the first quote we can see how citizens are constructed as passive and powerless and need community development to order to provide them with agency. In the second quote, the public are also constructed as competent and active subjects in relation to the state and social welfare professionals.

In addition to the above contradictory constructions, the Other is no longer constructed as homogenous—issues of race, gender, disability and sexuality now influence the Transformation discourse's construction of citizens. Here are two examples:

> Instead of having a unitary view of the working class which is based on an outdated view of white, male, workers engaged in heavy, manual work, the emphasis needs to be on the way in which class position is mediated by geographical location, sexuality, age, race and gender (Meagher and Tett 1996, p.131).

> A more refined or detailed analysis of social categories is needed. Too often community development has been prepared to accept very loose generalisations…A key task is to create more opportunities for the poor and non-poor to come together to identify common interests, find ways to address internal differences and conflicts (Miller and Ahmad 1997, p.281).

This is an important transformation in the structure of the discourse in the UK context. Finally, the public are constructed as raced, classed and gendered and difference is beginning to be recognised in the British community development tradition.

Conclusions

This chapter has focused on the context, formation and structure of two competing community development discourses during the 1992 to 1997 politically salient moment in the UK. I first discussed Thatcher's legacy and demonstrated how her views on citizenship, the state and the market exerted a powerful influence on the politics and policy priorities of both the Major and Blair governments. I then moved on to discuss how Thatcher's neoliberal ideas influenced the formation and structure of the community development discourses during this moment in time. As I have demonstrated, community development is constituted by neoliberalism and its practices of dismantling the welfare state, promoting individualism and privatising public life. The

Participation discourse constructs community development as a process by which to deliver consumer-citizens to state policy processes in order to inculcate them with the values and practices of the free market. In doing so, consumer-citizens learn self-reliance, self-determination and experience radical liberty in order to make free choices about their lives. In opposition to this, the Transformation discourse constructs community development as the process by which the public learn to practice a new form of collective citizenship which focuses on building public spaces for radical democratic practices and which support the obligation for collective forms of social protection as mediated by a newly responsive and democratic state.

The Participation and Transformation discourses continue the pattern of constructing questionable identity constructions for local people. In the UK context in particular, the way in which agency is operationalised, in terms of it being controlled and mediated by professionals in order to benefit local people, reinforces rather than breaks down hierarchical identity constructions for the Self and the Other. However, during this moment, we also see the emergence of different ways of representing the Other. For the Transformation discourse, the Other is also constructed as an active agent and is recognised as heterogeneous in terms of race, class, gender, disability and sexuality. This is an important expansion in the category of the Other especially because in the UK context, the discourses, up to this moment, have not effectively recognised difference or constructed the Other as possessing agency. This transformation in the construction of the Other echoes the developments I have charted in the US context especially in relation to the democratic identity constructions constituted by anti-racist feminisms.

This is the final empirical chapter of my comparative community development discourse analysis. Over six chapters using Hansen's post-structuralist discourse analysis method, I have explored the formation, structure and operation of American and British community development discourses dating from 1968 to 1997. I will now turn to my conclusion where I shall summarise my key findings,

discuss my original contribution to knowledge and explore the implications of my study for the field of community development.

Conclusion: Towards a Participatory, Democratic, Anti-Racist and Feminist Community Development Discourse

I began my research project by asking this question: What are the dominant discourses of American and British community development and what influence do these discourses have on the constitution of identities for those individuals and groups participating in a community development process? The aim of my research was to understand community development as a *discursive field of knowledge* and explore how dominant discourses influence the identity constructions of subjects in a given community development activity. By using Hansen's (2006) post-structuralist discourse analysis methodology and method, I was able to analyse the discourses and identities of community development through the systematic selection and analysis of key community development texts. In this final chapter of my thesis, I will discuss the extent to which I have answered my research question and fulfilled the aims of my project, I will outline the key findings of my research in relation to contemporary texts on community development and I shall conclude with a brief discussion about my future research plans in relation to my project.

By contextualising community development discourses in three different politically salient moments, by mapping the conceptual and linguistic patterns in texts and by analysing the constitution of subject positions, I was able to fulfil the aim of my research project. Over six chapters, I have demonstrated and evidenced the formation, structure, antagonisms, dominations and silences of fourteen interconnected discourses dating from 1968 to 1997 operating in either the US or the UK. I answered my research question by charting how problematic discourses and identities that reproduce inequality and disrespect have become dominant within community development and have, at times, marginalised competing discourses that seek to construct non-hierarchical and democratic identities and social practices.

In Chapters 3 and 4, I demonstrated two important aspects of the discourses of community development. In Chapter 3 in the US context, I showed how the Democracy discourse and its attendant identity constructions were marginalised by proponents of the Power and Poverty discourses. As a consequence of this marginalisation, the Democracy discourse's attempts to breakdown the community organiser/local people binary was silenced in the community development discursive repertoire. In its place, hierarchical identity constructions became dominant thereby investing either the 'radical' activist or 'technical' professional with agency and constructing African Americans/poor people/the masses/ordinary people as passive objects. This process of constructing the community development activist or practitioner with agency and constructing ordinary people as passive, sets an important precedent for subsequent American community development discourses.

In Chapter 4 in the UK, I explored how ostensibly rival discourses— Rationalist and Structuralist—shared many patterns in their repertoires, identity constructions and social practices. Both the Rationalist and Structuralist discourses invested agency in the state and in state actors such as community development professionals. As a result, this created hierarchical identity constructions whereby the state and state actors dominate the 'working class'. Similar to my findings in Chapter 3, the working class was constructed as passive and overwhelmed by rapid technological and social changes. This pattern in identity constructions is also reproduced in subsequent British community development discourses.

In Chapter 5 I explored how, in the context of the ascendancy of the New Right, New Left identities and discourses (such as the Democracy discourse) moved further out of fashion. Both the Populist and Partnership discourses sought to distance themselves from 1960s-style radicalism and instead focused on non-contentious 'majoritarian' issues or adopted New Right ideas and social practices, respectively. As I argued in Chapter 3, the similar hierarchical identity constructions are reproduced in both of these discourses in which the community development organiser or professional is invested with agency

whilst the people/the poor are constructed as passive objects. The oppositional Empowerment discourse, however, also emerged during this moment. This discourse appears to be an inheritor of the Democracy discourse in that its practices of equalising social relations between the professional and local people and the focus on creating democratic spaces for the equal participation of everyone is very similar to social practices of the Democracy discourse in 1968. Although not completely marginalised like the Democracy discourse, the Empowerment discourse did not appear to be as influential as the Populist and Partnership discourses during this moment in the US.

In Chapter 6 I showed how, in the context of a crisis in Marxism, the Post-Marxist and Realist discourses sought to reconstitute themselves. Similar to my argument in Chapter 4, two seemingly rival discourses share comparable discursive patterns in terms of identity constructions. For both the 'radical' Post-Marxist discourse and the 'conservative' Realist discourse, the professional is constructed as an active subject whilst the working class are constructed as a passive object. Interestingly, unlike in the US during this moment, no discourse emerges in the UK to oppose these identity constructions. As I argued in Chapter 4, this appears to be because of the way in which the state dominates and preoccupies constructions of the community development professional in the UK.

In Chapter 7 in the US context, I explored how the Revitalisation discourse was the inheritor of the Partnership discourse and continued the pattern of replicating the New Right's social practices in terms of free market capitalist development. I also showed how the Revitalisation discourse reproduced the same hierarchical identity constructions from both 1968 and 1979. In contrast to the Revitalisation discourse, the Coalition discourse reproduced the language and social practices of the Democracy and Empowerment discourses. Through its constructions of non-hierarchal identities and a focus on creating spaces for participation, the Coalition discourse sought to create new forms of democracy by building coalitions based on difference. As I argued in Chapter 5, it appears that when a community development discourse draws on the language and ideas

of anti-racist feminisms, the discourse is able to avoid problematic identity constructions.

In Chapter 8 I discussed the emerging dissimilarity between the Participation and Transformation discourses. The Participation discourse, like the Partnership discourse in the US, is focused on constructing community development as a process of free-market capitalist development. This discourse does not deviate from the established pattern of constructing unequal identity constructions between professionals and consumer-citizens. Although the Transformation discourse does, in part, reproduce hierarchical identities, the public, for the first time in the UK context, are invested with agency and are also recognised as possessing different identities in terms of race, class, gender, disability and sexuality. This new and important way of constructing the public in the British community development tradition, echoes the linguistic patterns of the American Coalition discourse during this politically salient moment.

Applying Hansen's PDA methodology helped me approach fairly well known data—the community development texts—in a new way. Instead of focusing only on controversies in texts, such as contested definitions of community development, my analysis prioritised the nature of identity constructions in different community development discourses. Focusing on identity was a powerful and innovative way of approaching my data because I was able to explore how community development professionals and local people are subjects of and subjected by discourse. As a consequence of operationalising Hansen's methodology and method, I was able to problematise the basic assumptions that give impetus to the theory and practice of community development.

In addition, by comparing American and British discourses, I was able to systematise my analysis of community development. Through my comparative analysis I could understand important similarities and contrasts in the particular Anglo-American tradition of community development. For example, in relation to my key arguments about identity constructions, I was able to chart similar patterns in the discourses on either side of the Atlantic that pointed to problems

rooted in the language of community development especially in terms of how the subject positions of 'the professional' and 'local people' are constituted. I was also able to highlight interesting divergences in the process of identity construction especially in relation to the state. In the UK, the state is influential in determining available identities in community development discourses. It is only when the state is partly dismantled in the 1980s that new spaces are created for different kinds of identities to take shape. Whilst in the US, in the context of a comparatively weak state, this creates different possibilities for the creation of subject positions. Indeed, the space for different types of identity constructions has been available since at least the 1960s—especially in relation to participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms—and this appears to be partly due to the absence of both a strong state and a popular socialist movement.

I will now turn to discuss my key findings and my original contribution to knowledge in relation to contemporary community development theory.

Based on my analysis, it seems that community development is embedded with a number of a priori assumptions, conventions and myths that perhaps distract from a more considered discussion of identity and related social practices. In more recent texts, it is taken for granted that contemporary community development is an emancipatory process in which the interests of local people are championed. For example, Pitchford (2008, p.32-3) frames community development in this unproblematic way:

> I can see that community development is a process [of] achieving change within and for communities to problems that they themselves identify…[It] is focused on changes that will be about achieving greater equality, justice and respect.

Here is Bunyan (2010, p.125) using the usual binary of radical/conservative to demonstrate that radical and conflict-orientated models serve the 'authentic' interests of the poor:

While partnership and consensus amongst professionals about how the needs of people are best served, may constitute a legitimate goal or aim, in the contested arena of public action, the interests of the poor and those who lack power are best served when power is developed to the extent that the potential and possibility for conflict exists.

From the above quotes we can see how both Pitchford and Bunyan—although drawing on very different models community development—are concerned with reproducing the idea that community development always serves the interests of the disenfranchised. More considered discussions of subject positions do not seem to have been taken into account.

It is also assumed that community development practitioners are always positioned on the side of and work in the interest of the 'marginalised' (Emejulu 2006; Shaw 2008). As Hoggett, Mayo and Miller (2009, p.32-3) suggest:

[R]unning through the veins of community development is a strong association with an anti-professional position…The practitioner is often in the paradoxical position of challenging but also representing "the authorities", while also being someone who works to enable others to take up their own authority.

While discussing the importance of reflexivity and reflective practice, here is Ledwith and Springett (2010, p.166-7) making an important point about recognising difference whilst at the same time avoiding the issue of problematising the presumption of a positive relationship between the professional and local people:

When considering our own power as practitioners, it is important to heed…warnings of the dangers when we use our authority to speak for marginalised people without an analysis of difference and diversity…Attempts to universalise theories of oppression have obscured

the hegemony of White, middle-class males and silenced the voices of others, relegating difference to the margins.

Finally, here is Dreier (2005, p.2) also working on the assumption that practitioners are always on the side of the people:

> Basic arithmetic tells us that the poor alone don't constitute a majority in any city, state, or congressional district, so that any effective organising requires allies who are not poor. Even so, one of the most important roles for progressives is to organize the poor to speak and advocate for themselves, so that they are at the political table and able to bargain and negotiate for their own concerns.

Each of the quotes I have highlighted above represents a snapshot of contemporary writing about the theory and practice of community development. I do not necessarily disagree with the arguments or the political analyses made by the authors about the importance of community development. However, what I take issue with and what my research has continually demonstrated, is how the identities that are generated by a given community development process are not sufficiently analysed by contemporary authors. It is asserted that practitioners will always work in the best interests of the marginalised (by using the author's preferred practice method) but this dominant way of positioning the professional in relation to the people is neither adequately explored nor justified. The positive role of community development in the lives of the public and unproblematic position that practitioners occupy in the community development process is reified.

My discourse analysis has repeatedly problematised this grand narrative of community development. Rather than community development being a transformative process of progressive social change, oftentimes it is a process of professionals subjecting local people to patronising and undemocratic ideas, language and practices. I think that many contemporary theorists and practitioners have been looking in the wrong direction when they critique a

given community development praxis and propose a new approach (for example see: Henderson and Thomas 2000; Ledwith 2005; Dominelli 2006; Butcher et al 2007; Shaw 2008; Defilipis, Fisher and Shragge 2009). From my analysis of texts, it seems that these theorists and practitioners have been over-concerned with the promotion of a right and proper definition of key concepts (such as 'community development', 'the community', 'power') and arguing for prescriptions for community development success. However, they have neglected the construction of identities and the attendant social practices that they unintentionally reproduce. For example, Defilipis, Fisher and Shragge (2009, p.49-50) in their discussions of 'what works' in community development, frame the discussion like this:

> Going beyond the local is a central aspect in the struggle for social and economic justice…Community organisations need to look beyond the local and incorporate a political and social analysis of the wider political economy into their day-to-day work.

Whilst this prescription of practice wisdom might be correct, the problem in this text, similar to the other contemporary texts, is that identity constructions have not been sufficiently analysed. The focus of many contemporary texts, as I have detailed above, is about asserting the legitimacy of community development as a practice for working with marginalised groups. Here is Ledwith (2007, p.3) arguing this case:

> Community development has always had a radical agenda...By this, I mean that our practice is inspired by a vision of social and environmental justice. It is fundamentally committed to bring about social change which contributes to this end. So, our practice starts in people's everyday lives.

However, as I have repeatedly demonstrated throughout my research, community development appears to be predicated on problematic subject positions. The professional or radical activist Self is invested with agency whilst the local people Other is constructed as a passive and oftentimes incorrigible

222

object to be acted upon by the Self. The reason why these identity constructions dominate the discourses seems to hinge on a particular way in which agency is operationalised by the majority of community development discourses. Agency is objectified by most of the discourses. What I mean is that agency is understood as a possession that can be given or taken away from people. Using the idea of agency in this way means that groups can be easily catergorised as possessing or lacking the ability to control their lives. As a result, community development is defined as the process of professionals mediating, regulating and controlling other people's development of agency. This approach can of course be justified in a number of different ways in terms of building confidence, teaching new skills and building the capacity for collective action for marginalised groups. The problem I find with this approach is that it is based on questionable normative assumptions about the different subject positions professionals and local people occupy. In the majority of the discourses I analysed, professionals always possess agency whilst local people always lack agency. The discourses give various reasons why local people lack agency: it may be rooted in structural discrimination or it could be the result of pathological individual failings. That professionals appear to inherently possess the ability to act is never questioned in the discourses and this is very troubling for a field of practice that proclaims its fundamental orientation to social justice. Based on my analysis, I think that by using the idea of agency in this way, the discourses unintentionally create a democratic deficit in the community development process. By defining local people as deficient—for whatever political justification—creates a hierarchical and unequal relationship between local people and professionals. The result is that local people can never truly have power, be in control or determine their fate unless they first surrender themselves to outside intervention. For the majority of discourses to justify their praxes, local people must be problematised in this way and professionals must take a lead role in the community development process.

That this binary construction of professional/local people exists and persists from 1968 to 1997 in both the US and the UK and that this binary is evident in various antagonistic discourses that span left-wing and right-wing political

223

thought is very troubling. This is my first research finding and my original contribution to knowledge in the sense that the persistence of problematic binaries in community development undermines the main assumptions and founding myths on which community development is based. According to my analysis, the majority of community development discourses do not seem to be able to support and facilitate the agency of local people; nor do they seem able to construct local people based on respect and equality in relation to the Self. Community development, in many ways, can be seen as an oppressive social practice of imposing undemocratic and disrespectful identities and relationships onto local people—in the name of the self-determination of these very people.

For my second significant research finding, I repeatedly demonstrated that the only community development discourses that appear to construct local people as active agents and authors of their lives, that attempt to facilitate the agency of local people and that aim to break down the suspect Self/Other binary embedded in community development is that of participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms which I discussed in Chapters 3, 5, 7 and 8. My thinking and analysis about community development throughout this research project has been heavily influenced and deeply affected by my research into Ella Baker, the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Democracy discourse which I analysed in Chapter 3.

The assumption underpinning the Democracy discourse is that local people have the knowledge, skills and capacity to deliberate and take action on issues that are important to them. In this discourse, it is not that local people lack agency and thus need to be 'developed' or their 'capacity built' by organisers; it is that organisers need to create a space for deliberation by local people and help facilitate the action of local leadership. It is in the Democracy discourse where the promise of community development seems to be realised in two important ways. Firstly, the Democracy discourse and its social practices seem to solve the vexed problem within community development about the balance between process and outcome in grassroots work. The discourse structures both process and outcome as equally important—the path a group takes to reach its goal is of equal

importance as the goal itself. This way of representing the dual nature of community development is crucial because it sets up important identity constructions between the Self and the Other. Secondly, because both process and outcome are important, this means that community development is constituted as a process of creating democratic spaces for debate and deliberation which is in turn a learning process for becoming a leader. The Self does not act upon an objectified Other in this discourse. Rather, the process of community development seeks to displace the binary of Self/Other—community organiser/local people—and instead subsume the Self into the Other (or vice versa) by not distinguishing between 'organiser' and 'local leaders'. In other words, the goal of community development in the Democracy discourse is to build a democratic civil society in which all citizens are constituted as leaders who have the ability tackle issues that are important to them.

In the Empowerment, Coalition and (to a much more limited extent) Transformation discourses in the 1980s and 1990s, we see the same discursive patterns. The three discourses focus on democratic spaces for the participation and deliberation of the most marginalised. What the Democracy, Empowerment, Coalition and Transformation discourses share is a focus on the need for the democratisation of public space. The assumption driving each of these discourses is that equal access to public space and public participation are crucial for a well functioning democracy, but there are significant barriers to public space that prevent equal access to it. Thus, for the four discourses, it is the nature of public space—and not the agency of local people—that is problematised. This focus on the problems of public space is echoed in contemporary feminist texts and seek build the influence of marginalised groups by attempting to transform the norms and values that shape participation in the public sphere (Squires 2008; Emejulu and Bassel 2008; Bagihole 2009).

Given my analysis, it seems to me that the task for community development is to reconstruct its language and social practices so that its identity constructions better align with those reproduced by the Democracy discourse and those anti-racist feminist community development discourses which echo the Democracy

discourse's identity constructions. It is ironic, of course, that the discourse I endorse is the one that occupies a marginal position in contemporary community development (for example see: Dominelli 2006 and Emejulu forthcoming 2011). However for community development to be strengthened, it needs to take seriously the challenge and opportunity of the Democracy discourse and the related social practices of anti-racist feminisms. For community development to be an emancipatory process and discourse it needs to construct relational identities between professionals and local people based on equality and respect. Part of this task is about reconceptualising the nature of the Self and the Other. As my analysis and interpretation of the Democracy and anti-racist feminist community development discourses has shown, these discourses attempt to subsume the Other into the Self (or vice versa) by avoiding clear distinctions between the identity of the 'professional' and that of 'local people'. In short, the Democracy and anti-racist feminist community development discourses attempt to deconstruct, displace and decentre the dominant binary construction of professional/local people in community development. These discourses then attempt to construct a new binary of us/them: those professionals, institutional actors or local people who do not value participatory, democratic, anti-racist and feminist approaches to community development are in turn othered.

Displacing the Self/Other professional/local people binary is a significant challenge to dominant approaches to community development for a number of reasons. Firstly, community development must take seriously the challenge of redefining its core constitutive concept of 'radicalism'. As I have shown throughout my thesis, radicalism appears to be a valueless concept in the discursive repertoire of community development because all of the self-described 'radical' discourses (with the exception of those related to participatory democracy and anti-racist feminisms) perpetuate questionable and rather conservative views regarding the agency of local people. Radicals in the community development context appear to me to be misguided because they construct local people as needing to be enlightened by a self-appointed elite. Viewing local people as under-developed does not strike me as particularly revolutionary or emancipatory. In fact, it seems to continue the long tradition of

elitism in political struggles. By reframing radicalism from a posture to a practical political project of building democratic spaces for deliberative decision-making and action for all groups is the first step to displacing the hierarchical binary of Self/Other.

Secondly, many community development practitioners cannot claim a form of essentialised 'solidarity' with local people in the way that many anti-racist feminists attempt to do through the shared experience of marginalisation through gender, ethnicity and 'race'[8]. Nevertheless, by focusing on constructing a 'leadership' identity in which the hierarchy between the Self/Other is challenged (which we have seen in the Democracy discourse) may help to overcome this problem. By focusing on constructing democratic spaces and then constituting the relationship between the Self and Other as one derived from a shared subject position of leadership and agency can help to displace this binary.

Thirdly, part of the identity of a 'professional' is to be an authority who has access to exclusive knowledge and belongs to a closed group who protects this knowledge. Thus to displace the binary requires a fundamental redefinition of what it means to be a 'professional' in a community development discursive field of knowledge. Several authors have already considered this issue (for example see: Dominelli 2006; Butcher et al 2007; Hoggett, Mayo and Miller 2009; Ledwith and Springett 2010). However, I think this debate about professionalism needs to be supplemented with a discussion of the values that are ascribed to particular subject positions within a community development discursive field of knowledge.

Finally, further empirical and theoretical work needs to take place in order for community development to have the ability to recognise the Other and thus construct local people in equal, respectful and democratic ways. Indeed, as I

---

[8] It is important to note that I am not advocating for essentialised identities here. A key weakness in the anti-racist feminist community development discourses, which I argued in my analysis, is the tendency to reify 'women' and 'minority groups' for the sake of solidarity purposes. If community development chooses to adopt the practices of anti-racist feminist discourses it will need to avoid this practice.

pointed out in my analysis, the fixation that community development has with constructing the Self to the detriment of the Other is surprising. Given that the aim of community development is to support the empowerment of excluded groups it is strange that empirical and interpretive accounts of both exclusion and activism do not feature as prominently as they should in community development texts. Local people themselves need to be directly involved in this process of identity construction. Thus, through a joint process of challenging the subject positions ascribed by community development, by creating democratic spaces for the equal participation of everyone and by analysing how power circulates through this discursive field of knowledge, professionals and local people can reconstruct the theory and practice of community development.

Displacing the Self/Other binary by reconstructing the dominant identities is a major challenge to community development. Indeed, I would like to take my work forward by seeking to theorise further about how community development can replicate the identity constructions of participatory democratic and anti-racist feminist community development discourses—especially in terms of avoiding the reification of local people whilst at the same time building equal and respectful reciprocal relationships with them. One possible path is that set out by Barack Obama's 2008 Presidential campaign. The discourse of the campaign constructs specific identities of both Obama and the public which (re)produce a collective mood for change. By constructing the public (rather than the campaign) as active agents for change, the Obama campaign helped to fuel the desire and social practices for change in the political establishment (for a more detailed discussion see Emejulu 2009). I would also like to take my research forward by re-theorising the idea of agency in a community development context. Using the work of de Beauvoir (1997) and her analysis of the denial and reclamation of woman's Selfhood will be an important first step in helping me rework the dominant community development paradigm of objectifying agency. Drawing on the work of Butler (1990), Gardiner (1994) and Benhabib (1999) can also help me re-analyse the types of identities community development constitute and support my wider project of reconstructing a socially situated and democratic Self in political activist spaces.

228

In conclusion, this research has challenged the hegemonic interpretations of community development in a number of different ways. By seeking to understand the influence of the dominant discourses of community development I have problematised the shared myths and assumptions on which community development is predicated. According to my analysis, more often than not, community development is a questionable activity in which to engage in terms of its subjection of the professional Self and the local people Other. Rather than being a radical and transformative process of progressive social change, most discourses unintentionally construct it as an oppressive process that robs local people of agency and invests action in the professional. With the exception of the Democracy discourse and related anti-racist feminist discourses which seek to displace the Self/Other binary by subsuming the Self into the Other, few discourses deviate from the dominant constructions of problematic identities. In my journey in thinking and theorising about community development, I contend that for community development to effectively address these problems in its language, practitioners, theorists and local people will need to treat seriously the challenge of identity construction and consider how community development can be transformed into a practice which is based on democracy, equality and respect.

Bibliography

Ackelsberg, M. (1988) 'Communities, resistance, and women's activism: Some implications for a democratic policy' in Bookman, A. and Morgen, S. (eds) (1988) *Women and the Politics of Empowerment.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Alinsky, S.D. (1989 [1946]) *Reveille for Radicals*. New York: Vintage.

Alinsky, S.D. (1971) *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*. New York: Vintage.

Althusser, L. (1970) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' in Althusser, L. (1970) *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays.* London: New Left Books.

Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D. and Potter, J.A. (2004) 'Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings'. *Discourse Analysis Online*. Extracted from the Internet on 6/3/09 http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a1/antaki2002002-t.html

Amin, A. (ed) (1994) *Post-Fordism: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Baine, S. (1974) 'The political community' in Jones, D. and Mayo, M. (eds.) (1974) *Community Work One*. London: Routledge.

Bagilhole, B. (2009) *Understanding Equal Opportunities and Diversity: The Social Differentations and Intersections of Inequality*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Baker, E. (1960) 'Bigger than a Hamburger' in *The Southern Patriot*. Extracted from the Internet on 3/12/07 http://www.crmvet.org/docs/sncc2.htm

Baker, E. (1972) 'Developing community leadership', in Lerner, G. (1972) *Black Women in White America: A Documentary History.* New York: Vintage.

Barthes, R. (1993) *Mythologies*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Barr, A. (1991) *Practising Community Development: Experience in Strathclyde*. London: Community Development Foundation.

Baxter, J. (2002) 'Competing discourses in the classroom: A post-structuralist analysis of girls' and boys' speech in public contexts.' *Discourse & Society*, 13(6), pp.827-842.

Belsey, C. (2002) *Post-structuralism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benhabib, S. (1999) *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. London: Polity Press.

Berndt, H.E. (1977) *The New Rulers of the Ghetto: The Community Development Corporation and Urban Poverty.* Westport: Greenwood.

Billig, M. (1999) 'Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis', *Discourse & Society*, 10, pp.543-558.

Billig, M. (1999) 'Conversation analysis and the claims of naivete.' *Discourse & Society* 10, pp.572-576.

Blackman, T. (1994) *Urban Policy in Practice.* London: Routledge.

Blagg, H. and Derricourt, N. (1982) 'Why we need to reconstruct a theory of the state for community work' in Craig, G., Derricourt, N. and Loney, M. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and the State: Towards a Radical practice.* London: Routledge.

Block, F., Cloward, R.A. and Ehrenreich, B. (1987) *The Mean Season: The Attack on the Welfare State.* New York: Pantheon.

Bookman, A. and Morgen, S. (eds) (1988) *Women and the Politics of Empowerment.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Boyte, H. (1980) *The Backyard Revolution.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Boyte, H. (1985) 'The politics of community', *The Nation.* Extracted from the Internet on 9/9/08 http://live.thenation.com/archive/detail/10977885

Boyte, H., Booth, H. and Max, S. (1986) *Citizen Action and the New American Populism.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bradshaw, C., Soifer, S. and Gutierrez, L. (1994) 'Toward a hybrid model for effective organizing in communities of color', *Journal of Community Practice*, 1(1), pp.25-56.

Brager, G. and Specht, H. (1973) *Community Organisation.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Brandwein, R. A. (1987) 'Women and community organization' in Burden, D.S. and Gottlieb, N. (eds) (1987) *The Woman Client.* New York: Tavistock.

Burkett, I. (2001) 'Traversing the swampy terrain of postmodern communities: Towards theoretical revisionings of community development' *European Journal of Social Work*, 4(3), pp.233-246.

Burman, E. and Parker, I. (eds) (1993) *Discourse Analytic Research.* London: Routledge.

Burns, D., Hambleton, R. and Hoggett, P. (1994) *The Politics of Decentralization: Revitalising Local Democracy.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Butcher, H., Banks, S., Henderson, P. and Robertson, J. (2007) *Critical Community Practice*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble.* London: Routledge.

Bunyan, P. (2010) 'Broad-based organizing in the UK: Reasserting the centrality of political activity in community development', *Community Development Journal*, 45, pp.111-127.

Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (1968) *Community Work and Social Change: The Report of a Study Group on Training.* London: Longmans.

Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (1973) *Current Issues in Community Work. A Study by the Community Work Group*. London: Routledge

Carapic, A. (2007) Book Review of Lene Hansen (2006) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge. *Discourse & Society*, 18(5), pp.675-677.

Carmichael, S. and Hamilton, C.V. (1967) *Black Power*. London: Penguin.

Carson, C. (1995) *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Chambers, E.T. (2003) *Roots for Radicals: Organizing for Power, Action, and Justice.* New York: Continuum.

Checkoway, B. N. (2009). Community change for diverse democracy. *Community Development Journal*, 44(1), pp.5-21.

Clinton, W.J. (2004) *My Life*. New York: Knopf.

Cochrane, A. (1993) *Whatever Happened to Local Government?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Cockburn, C. (1977) *The Local State: Management of Cities and People.* London: Pluto Press.

Collins, C. and Lister, J. (1997) 'Hands up or heads up?' in Cooke, I. and Shaw, M. (1997) *Radical Community Work. Perspectives from practice*, Edinburgh: Moray House.

Combahee River Collective (1977) 'Combahee River Collective Statement: Black Feminist organizing in the Seventies and Eighties' in Moraga, C. and Anzaldua, G. (eds) (1984) *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table.

Cooke, I. (1997) 'Whatever happened to the class of '68? The changing context of radical community work practice' in Cook, I. and Shaw, M. (eds) *Radical Community Work: Perspectives from Practice in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Moray House.

Cooke, I. and Shaw, M. (1997) *Radical Community Work. Perspectives from practice in Scotland.* Edinburgh: Moray House.

CDP (1977) *Gilding the Ghetto: The State and the Poverty Experiments.* London: Community Development Project Inter-project Editorial Team.

CDP (1978) *The Costs of Industrial Change.* London: Community Development Project and Inter-project Editorial Team.

Craig, G., Derricourt, N. and Loney, M. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and the State: Towards a Radical Practice.* London: Routledge.

Craig, G. and Mayo, M. (eds.) (1995) *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*. London: Zed.

Curno, P. (ed.) (1978) *Political Issues and Community Work.* London: Routledge.

Daley, J.M. and Wong, P. (1994) 'Community development with emerging ethnic communities', *Journal of Community Practice*, 1(1), pp.9-24.

de Beauvoir, S. (1997) *The Second Sex*. London: Vintage.

Dearlove, J. (1974) 'The control of change and the regulation of community action' in Jones, D. and Mayo, M. (eds.) (1974) *Community Work One*. London: Routledge.

DeFilippis, J., Fisher, R. and Shragge, E. (2009) 'What's left in the community?' *Community Development Journal*, 44(1), pp.38-52.

Delgado, G. (1986) *Organizing the Movement: The Roots and Growth of ACORN*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Delgado, G. (1998) 'The last stop sign', *Shelterforce Online*, 101(November/December) Extracted from the Internet on 21/8/08 http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/102/stopsign.html

Derrida, J. (1974) *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Diamond, S. (1995) *Roads to Dominion: Right-wing Movements and Political Power in the United States.* New York: Guilford.

Dixon, G., Johnson, C., Leigh, S. and Turnbull, N. (1982) 'Feminist perspectives and practice' in Craig, G., Derricourt, N. and Loney, M. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and the State: Towards a Radical Practice.* London: Routledge.

Dominelli, L. (2006) *Women and Community Action*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Dreir, P. (2005) *ACORN and Progressive Politics in America.* Extracted from the Internet on 13/11/09 http://comm-org.wisc.edu/papers2005/dreier.htm

Dwyer, P. (2000) *Welfare Rights and Responsibilities: Contesting Social Citizenship.* Bristol: Policy Press.

East London Claimants Union (1974) 'East London Claimants Union and the concept of self management' in Jones, D. and Mayo, M. (eds.) (1974) *Community Work One*. London: Routledge.

Echols, A. (1989) *Daring to be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ehrenreich, B. (1987) 'The New Right attack on social welfare' in Block, F., Cloward, R.A. and Ehrenreich, B. (eds) (1987) *The Mean Season: The Attack on the Welfare State.* New York: Pantheon.

Emejulu, A. (2006) 'The Strange death (and possible rebirth) of Scottish community development' *Concept,* 16(2), pp.7-15.

Emejulu, A. and Bassel, L. (2009) 'Comparative intersectionality: The separation of gender and ethnicity in France and the United Kingdom', ECPR, 1st European Conference on Politics and Gender, Belfast, 21st -23rd January 2009.

Emejulu, A. (2009) 'We are the ones we've been waiting for: Community development, collective identity and agency in the age of Obama', Community Development Journal International Symposium, London, 3rd -5th September 2009.

Emejulu, A. (forthcoming 2011) 'Re-Theorising feminist community development: Towards a radical democratic citizenship' *Community Development Journal.*

Etzioni, A. (1993) *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda.* New York: Crown.

Evans, S. (1980) *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left.* New York: Vintage.

Fabricant, M. and Burghardt, S. (1998) 'Rising from the ashes of cutback, political warfare and degraded services', *Journal of Community Practice*, 5(4), pp.53-65.

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power* (2nd ed). London: Longman.

Faulks, K. (1998) *Citizenship in Modern Britain.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ferree, M.M. and Martin, P.Y. (eds) (1995) *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the new Women's Movement.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Filkin, E. and Naish, M. (1982) 'Whose side are we on? The damage done by neutrality' in Craig, G., Derricourt, N. and Loney, M. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and the State: Towards a Radical Practice.* London: Routledge.

Filner, M. (2001) 'Community Development Corporations: An historical overview', *Center for Democracy and Citizenship, University of Minnesota Research Case study series.*

Fisher, R. (1984) *Let the People Decide: Neighbourhood organizing in America.* Boston: Twayne.

Fisher, R. and Shragge, E. (2000) 'Challenging community organizing: Facing the 21st century,' *Journal of Community Practice*, 8(3), pp.1-19.

Fleetwood, M. and Lambert, J. (1982) 'Bringing socialism home: Theory and practice for a radical community action' in Craig, G., Derricourt, N. and Loney, M. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and the State: Towards a Radical Practice.* London: Routledge.

Floyd, R. (2007) Book Review of Lene Hansen (2006) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War.* London: Routledge. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 10(2), pp.214-217

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition.* London: Routledge.

Fraser, N. (1997) 'Rethinking recognition: Overcoming displacement and reification in cultural politics, in Hobson, B. (ed) (2003) *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements: Contested Identities, Agency and Power.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* London: Penguin.

From, A. (2005) *William Jefferson Clinton: 'New Democrat' From Hope.* Extracted from the Internet on 14/6/09
http://www.dlc.org/ndol_ci.cfm?kaid=126&subid=189&contentid=253619

Fukuyama, F. (1990) *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York: Avon.

Gardiner, J.K. (1995) (ed) *Provoking Agents: Gender and Agency in Theory and Practice.* Bloomington: University of Illinois Press.

Gerson, P. (1993) 'Popular participation in economic theory and practice', *Human Resources Development and Operations Policy Working Paper Series*, Washington, DC: World Bank.

Giddens, A. (1994) *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics.* Cambridge: Polity.

Gilchrist, A. (2004) *The Well-Connected Community: A Networking Approach to Community Development.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Gilkes, C. T. (1988) 'Building in many places: Multiple commitments and ideologies in Black women's community work' in Bookman, A. and Morgen, S. (eds) (1988) *Women and the Politics of Empowerment.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gitlin, T. (1995) *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America Is Wracked by Culture Wars.* New York: Holt.

Gittell, R.J. and Vidal, A. (1998) *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy.* London: Sage.

Golding, P. (1983) 'Rethinking commonsense about social policy', in Bull, D. and Wilding, P. (eds) (1983) *Thatcherism and the Poor*. London: Child Poverty Action Group.

Goldwater, B. (1964) *Acceptance Speech for the Republican Nomination for President.* Extracted from the Internet on 7/9/08 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/daily/may98/goldwaterspeech.htm

Gordon, L. and Hunter, A. (1977) 'Sex, family and the New Right: Anti-feminism as a political force', *Radical America*, 11(6 &1).

Gorz, A. (1980) *Farewell to the Working Class*. London: Pluto.

Gramsci, A. (1984) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Greaves, B. (1976) 'Communities and power' in Hain, P. (ed) (1976) *Community Politics*. London: John Calder.

Green, J. and Hunter, A. (1974) 'Racism and busing in Boston' *Radical America,* 8(6).

Gutierrez, L.M. and Edith, A. L. (1992) 'A feminist perspective on organizing with women of color' in Rivera, F.G. and Erlich, J.L. (eds) (1992) *Community Organizing in a Diverse Society*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gyford, J. (1991) *Citizens, Consumers and Councils: Local Government and the Public.* London: Palgrave.

Hain, P. (ed) (1976) *Community Politics*. London: John Calder.

Hall, S. (1988) *The Hard Road To Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. London: Verso.

Hamilton, C.V. (1974) 'Black and the crisis in political participation'. *The Public Interest,* 34, Winter, pp.188-210.

Hansen, L. (2006) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.

Hayden, T. (2005 [1961]) *The Port Huron Statement: The Visionary Call of the 1960s Revolution.* New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Hekman, S. (1995) 'Subjects and agents: The question for feminism', in Gardiner, J.K. (1995) (ed) *Provoking Agents: Gender and Agency in Theory and Practice.* Bloomington: University of Illinois Press.

Henderson, P., Jones, D. and Thomas. D. N. (eds.) (1980) *The Boundaries of Change in Community Work.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Henderson, P. and Thomas, D. N. (eds.) (1981) *Readings in Community Work.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Henderson, P. and Thomas, D. (2002) *Skills in Neighbourhood Work*. London: Routledge.

Heritage, J. (2001) 'Goffman, Garfinkel and Conversation analysis' in Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. (eds) (2001) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader.* London: Sage.

Hill, D.M. (1970) *Participating in Local Affairs*. London: Pelican.

Hill Collins, P. (2000) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Hobson, B. (ed) (2003) *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements: Contested Identities, Agency and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoggett, P. Mayo, M. and Miller, C. (2009) *The Dilemmas of Development Work: Ethical Challenges in Regeneration.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Howarth, D. (2000) *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hunter, A. (1981) 'In the wings: New Right organization and ideology', *Radical America*, 15(1&2).

Hyde, C. (1995) 'Feminist social movement organizations survive the New Right' in Ferree, M.M. and Martin, P.Y. (eds) (1995) *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the new women's movement.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jacobs, S. and Popple, K. (eds.) (1994) *Community Work in the 1990s.* Nottingham: Spokesman.

Jones, K. (2006) *The Making of Social Policy in Britain: From the Poor Law to New Labour.* London: Continuum.

Jones, D. and Mayo, M. (eds.) (1974) *Community Work One*. London: Routledge.

Katz, M. (2008) *The Price of Citizenship: Redefining the American Welfare State.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kerner Commission (1968) *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

King, M.L. (1967) *Where Do We Go from Here? Chaos or Community?* New York: Beacon.

Kitzinger, C. and Frith, H. (1999) 'Just Say No? The use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal,' *Discourse & Society*, 10(3), pp.293-316.

Kretzmann, J. and McKnight, J. (1993) *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets.* Skokie: ACTA Publications.

Kretzmann, J. (1995) **'**Building communities from the inside out' *Shelterforce Online,* (September/October) Extracted from the Internet on 21/8/08 http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/83/buildcomm.html

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics.* London: Verso.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1987) 'Post-Marxism without apologies', *New Left Review,* No.166, November/December.

Lal, D. (1994) 'Participation, markets and democracy', *Human Resources Development and Operations Policy Working Paper Series*, Washington, DC: World Bank.

Lambert, J. (1978) 'Political values and community work practice' in Curno, P. (ed.) (1978) *Political Issues and Community Work*. London: Routledge.

Lawrence, E. (1977) 'The Working Women's Charter campaign' in Mayo, M. (ed.) (1977) *Women in the Community*. London: Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S., and Guba, E. G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London: Sage.

Ledwith, M. (2005) *Community Development: A Critical Approach*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Ledwith, M. (2007) 'Reclaiming the radical agenda: a critical approach to community development', *Concept* 17(2), pp.8-12.

Ledwith, M. and Springett, J. (2010) *Participatory Practice: Community-based Action for Transformative Change*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Lemann, N. (1995) *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*. London: Vintage.

Lewis, J. (1998) *Walking with the Wind: A Memoir of the Movement*. New York: Simon Schuster.

Loney, M. (1983) *Community against Government: The British Community Development Project 1968-78: A Study of Government Incompetence*. London: Heinemann.

Manning, B. and Ohri, A. (1982) 'Racism—the response of community work.' in Ohri, A., Manning, B. and Curno, P. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and Racism*. London: Routledge.

Marris, P. and Rein, M. (1972) *Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States*. London: Pelican.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1985) 'The Communist Manifesto' in Tucker, R.C. (1985) The Marx-Engels Reader. New York: W.W. Norton.

Mayo, M. (ed.) (1977) *Women in the Community*. London: Routledge.

Mayo, M. (1997) 'Partnerships for regeneration and community development: Some opportunities, challenges and constraints', *Critical Social Policy*, 17(1), pp.3-26.

Mayo, M. (2000) *Cultures, Communities, Identities: Cultural Strategies for Participation and Empowerment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Meagher, J. and Tett, L. (1996) 'Domestication or liberation? Working women and community work practice', in Cooke, I. and Shaw, M. (eds) (1996) *Radical Community Work: Perspectives from Practice in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Moray House.

McKnight, J. and Kretzmann, J. (1984) 'Community organizing in the 80's: Toward a post-Alinsky agenda', *Social Policy* 14(1), pp.15-17.

Miliband, R. (1973) *The State in Capitalist Society: The Analysis of the Western System of Power*. London: Quartet.

Miliband, R. (1994) *Socialism for a Sceptical Age*. London: Polity.

Miller, S.M., Rein, M. Levitt, P. (1995) 'Community action in the United States' in Craig, G. and Mayo, M (eds.) (1995) *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*. London: Zed.

Miller, C. and Ahmad, Y. (1997) 'Community development at the crossroads: A way forward, *Policy & Politics*, 25(3), pp.269-281.

Mills, C. W. (1963) *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mondros, J. B. and Wilson, S. M. (1994) *Organizing for Power and Empowerment*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Moraga, C. and Anzaldua, G. (eds) (1984) *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table.

Mouffe, C. (1992) 'Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics in Butler, J. and Scott, J.W. (eds) (1992) *Feminists Theorise the Political*. New York: Routledge.

Mueller, C. (1993) 'Ella Baker and the origins of "Participatory Democracy"' in Crawford, V.L., Rouse, J.A. and Woods, B. (eds) (1993) *Women in the Civil Rights Movement*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Murnhall, P.L. and Chenail, R. (2007) *Qualitative Research Proposals and Reports: A Guide*. London: Jones and Bartlett.

O'Connor, J. (1998) 'US social welfare policy: The Reagan record and legacy' *Journal of Social Policy*, 27(1), pp.37-61.

Ohri, A., Manning, B. and Curno, P. (eds.) (1982) *Community Work and Racism*. London: Routledge.

Parker, I. and Burman, E. (1993) 'Against discursive imperialism, empiricism, and constructionism: Thirty-two problems with discourse analysis' in Burman, E. and Parker, I. (eds), *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and readings of texts in action*. London: Routledge.

Payne, C. (1989) 'Ella Baker and models of social change.' *Signs*, 14(4), pp.885-899.

Payne, C. (2007) *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Peirce, W.R. and Steinbach, C.F. (1987) *Corrective Capitalism: The rise of America's community development corporations*. New York: Ford Foundation.

Philpot, R. (1999) 'Why Bill Clinton is a hero', *The New Statesman.* Extracted from the Internet on 14/6/09 http://www.newstatesman.com/199907190016
Pitchford, M. (2008) *Making Spaces for Community Development.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Piven, F. F. and Cloward, R. (1979) *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed and How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon.

Polletta, F. (2003) *How Participatory Democracy Became White: Culture and Organizational Choice.* Extracted from the Internet on 3/12/07 http://www.bc.edu/schools/cas/sociology/meta-elements/pdf/Polletta.pdf

Polletta, F. (2004) *Freedom is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Popple, K. (1995) *Analysing Community Work: Its Theory and Practice.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). 'Bowling alone: America's declining social capital', *Journal of Democracy* 6(1), pp.65-78. Extracted from the Internet on 9/4/08 http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/journal_of_democracy/v006/putnam.html

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of the American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Raab, E. (1966) 'What war and which poverty?' *The Public Interest,* 3, Spring, pp.45-56.

Radford, J. (1978) 'Don't agonise—organise' in Curno, P. (ed.) (1978) *Political Issues and Community Work.* London: Routledge.

Ransby, B. (2003) *Ella Baker and The Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Reagan, R. (21 January 1981) *Inaugural Address.* Extracted from the Internet on 7/9/08 http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1981/12081a.htm

Reed, A. (1986) 'The "Black Revolution" and the reconstitution of domination' in Reed, A. (ed) (1986) *Race, Politics and Culture: Critical Essays on the Radicalism of the 1960s*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Rivera, F.G. and Erlich, J.L. (eds) (1991) *Community Organizing in a Diverse Society*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Robnett, B. (1997) *How Long? How Long? African American Women in the Struggle for Civil Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodwell, M.K. (1998) *Social Work Constructivist Research*. London: Routledge.

Rosenthal, E. and Mizhari, T. (1994) 'Should community organizations build coalitions or build their membership?' in Austin, M.J. and Lowe, J.I. (eds) (1994) *Controversial Issues in Communities and Organisations*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (1992) *Community Organizing and Development*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rubin, H. (1997) 'Being a conscience and a carpenter: Interpretations of the community-based development model'. *Journal of Community Practice*, (4)1, pp.57-90.

Salmon, H. (1978) 'Ideology and practice' in Curno, P. (ed.) (1978) *Political Issues and Community Work.* London: Routledge.

Schegloff, E.A. (1997) 'Whose text? Whose context?' *Discourse & Society*, 8, pp.165-187.

Schegloff, E.A. (1999) 'Schegloff's "texts" as Billig's "data": A critical reply', *Discourse & Society*, 8, pp.558-575.

Sen, R. (2003) *Stir it Up: Lessons in Community Organizing and Advocacy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shaw, M. and Martin, I. (2000) 'Community work, citizenship and democracy: Re-making the connections', C*ommunity Development Journal.* 43(1), pp.24-36.

Shaw, M. (2008) 'Community development and the politics of community' C*ommunity Development Journal,* 35, pp.401-413.

Sim, S. (2001) *Post-Marxism: An Intellectual History*. London: Routledge.

Smith, J. (1978) 'Hard lines and soft options', in Curno, P. (ed.) (1978) *Political Issues and Community Work.* London: Routledge.

Specht, H. (1975) 'The dilemmas of community work in the United Kingdom: A comment' in Henderson, P. and Thomas, D. N. (eds.) (1981) *Readings in Community Work*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Squires, J. (2008) 'Intersecting inequalities: Reflecting on the subjects and objects of equality', *The Political Quarterly* 79(1), pp.53-61.

Stall, S. and Stoecker, R. (1997) 'Community organizing or organizing community? Gender and the crafts of empowerment', *Gender and Society,* 12, pp.729-756.

Stoecker, R. (1997) 'The Community Development Corporation model of urban redevelopment: A critique and an alternative', *Journal of Urban Affairs,* 19, pp.1-23.

Stoecker, R. (2001) 'Community development and community organizing: Apples and oranges? Chicken and egg?', in Hayduk, R. and Shepard, B. (eds) (2001) *From ACT UP to the WTO: Urban Protest and Community Building in the Era of Globalization*. New York: Verso.

Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (1963) *SNCC: Structure and Leadership.* Extracted from the Internet on 3/12/07
http://www.crmvet.org/docs/sncc63-1.pdf

Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (1968) *SNCC Position Paper: The Basis of Black Power.* Extracted from the Internet on 3/12/07
http://www3.iath.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Resources/Primary/Manifestos/SNCC_black_power.html

Susser, I. (1998) 'Working-class women, social protest, and changing ideologies', in Bookman, A. and Morgen, S. (eds) (1988) *Women and the Politics of Empowerment.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement: Collective Action, Social Movements and Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, M. (1995) 'Community work and the state: The changing context of UK practice.' in Craig, G. and Mayo, M (eds.) (1995) *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*. London: Zed.

Taylor, M., Barr, A. and West, A. (2000) *Signposts to Community Development*. London: Community Development Foundation.

Taylor, S. (2001) 'Locating and conducting discourse analytic research', in Yates, S., Taylor, S., Wetherell, M. (eds) (2001) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.

Thomas, D.N. (1983) *The Making of Community Work*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Tobin, G., & Begley, C. (2004). 'Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48(4), pp.388-396.

Twelvetrees, A. (1982; 2001) *Community Work*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

United Nations Development Programme (1993) *Human Development Report: People's Participation.* Extracted from the Internet on 14/8/08 http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1993/

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993) 'Principles of critical discourse analysis', *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), pp.249-283.

Waddington, P. (1979) 'Looking ahead—community work in the 1980s', *Community Development Journal*, 14(3), pp.224-234.

Waddington, P. (1994) 'The value base of community work', in Jacobs, S. and Popple, K. (eds.) (1994) *Community Work in the 1990s*, Nottingham: Spokesman. West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1987) 'Doing gender', *Gender & Society*, 1, pp.125-151.

Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and interpretive repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-structuralism in dialogue', *Discourse & Society,* 9, pp.387-412.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. (eds) (2001) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader.* London: Sage.

Wildavsky, A. (1968) 'The empty-head blues: Black rebellion and white reaction', *The Public Interest,* 11, Spring, pp.3-16.

Wilson, E. (1977) 'Women in the community', in Mayo, M. (ed.) (1977) *Women in the Community. Community Work 3,* London: Routledge.

Women Organizers Collective (1990) *Women on the Advance: Highlights of a National Conference on Women and Organizing.* Extracted from the Internet on 9/9/08 http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/ecco/WomenOnAdvanceDocument-.pdf

Young, I.M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, T. (1976) 'The industrial connection', in Hain, P. (ed) (1976) *Community Politics.* London: John Calder.

Zdeneck, R.O. (1994) 'Toward comprehensive approaches for strengthening communities', *Shelterforce Online* 74, Extracted from the Internet on 13/8/08 http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/74/zdenek.html

Zinn, H. (1964) *SNCC: The New Abolitionists.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Appendices: Selected Texts for Analysis

Table 2.1 United States 1968-1975			
Hansen's Text Selection Criteria	**Clear Articulations of Identity**	**Widely read**	**Has authority**
Alinsky (1971)	x	x	x
Baker (1960)	x		x
Baker (1972)	x		x
Brager and Specht (1973)	x	x	x
Carmicheal and Hamilton (1967)	x	x	x
Carson (1995)	x	x	x
Hayden (1961)	x	x	x
King (1967)	x	x	x
Marris and Rein (1972)	x	x	x
Mueller (1993)	x	x	
Payne (1989)	x	x	x
Payne (2007)	x	x	x
Polletta (2004)	x		
Polletta (2005)	x	x	x
Ransby (2003)	x	x	x
Reed (1986)	x	x	x
Robnett (1997)	x	x	x
SNCC (1963)	x	x	x
SNCC (1968)	x	x	x
Wildavsky (1968)	x		

Table 2.2 United Kingdom 1968-1975			
Hansen's Text Selection Criteria	Clear Articulations of Identity	Widely read	Has authority
Baine (1974)	x		
Cockburn (1977)	x	x	x
CDP (1977)	x	x	x
CDP (1978)	x	x	x
Dearlove (1974)	x		
ELCU (1974)	x		
Greaves (1976)	x		
Gulbenkian (1968)	x	x	x
Gulbenkian (1973)	x	x	x
Hain (1976)	x	x	x
Hill (1970)	x		
Jones and Mayo (1974)	x	x	x
Loney (1983)	x	x	x
Miliband (1973)	x	x	x
Young (1976)	x		

Table 2.3 United States 1979-1985			
Hansen's Text Selection Criteria	**Clear Articulations of Identity**	**Widely read**	**Has authority**
Acklesberg (1988)	x		
Berndt (1977)	x	x	x
Bookman and Martin (1988)	x	x	
Boyte (1980)	x	x	x
Boyte (1985)	x	x	x
Boyte et al (1986)	x	x	x
Brandwein (1987)	x	x	
Delgado (1986)	x	x	x
Diamond (1994)	x		
Ferree and Martin (1995)	x		
Fisher (1993)	x	x	x
Filner (1999)	x		
Gilkes (1988)	x		
Green and Hunter (1974)	x	x	
Gordon and Hunter (1977)	x	x	
Hunter (1981)	x	x	
Kretzmann (1984)	x		
Moraga and Anzaldua (1986)	x	x	x
O'Connor (1998)	x	x	
Peirce and Steinbach (1987)	x	x	x
Rivera and Elrich (1991)	x	x	
Stoeker (1996)	x		
Stall and Stoeker (1997)	x	x	
Susser (1988)	x		
West and Zimmerman (1987)	x		
WOC (1990)	x		

Table 2.4 United Kingdom 1979-1985			
Hansen's Text Selection Criteria	**Clear Articulations of Identity**	**Widely read**	**Has authority**
Blagg and Derricourt (1980)	x	x	
Craig, Derricourt and Loney (1982)	x	x	x
Curno (1978)	x	x	
Dixon et al (1982)	x		
Fleetwood and Lambert (1982)	x		
Filkin and Naish (1982)	x		
Henderson, Jones and Thomas (1980)	x	x	x
Henderson and Thomas (1981)	x	x	x
Jones and Thomas (1980)	x		
Lambert (1978)	x	x	
Lawrence (1977)	x		
Manning and Ohri (1982)	x		
Mayo (1977)	x	x	x
Ohri and Curno (1982)	x	x	
Radford (1978)	x		
Salmon (1978)	x		
Smith (1978)	x		
Specht (1975)	x	x	x
Thomas (1983)	x		
Twelvetrees (1981)	x	x	x
Waddington (1979)	x		
Wilson (1977)	x	x	x

Table 2.5 United States 1992-1997			
Hansen's Text Selection Criteria	**Clear Articulations of Identity**	**Widely read**	**Has authority**
Bradshaw, Soifer and Guitierrez (1994)	x		
Daley and Wong (1994)	x		
Delgado (1998)	x	x	x
Fabricant and Burghardt (1998)	x		
Fisher and Shragge (2000)	x		
Gittell and Vidal (1998)	x		
Katz (2008)	x		
Kretzmann (1995)	x	x	x
Kretzmann and McKnight (1993)	x	x	x
Lemann (1994)	x	x	x
Mondros and Wilson (1994)	x		
Miller, Rein and Levitt (1995)	x		
O'Connor (1999)	x		
Putnam (1995)	x	x	x
Rosenthal and Mizrahi (1994)	x		
Rubin and Rubin (1992)	x	x	
Rubin (1997)	x		
Zdenek (1994)	x		x

Table 2.6 United Kingdom 1992-1997			
Hansen's Text Selection Criteria	Clear Articulations of Identity	Widely read	Has authority
Barr (1996)	x	x	x
Blackman (1994)	x		
Burns et al (1994)	x	x	
Collins and Lister (1996)	x		
Faulks (1998)	x	x	x
Gerson (1993)	x		
Gyford (1991)	x	x	
Jones and Popple (1994)	x	x	x
Lal (1994)	x		
Mayo (1997)	x	x	x
Meagher and Tett (1996)	x		
Miller and Ahmad (1997)	x	x	
Popple (1995)	x	x	x
Shaw and Martin (2000)	x	x	x
Taylor (1995)	x	x	x
Taylor et al (2000)	x		x
UNDP (1994)	x	x	x
Waddington (1994)	x		