

Dr. David Chandler, Centre for the Study of Democracy, University of Westminster : 'Developments in Public Participation' Barcelona June 2001, Normative Issues strand. *Work in Progress*, not to be cited without author's permission, comments welcomed, D.Chandler@westminster.ac.uk.

WE KNOW THE ANSWER IS PUBLIC PARTICIPATION...BUT WHAT'S THE QUESTION?

PARTICIPATING IN WHAT?

Everyone seems to agree that participation is a good thing and that non-participation is bad. In fact the dichotomy between the two is reproduced continuously in social and political debate – either we have social inclusion (good) or social exclusion (bad); either we have greed and financial capital (bad) or altruism and social capital (good); civic culture or selfishness, etc. etc. The leading example of this dichotomy over the last few weeks has been the discussion over participation in the UK General Elections. In this case, either we have civic-mindedness and voting (good) or electoral apathy (bad) which is blamed on moral failings, laziness, selfishness and ignorance.

In fact, the discussion around participation is not new. I don't mean the theoretical discussion over the pros and cons of representative and participatory democracy, but the broader social process of negotiating the question of regulation and cohesion in the modern market or capitalist system. The concern with participation - or inclusion/ social capital/ community/ capacity-building - is the current framework or language for discussion around the reshaping of social cohesion or community against trends towards the atomisation and fragmentation of society. This question will not go away and is periodically renegotiated because the market system is contradictory. On the one hand it is destructive of social cohesion, it breaks down traditional bonds and formalises our treatment as free or autonomous individuals. On the other hand, it would be unworkable without an institutional framework of cohesion or community and can only be successfully regulated through the collective framework of the state and the acceptance of a set of shared values. The continual tension between the spontaneity of the market and the institutionalisation of community, at the level of family legislation and education, welfare, policing etc, is one that has been renegotiated in different forms over the last two hundred years.

The problem today is that the institutionalisation of community is occurring in unique circumstances. In the past community was always institutionalised in the interplay between social forces and ruling elites. This enabled social regulation to be undertaken with a large degree of consensus, through integrating and 'house-training' labour movement organisations, social reforms etc. Of course, in times of social conflict, when the political class has been weak or divided, attempts at social cohesion have had a much more coercive character, through the crushing of opposition rather than integration, but even this was shaped through the inter-play of opposing social forces. My point is that today the reorganising of community - the creation of a participatory society - is problematic because governing elites have little way of relating to broader society. I would suggest

that the participation discussion today is a reflection of this problem, there is no content to the discussion, because it is not based on social engagement.

In the past, when the question of participation was based on relationship to social forces it was a potentially radical and empowering one, which challenged the status-quo. There was not just the answer of more participation there was also an agenda of political and social change which related to social needs. Today it is a discussion restricted to the political class and is in theory conservative and in practice destructive. I intend to argue that it is conservative in theory because the answer is no longer related to a question being asked in society itself, and that it is destructive in practice because the questions of why to participate and in what to participate do matter. Participation for its own sake, driven from the top-down is destructive of spontaneous and informal connections which are important for the development of social bonds.

This paper is in two parts. The first section seeks to highlight the lack of content in today's debates about participation through briefly comparing Carole Pateman's *Participation and Democratic Theory* written thirty years ago (1970) and Robert Putnam's *Bowling Alone*, published last year in the States (2000). The second part of the paper seeks to draw out why the participation discourse today is a highly conservative one, despite the radical language of empowerment/ inclusion/ capacity-building etc, focusing on its academic integrity, relationship to democracy and impact on participation. This last aspect is the area in which attempts to institutionalise participation can take on more destructive forms.

FROM PATEMAN TO PUTNAM

The emptying-out of the discussion of participation from one which seeks to engage with social forces to today's narrow preoccupation with elite concerns can be crudely traced by comparing two books that mark the start and current point of the modern participation debate: Carole Pateman's *Participation and Democratic Theory* (1970) and Robert Putnam's *Bowling Alone* (2000). This will be done through considering the evolution of the post-war discussion chronologically, in three phases, loosely termed as the conservative, the radical, and the liberal.

1) 1950s and 1960s - Conservative participation theory

In the aftermath of social mobilisation and integration in the Second World War, Western societies in the Allied states were more cohered than before with the subjugation and integration of opposition voices. In the defeated powers, Italy and Germany society was reshaped through the institutionalisation of new consensual political frameworks. The post-war boom, the welfare consensus and the bi-polarity of the Cold War, particularly anti-communism, ensured that politics remained confined within a narrow and institutionalised framework.

No one in the Anglo-American establishment was concerned with participation or social cohesion; as Pateman notes participation was linked to totalitarian systems of Nazi

Germany or Soviet Russia rather than with Western democracies.¹ During the Cold War, the political sphere was seen to be unproblematic. The democratic framework was seen as a set of institutional mechanisms by which citizens held elites accountable. Classic texts, like Joseph Schumpeter's *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1943) and Robert Dahl's works in the mid-1950s, upheld representative democracy as fitting the needs of both governments and people. The political system was unproblematic as there was no radical challenge to the system but also because there was a high level of social engagement through mass movements, welfare integration etc. It was only with the development of new political forces, the 1968 student movement, civil rights protests and the anti-Vietnam peace movement that issues of social cohesion returned to the agenda.

2) 1970s – Radical participation theory

Pateman's work and the radical era of participation discourse is very much shaped by the failures of the 1968 radicalism to galvanise society, and the divisions between the new social movements and the old left, the trade union movement and Labour and Communist Parties. This failure was blamed on the narrow preoccupations of the working class and their narrow materialist focus, sustained by the post-war boom, which isolated them from the idealism of the student and peace movements. There is already a strong element of elitism within this 'radical' framework of participation, seeking to socially-engineer 'political enlightenment' for workers.

This elitist approach is highlighted in Pateman's return to the concerns of the pre-revolutionary French Enlightenment and to middle class reformers of the 19th century who emphasised the importance of participation for community. She cites Rousseau's concern with education to provide a set of values and attitudes which develops acceptance of collective needs and obedience to laws and increases the feeling of community 'belonging'. Other usual suspects in the participatory discourse are brought in, like Alexis de Tocqueville and J. S. Mill's encouragement of participatory institutions, particularly at a local level, to develop the moral dispositions necessary for 'active' public-spirited citizens. Pateman considers that levels of participation have important effects on civilisation, including parenting capacities and domestic violence.² The masses could be transformed into civic-minded political activists with some guidance from the intellectuals.

Pateman's book is 'radical', despite the elitist content, because it keyed into widespread recognition of the narrow limits of the political sphere and related to broader social aspirations. It is one of the earliest responses to what was now seen as 'conservative' representative democratic theory, which defended low levels of participation. For Pateman and other radical critics electoral democracy was a 'thin' veneer of democracy, it was actually a cover for elite competition which gave little say to the masses beyond the vote once every five years. Conservative theorists saw no problem with limited participation, in contrast Pateman highlighted the need for higher levels of social engagement, proposing that community could not be left to market forces but needed government intervention in society. Pateman's object of critique is not so much the political framework of representative democracy but the decline of engagement and

social cohesion outside the formal political sphere. She is critical of conservative democracy theorists for their lack of concern with the broader networks that bind society.

However, the key to her book is the twinning of this set of participatory values to enhance community with an engagement with broader society, in this case the labour and trade union movement: 'The theory of participatory democracy stand or falls on two hypotheses: the educative function of participation, and the crucial role of industry, and attention will be concentrated on these'.³ The second aspect of her thesis is ignored today.

Industry was crucial for Pateman, because the level of social atomisation or 'apathy' could only be challenged by relating to existing concerns, by giving people something they wanted. She seeks to rebuild community through relating to real social aspirations at the time, particularly trade union campaigns. At the time she was writing there was high level of union involvement and activity, three-quarters of strikes related to working arrangements rather than pay. She argued that 'authority structures' in the workplace and the scope for individuals to participate were a key to psychological willingness to participate in politics and develop community values.

Unlike any writer on participation today, she makes a clear distinction between participation and democracy in the workplace. This is not so much because she is keen on democracy but because token involvement would not be enough to engage people. This is why she argues that 'pseudo participation' as a management technique of persuasion was not enough. Although this form of 'inclusion' could produce beneficial effects on the individual it would hardly 'sell' the experience to encourage participation. Pateman stresses the importance of for full participation i.e. a clear sense of decision-making responsibility. Because this is a radical demand she supports its feasibility and power to generate community values by the example of Yugoslav self-management practices. Pateman is very much aware that social and political participation can not be promoted merely as good for the individual or as good for society but needs to respond to social aspirations.

3) 1990s – Liberal participation theory

Putnam's book is very different to Pateman's. While Pateman focuses most of her slim 100 page volume on the participatory solution as it could be applied to industry. Putnam's substantial 500 page work is largely a restatement of the break-down of collective participation - termed social capital. The solution is limited to a 13 page indicative agenda of areas which government could act in.

Near the end of his book Putnam looks at the lessons of the civic organisational building period of the Progressive Era, at the turn of the nineteenth century, and advocates the repetition of this feat of community activity:

[M]y message is that we desperately need an era of civic inventiveness to create a renewed set of institutions and channels for a reinvigorated civic life that will fit the way we have come to live. Our challenge now is to reinvent the twenty-first-

century equivalent of the Boy Scouts or the settlement house [missionary work among the underclasses] or the playground or Hadassah or the United Mine Workers or the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People]. What we create may look nothing like the institutions Progressives invented a century ago... We need to be as ready to experiment as the Progressives were. Willingness to err – and then correct our aim – is the price of success in social reform.⁴

Putnam doesn't have any clear idea in which practical ways participation can be encouraged, and clearly does not start from any relationship to existing demand:

Looking back from the doorstep of the twenty-first century, it is hard to imagine a time without Boy Scouts, but a century ago it must have seemed fanciful that the twentieth-century equivalent of Tom Sawyer's antebellum gang on the Mississippi sandbar would involve beanies, merit badges, and the Scout's oath. Nevertheless, institutions like the Boy Scouts provided a new and successful forum for youthful community building. So too some of the solutions to today's civic deficit may seem initially preposterous, but we should be wary of straining our civic inventiveness through conventional filters.⁵

For Putnam, participation is very much an open-ended field of experimentation. Some ideas may 'seem preposterous' but there is little way of knowing what might work and what won't because there is little that the elite can relate to.

Putnam sums up the problem, facing community-builders today, using a metaphor of the market: 'we need to address both the *supply* of opportunities for civic engagement and the *demand* for those opportunities'.⁶ This is a unique problem for the elite. The political class has always had a problem delimiting the 'supply' of opportunities to participate, but has never been confronted with the problem of generating the 'demand' for participation. In fact, the history of modern politics has been one of attempting to hold back the demand for participation. People had to be held back from claiming their rights, women struggled for the right to vote, working classes fought for the right to organise in trade unions etc.

Without any genuine demand for participation for elites to relate to, the solution is inevitably a highly artificial 'top-down' one, which attempts to institutionalise involvement in a variety of ways. Putnam's solutions are interesting because he has spent several years bringing academics and practitioners, i.e. civic leaders, together in a series of discussions, the 'Sanguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America' funded by the Carnegie Corporation, MacArthur Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation, among others.⁷ Putnam looks briefly at six spheres which 'aspiring social capitalists' need to pay attention to: youth and schools; the workplace; urban and metropolitan design; religion; arts and culture and politics and government.⁸ Let us consider these briefly in turn.

Education

There are three areas Putnam recommends: the teaching of civic values and skills; the development of community service work, noting that ‘voluntary programmes seem to work as well as mandatory ones’,⁹ and encouragement of extra-curricula activities – music groups, sports etc.

Workplace

Putnam argues that the workplace should be more family-friendly and community-congenial, with flexible working and more informality like ‘dress-down Fridays’ suggesting release time for volunteering in the community and more support for part-time work.

Urban design

Restoring neighbourliness by more pedestrian-only zones, restricting out of town shopping developments etc.

Religion

Basically encouraging churches to do more outreach work in the community.

Arts and Culture

Putnam argues that art should not only have aesthetic but also social objectives and that ‘art is especially useful in transcending conventional social barriers’ and social capital a by-product of cultural activities.

Politics and Government

Putnam argues that financial limits on campaigning would force parties to mobilise more people and that government should be decentralised to give people more of a say in their locality.

Putnam’s concluding chapter devotes more space to targets for participation than to means for achieving them. Targets include restoring electoral turnout to the level of the 1960s, increasing participation in team sports, choirs, voluntary organisations and grassroots social movements. In relation to urban design the objective is that ‘more of us know more of our neighbours by first name than we do today’.¹⁰ The book concludes by recalling advice from a reformer a century ago that we should ‘multiply picnics’ and thereby reconnect with friends and neighbours.¹¹

ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION?

To get to the reason for the title of my paper. I want to raise some questions over the ‘Putnam’ or liberal approach to participation. I call this the liberal approach because unlike the ‘conservatives’ it emphasises the importance of popular engagement, but

unlike the ‘radicals’ it does not engage people’s active, aspirational side. These problems stem from the artificiality of the participatory project, the elite search for any collective experience whether political or social, in order to emphasize the values of community and civic-ness. It is very much participation as a policy prescription - on its own terms, as an end in itself. Now, many people may think that there is nothing wrong with participation being promoted as valuable in its own right. I want to raise, what I think are three problems with the current participation discussion. Firstly, it raises questions over the relationship between government policy needs and the independence of academic research. Secondly, it raises questions over the relationship between participation and democracy. Thirdly, it raises questions over the gap between policy initiatives based on normative claims of why we ‘should’ participate and real-life evidence of why we ‘do’ participate.

1) Academic honesty

The question of academic honesty is based on the lack of any clear external point of reference; this takes two related forms. Firstly, lack of a clear external point of reference tends to lead to an amorphous sense of community, which is almost free-floating; the concept of ‘social capital’ is an excellent reflection of this. Social capital can be created allegedly by almost any form of interaction and these interactions are then held to produce positive outcomes in literally every sphere. This creates a blind attachment to participation *per se* as the answer to a whole range of problems and there is little attention to what is important and what is not important. There is no longer a relationship of cause and effect and every policy question is easily ‘dumbed down’ and reduced to moral injunctions about behaviour and attitudes.

Putnam provides many examples of this; he lumps together a wide variety of indicators of community participation or social capital. For example, he sees community participation as a major factor in educational attainment therefore:

[T]o see educational outcomes [rise]...residents...could do any of the following: increase their turnout in presidential elections by 50 percent; double their frequency of club meeting attendance; triple the number of nonprofit organizations per thousand inhabitants; or attend church two more times per month.¹²

While voting more often is held to lead to educational gains, education is seen to result in more voting. British education is being reformed under the 1999 Citizenship Order, under which the values and practice of civic participation are preached in order to inculcate moral and community responsibility in British youth. Bernard Crick argues this is necessary ‘to diminish exclusion from schools, cynicism, welfare-dependency, apathy, petty criminality and vandalism, and a kind of could-not-care-lessitude towards voting and public issues’.

There is a vicious circle in which the amorphous concept of social capital is used to justify the transformation of policy-areas into social engineering projects. New Labour

strategy in relation to health, education and transport is increasingly justified in relation to social capital creation while social capital is blamed for bad health or educational failings. Putnam actually argues that education improvements are less likely to come through ‘traditional educational reforms – by decreasing class size, for example’ than by increasing participation in the community.¹³ Far from community participation as radical empowerment, communities are increasingly blamed for the lack of social investment in local infrastructure as social problems are recast as moral failings of the non-participating ‘underclass’.

Secondly, there is dishonesty in celebrating every action involved in more than one person interacting. The academic discussions reflect the lack of social engagement in the fact that there is no external point of reference, no end point or specific outcome. The concepts are free-floating, participation can be participation in anything – joining a sports club, a public library or just inviting friends over for dinner; similarly social inclusion or exclusion can apply in any context. Voting is good regardless of why you vote or who you vote for. Similarly for direct action, people ask me if I’m in favour of direct action not if I support particular purposes or ends. Volunteering in another example where it is the activity that counts.

The lack of any external point of reference means that a whole literature has arisen devoted to the inflation of the smallest amounts of interactive activity, internet discussion boards, animal rights campaigners, community pressure groups etc. Rather than comparing these collectivities to eras of mass involvement in collective action, or considering the impact they have on society, they are treated in their own terms. A good example is in the field of sociology where ‘new social movements’ are ascribed to any group of individuals and their actions described as ‘submerged networks’, ‘prefigurative politics’ or as ‘symbolic challenges’, highlighting ‘immanent possibility’ rather than real challenges based on real possibilities.¹⁴ This dishonest approach has rightly been criticised as ‘decorative’ sociology.

What is probably most dishonest is the attempt by academics to turn everyday life into participatory politics. Instead of just reporting survey evidence that young people are turned off by politics they try to argue that in fact young people are very political, aspirations about the environment or fresh air are celebrated. Similarly the simple act of consumer choice is seen as a political statement, the participation framework conflates being alive and therefore socially-engaged with political participation.

2) Shaping new elite legitimacy

Secondly, this glorification of participation is in fact a highly elitist perspective. For many political commentators the emphasis on civic participation and ‘getting in touch with the people’ is to be welcomed as a way of empowering excluded communities and democratising decision-making. But this raises the obvious question of why? It is hardly because of popular pressure or popular demand. People were never empowered by elites giving power away because they just ‘wanted to’.

Today the political class is empowering everybody, giving out institutions left, right and centre whether people want them or not. Local government reform to empower communities is being pushed through despite the fact that local politics is as dead as a dormouse. In Liverpool there was a referendum on reform last month with a less than one percent turnout, this is similar to the results from many other local authorities.¹⁵ Regardless of whether the people in London want an elected mayor, or the people of Wales want their own assembly, they will be empowered, like it or not. From the focus on political ‘apathy’, it is clear that the government and leading institutions are keener on public participation than the public itself.

The participation debate is a top-down one, because institutions lack a clear relationship to an increasingly atomised society. Today it seems that institutions no longer have a clear view of the role they play in society and lack the confidence to express their aims and mission. The question of legitimacy and values undermines every public body from the arts (elitist?) to the health service (ethical?), from policing (racist?), to the army (national interest or humanitarian?) to the government (Third Way?). The problems of aim and policy direction are seen most clearly at the level of government institutions. Without social pressure, in the absence of the mass political and social bodies of the past, there is little to cohere government and focus policy around. For this reason there is an attempt to encourage new links with society - particularly through the institutions of ‘civil society’ or ‘the third sector’ – to help an ever more isolated governing elite develop and cohere a set of ideas in relation to a broader activist audience.

The rhetoric of tackling social exclusion from politics is deployed to build a relationship with small groups of middle class activists whose particular passions dominate political campaigning. Inclusion of these groups helps legitimate public decision-making. The new participatory and deliberative forums are a mechanism for the government to court all manner of extra-parliamentary campaign groups, NGOs and charities, drawing them into consultation processes on legislation on everything from asylum to social security. The Local Government Act 2000 mandates local authorities to encourage and institutionalise new forms of civic participation to meet the funding requirements of Best Value. The vast majority of voters have only a subordinate role in these mechanisms. The elite nature of these mechanisms, from the setting of the agenda to the selected worthies invited to sit on the committees, highlights the contradiction of ‘popular’ empowerment.

Power is not being given up by elites. We shouldn’t confuse these institutions that are being given out like candy with the real thing. People can not be empowered by institutions. If you look at the regional assemblies or local government reforms they are mechanisms for integrating the middle class and legitimising government. Far from being empowering they represent the greater marginalisation of ordinary people from politics and their replacement by elite advocates. Political frameworks are no longer decided by electoral competition but by ‘deliberative’ elite forums of advocate groups.¹⁶

3) Aspiration replaced by participation

The third problem, and to my mind the most important one to raise, is that the desire to institutionalise collective activity is a highly destructive and atomising one. I don't think we should lose sleep over the fact that the average age of Labour and Conservative Party members is increasing and numbers are falling or over the fact that the turnout for the UK elections was the lowest since 1918. There is little to inspire or engage people in these political programmes. The idea that non-voters are morally culpable or apathetic is a disingenuous one, and I for one would not look down on people who would rather vote in Big Brother than in the General Election.

The danger is that areas of informal participation are increasingly picked up upon by the political class as potential experiments for building social participation. This search for new ways to institutionalise and encourage participation has a counter-productive effect of increasing atomisation rather than building trust and social bonds.

Community volunteers

For Putnam and other community volunteering is central to participatory society and should be institutionalised in schools, colleges and workplaces. Once there was a clear division between voluntary work and imposed community service. Community service was merely seen as a punishment, Community Service Orders were dished out by magistrates as alternatives to fines and prison sentences. Today Community Service Orders are being served on us all. In the schools the 1999 Citizenship Order makes participation in the local community mandatory. The New Deal for the unemployed is directly coercive in its imposition of volunteering or losing benefits. John Potter, the director of Community Service Volunteers – Education for Citizenship is all in favour of the return of national service.¹⁷ David Blunkett has set a target of 2 hours a week volunteering for two-thirds of the population as part of the Millennium Volunteering Awards Programme. Malcolm Wicks, the Minister for Lifelong Learning sees high levels of volunteering as 'not good enough' he argues: 'all young people must have these opportunities. Poverty or deprivation must not be barriers.'¹⁸

Volunteering under pressure for benefits or CV purposes is considered to be good in itself. Even if mandatory the experience of 'voluntary' engagement is held to be an empowering and educational one awakening a sense of community commitment. Institutionalising volunteering has removed the element of social engagement and commitment to a specific cause or concern which gave rise to volunteering in the first place. The government recognises that volunteers have compassion and commitment but in order to generalise the experience of volunteering more broadly the policy-makers are concerned that people will be put off. For this reason institutionalisation involves a 'dumbing down' of the participatory impulse. Volunteering is promoted as an end in itself, removing the element of voluntary commitment to an idea or cause to open the experience to all.

This turns volunteering into an instrumental activity for individual status, seen in the competition for roles in the bureaucracy of the burgeoning government and EU sponsored 'voluntary' campaigns, with structured progress with awards, certificates and

‘qualifications’ depending on the hours served.¹⁹ This process is repeated in every sphere of institutionalised participation. The original passion or commitment is ‘dumbed down’ and the social bonds reduced to individual ones.

Arts and culture

Every institution from museums to the media increasingly formalises public participation through a variety of institutional mechanisms from focus groups to inclusion targets. These institutionalised mechanisms for participation come at a price. Far from art for arts sake the ‘spin-off’ effects of collective involvement in theatres or art-galleries have led to inclusion targets and the inevitable clash between directors and museum curators and the government funders who want art which is not too challenging or ‘difficult’. The ‘dumbing down’ impact can be seen in the recent Green Paper which states that ‘everyone is creative’ and ends in community arts projects where the content is secondary to the fact that more than one person is ‘doing it’.

Government and politics

Unfortunately the most dangerous sphere of ‘dumbing down’ and destruction of the participatory impulse is in politics itself. Where the political class assuages idealism for ‘common sense’ and argues that politics should not become a ‘football’ where fundamental disagreements occur. The reason why many people will not be participating in the UK general election is because expectations of political change have been lowered by the experience of the New Labour government, which maintained Conservative levels of public spending. The commitments of the main political parties to public spending are so similar that the debated 2 percent of spending differences would be subsumed within the margin of error. Instead of idealism, the election leaflet for my sitting MP, a government minister, follows the participatory focus on local connections. It focuses on how he ‘listens to local people’ and is ‘working to strengthen our communities’ through encouraging Bramley and Rodley Community Action, West Leeds Family Learning Centre, Hawksworth Wood Community Association and Bramley Elderly Action.²⁰ These groups I’m sure have their place but there is no attempt to win people to a political position or inspire people to get involved. Winning an election without contestation can not consolidate government authority; ‘dumbing down’ politics doesn’t encourage participation. The political class’s participation agenda has institutionalised disengagement rather than sought to challenge it.

CONCLUSION

The top-down impulse to institutionalise and encourage participation is either exclusionary, establishing middle class activist forums as a replacement for popular involvement, or it is destructive because it dehumanises and ‘dumbs down’ areas it moves into. The attempt to institutionalise spontaneous forms of participation repackages them without the content which made them engaging in the first place. This is why participation *per se* is not the answer, and why the question of what the ends of participation are is important. Taking a step back from the current discourse I’d argue

that autonomy and spontaneity need to be encouraged rather than fettered further if we want to go beyond artificial and counterproductive initiatives on offer in this area.

¹ Carole Pateman, *Participation and Democratic Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.2.

² Ibid, p.49.

³ Ibid, p.44.

⁴ Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), p.401.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid, p.403.

⁷ Ibid, p.509.

⁸ Ibid, p.404.

⁹ Ibid, p.405.

¹⁰ Ibid, p.408.

¹¹ Ibid, p.414.

¹² Ibid, p.301.

¹³ Ibid, p.301.

¹⁴ Taylor and Van Willigen cited in Greg Martin, 'Social Movements, Welfare and Social Policy: A Critical Analysis' unpublished paper 2001; A. Bartholomew and M. Mayer, 'Nomads of the Present: Melucci's Contribution to "New Social Movements" Theory', *Theory, Culture and Society* (1992), Vol.9, No.4, pp.141-159; p.142; A. Melucci, *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society* (London: Hutchinson Radius, 1989), p.175.

¹⁵ Heather Jameson, 'Liverpool Poll Rejects Elected Mayor', *Municipal Journal*, 25 May 2001, p.3.

¹⁶ David Chandler, 'Active Citizens and the Therapeutic State: The Role of Democratic Participation in Local Government Reform', *Policy & Politics*, Vol.29, No.1, pp.3-14.

¹⁷ Speech at 'Volunteer OR ELSE!' workshop at 'Disconnected: The Changing Role of Participation', Institute of Ideas, Soho Theatre and Writers' Centre, Dean Street, London, 21-22 April 2001.

¹⁸ 'Volunteering and a Voice – Young People's Right', *Volunteer Action!*, National Youth Agency, 2001, p.1.

¹⁹ Millennium Volunteer contact leaflet; 'Making MVs Voices Count', *Volunteer Action!*, National Youth Agency, 2001, p.11.

²⁰ 'A Message from John Battle', Leeds, 2001.