27

Community Development . . . Its Political and Administrative Challenge

R. Young

In an earlier article on multiple deprivation, (*SWT*, November 30, 1976) I indicated that two of the preconditions of any strategy to ameliorate such problems were a willingness of public agencies to share power with the public, and a readiness to concede the existence of deficiencies (perhaps inherent) in the way particularly local government delivers its services.

The Regional Council of which I am a member has satisfied the second of these conditions and has established two review groups[1] - on deprivation and community development - to help firm up a coherent strategy. Both of these subjects are profoundly political and tend in the UK to be depoliticised by two factors - an army of "technocrats", and the failure of the political system in local government to act or think politically.

The drift of the argument in this article - drafted for the community development review group - is not a comfortable one for someone who has been nine years an elected member.

Although community development has a long history (particularly associated with colonial development) it was only in the 1960s that there emerged in America[2] activities and various schools of thought which by the end of the decade were finding expression in Britain, in both voluntary and statutory agencies, under the varied terms "community work", "community development" and "community action".[3] These cannot be understood in isolation of the deficiencies in the administrative and political processes of representative democracy.

Our society is hardly what one would call a participatory democracy. The term that is used - "representative" democracy - is official recognition of the fact that "the people" do not take political decisions but have rather surrendered that power to one (or several) small elites - subject to quinquennial (or infrequent) checks. Such checks are, of course, a rather weak base on which to rest claims for democracy[4] and more emphasis is therefore given to the freedom of expression and organisation whereby pressure groups articulate a variety of interests. Those who defend the consequent operation of the political process argue that we have, in effect, a *political market place* in which valid or strongly supported ideas survive and are absorbed into new policies. They further argue that every viewpoint or interest has a more or less equal chance of finding expression and recognition. This is the political theory of pluralism.[5]

Community development is an expression of unhappiness with this view of the operation of the policy process. At its most extreme - in some theories of community action - it argues that the whole process is a gigantic confidence trick. In its more liberal version it merely wants to strengthen the voice of certain inarticulate members of society.

There is, I think, a relatively simple way in which to test the claims of those who argue that there is little scope for improvement in the operation of our democratic process and that any deficiencies are attributable to the faults of individuals rather than to the system.[6] It involves looking at how new policies emerge.

The policy process

A key question is: By what devices does government hear and act upon the signals from below? How do "problems" get on the political "agenda"? Does the political and administrative process influence the *type* of problem picked up by government or the *form* in which it is presented?[7] The assumption of our society, good "liberals" that most of us essentially are, is that the channels relating governors to governed are neutral and that the opportunity to articulate grievances and have these defined (if they are significant enough) as "problems" requiring action from authority is evenly distributed throughout society. This is what needs to be examined critically - the *concept* of grievance and the *process* by which government responds to grievances.

"Problems" emerge because individuals or groups feel dissatisfied and articulate and organise that dissatisfaction in an influential way which makes it difficult for government to resist.

"Grievance" or "dissatisfaction" is not, however, a simple concept - it arises when a *judgement* is made that events fall short of what one has reason to expect. Grievance is a function of *expectations* and *performance* - both of which are relative and vary from individual to individual - or, more significantly, from group to group.

The process whereby "problems" are brought to the attention of government can be represented thus:

A Expectations	B Achievement
C Felt grievance (if B lower than A)	D Articulation of grievance
E Organisation	F Recognition by politicians
G Definition and administrative processing	H Decision and implementation

From the recognition of these eight stages flow various questions:

1 Do all groups in our society have the *same expectations* about government or (say) the social services?

2 Do all groups share roughly the *same level of critical* perception of their own achievement?

3 Is the *capacity to articulate* grievances equally distributed in society?

4 Is the *capacity to organise* that articulation equally distributed?

5 Is the process by which the political system picks up signals a neutral one?

6 Is the process by which civil servants define problems and collect information a random one?

7 Does the *way* our decisions are taken and implemented affect the chance of their subsequent success?[9]

Community development grew in the 1960s as, increasingly, *negative* answers were given to these sorts of questions[10] and - perhaps more significantly - confidence grew that the *situation could be changed*. There are at least three schools of thought.

(a) *Mainstream community development* concentrated initially on stage (E) - organisation and co-ordination - but gradually extended its rationale to include (D) - help in articulating these grievances. Clearly it is not so interested in questions 1 and 2 above.

It is concerned to emphasise the need for better communications and organisation, but has shown an increasing awareness of the general deference of, for example, most of the tenants of housing estates and their absence in the lists of membership of established local party organisations.[11] If however, as Marris and Rein so simply put it, "democracy is about who listens to whom"[12] then it clearly follows that politicians will not only ignore the interests of the inarticulate and disorganised but - the pluralists would argue - are right to do so. The inarticulate and non-joiners must take up their beds and walk! This school

of thought is essentially liberal in its perception of the operation of the government system - assuming, that is, neutrality and goodwill.

(b) A slightly *more radical school* of community development draws on sociological theory of organisations in crediting the various groups within the government apparatus with specific vested interests or values which they spend some time protecting.[13] At its worst this school of thought is merely liberal populism (which sees problems of public expenditure in terms of "overblown bureaucracies") but at its best this school concentrates much needed attention on the screening devices whereby, however unconsciously, selections of problems or information are made to fit in with preconceived professional canons or administrative procedures (stage G) which serve to further the interests of the suppliers of the service at least as much as those of the clients. To the more cynical theorists of this school, the explanation for the establishment by education, for example, of its "community education sections" stems more from a desire to create the *impression* of change and caring than the *reality*.

This school has tended to concentrate on the consequences for the ordinary folk in a particular locality of these professional attitudes and bureaucratic processes.[14]

The particular style of community development to which this leads varies - some workers emphasising the prime importance of community groups learning about the "operation of the bureaucracy" first because without that understanding the community groups will fail, and second, by, hopefully, exposing for the groups the "inadequacies of the bureaucracy" both to incite groups to action and to challenge their own feelings of deference (stage D and E). Other workers again, however, have calculated that the prior necessity, *before* contacts are made between community groups and "authority", is to develop group self-confidence and have emphasised learning through self-help.

(c) *The third school* of community development theory takes the analysis of the second somewhat further - it takes the concern at least to stages (A) and (B) of the original "flow chart" but also queries fundamentally the validity of a strategy which concerns itself mainly or exclusively with the responses or output from the political machine. This school makes three points:

● It suggests that the "defence" of professional groups of their position within society is more active and subtle than that suggested by the second school and consists - generally unconsciously - of their various ideologies which stress *their own* expertise and, by definition, the incompetence of the lay person in a manner which undermines community self-confidence.

On this argument the "over-professionalisation" condemned by many, far from being an aberrant feature, is an essential component!

● It criticises the populist basis of the theory underpinning the second school which also ignores questions of social and industrial organisation, socio-economic structure and the funding of the social services.[15]

● It argues that the operation of our society, based as it is on an essentially acquisitive philosophy, has created mechanisms (in, for example, the education and housing sectors) which teach the majority of our population by and large to be satisfied with their lot, to have *low expectations*. On this argument the role of the professions is not only to protect their *own* positions of power and privilege but also - by the messages they pass across to ordinary people - to maintain the social structure as a whole!

It consequently implies that the reasons for the negative answers to the seven questions above are to be sought not in bad politicians or self-seeking professionals and bureaucrats but in the imperatives of our technological system. It tends to want self-help not so much as a means to a political end but as an end in itself.

The effects of community development

This three-fold distinction, although somewhat artificial, is not, however, totally different from the previous classifications which have been made.[16] Almost a decade on, it seems reasonable to ask what the contribution of community development in general or its particular schools in particular has been in Britain. And presumably we are interested in the possible effect the variety of community development activities have had on at least four target areas.

Firstly, the groups who seem to fair badly on the application of the above questions - have they become more organised, more articulate, more influential, more dissatisfied indeed (if we are to be logical) or, rather, more aware about the specifics of their dissatisfaction?; secondly the policies and procedures of *statutory agencies*; thirdly the understanding of *society* as a whole of such issues as power and poverty; and fourthly, the policy structure and philosophy of *political parties*.

In the remainder of this paper I shall be concerned essentially with the relationship between community development and the political process.

The disdain for politics

For the past year or so there has been some disillusionment in the radical school which to an extent has left the field to their liberal colleagues who, from within and

outside the statutory agencies, are helping community groups to operate more effectively[17] the rules of the game. To be fair to the radicals it may be that they have moved on - to political education and co-operative activities[18] -rather than stay with what they see as parochial dog-fights. For whatever reason, community development seems to have become institutionalised rather than politicised. In a sense the wheel has almost come full circle - at one time a casework approach to group dynamics[19] was seen to require professional skills and leave little room for contact with the political system. Radical community work challenged the casework model but had its own reasons for treating the political system with disdain. Now that community work has become respectable and fashionable, its political potential has been defused and it rests in the hands of "new priests".

There is here a great irony. Pre-war, the debates and activities which have characterised the community development scene would have taken place within or around local Labour Parties. That that Party (particularly at the local level) now views community development with such suspicion is perhaps indicative of the extent to which it has indeed become the "Party of Government".

Insofar as the major political parties as a whole can be said to have views of community development, they range from outright hostility through impatience and bewilderment to manipulation and tactical absorption. There are three reasons for the hostility of local politicians to "community development" - two of these are fundamental. The third is fairly inconsequential and can be disposed of briefly. It is that politicians tend to assume that community development processes will create political rivals (or certainly dissatisfaction) impose extra demands on an already overloaded administrative (and political) system, and give rise to pressure for extra spending when the opposite is (always) wanted by local government.

There is certainly an element of truth in each of these assertions but the shrewd politician welcomes both the "self-help" and "political" activities encouraged by community development - the "self-help" ones since they will, in fact, save the council money,[20] the "political" ones since they should give him both the information to be a better local representative and, in effect, local contacts who can share his burdens.

The other two reasons for hostility are, however, more profound. They are, firstly, that local political parties and processes have simply broken down, fail now to perform even the functions required of them by pluralist theory and that community development threatens the consequent "conspiracy of pretence" about this which has grown up. Secondly, that, even if these functions were

performed, it would not be *sufficient* to create a healthy society. In other words, pluralism is not enough.

The breakdown of the local political process

The modern political party is a creature of a pluralist society - in this role it is a more or less successful device to:

● *recruit* political leaders (or managers).
● *represent* community grievances, demands etc.
● *implement* party programmes - which may or may not be consistent with those community demands.
● *extend* public insight - by both media coverage of inter-party conflict *and* intra-party dialogue - into the nature of governmental decision-making (such insights can, of course, either defuse or inflame grievances!)
● *protect* decision-makers from the temptations and uncertainties of decision-making.[21]

As I've argued elsewhere[22] politicians shrug off any detailed criticisms of the effective working of these devices by arguing that if they were true and people felt strongly enough about them, fair opportunities clearly exist to change the procedures (if not the parties). To change in advance of such pressures is not only unwise (let sleeping dogs lie) but undemocratic! The idea that the manner in which the political parties and governmental machine behave and are covered by the media is itself diversionary and *alienating* is, not perhaps surprisingly, not one which normally occurs to politicians. Any inadequacies in these devices as a result, with no correcting devices, become compounded in a vicious downward circle. This is particularly true of local politics in that the recruitment of councillors i inadequate,[23] meaningful manifestos for local government are rarities,[24] when they exist they are rarely implemented since the councillor quickly turns into a manager or spokesman for departments,[25] but, above all, no dialogues are established to permit the community or party - let alone the elected member - to understand the reasons for the implementation failures.[26] As a substitute for such dialogues and insights everyone engages in scapegoat hunting, blaming the group with whom one has to work most closely, and indulging in adversary politics.[27]

The conspiracy of pretence

Government - whether local or central - has taken on too much.[28] It simply cannot cope with the resulting expectations. Instead, however, of trying openly to work through that dilemma, the politician as manager desperately and dishonestly tries to paper over the cracks and resents the intrusions of those who suggest that perhaps the Emperor has no clothes. In this dishonesty the professions and media play

a crucial role. The *media*, since it is they who create - by demands, for example, for "crash programmes" - the myth of government power which affects even governments themselves;[29] the *professions*, insofar as they resist questioning of certain practices and assumptions - particularly from lay people.[30] There is here a fatal contradiction for the political party in local government. Its role as a major employer clashes with its potential as a possible engine for social change. Local councillors are·trapped not only by these two forces of media and professions, but also by their part-time position, central government structure, and the committee structure, which apart from its other deep deficiencies,[31] encourages more loyalty to professional dogma than to any coherent ideology or programme.

These are the factors which entwine otherwise good intentioned councillors into roles and perceptions which they would not necessarily have chosen for themselves. Community workers are quick to excuse the behaviour of the "undeserving poor" on the basis of the roles and situation society creates for them - the same approach surely needs to be adopted by community workers for local politicians (particularly given the extreme pressures to which they are subject)[32] if community development is to do any more than fight a series of local scrimmages.

The councillor is powerless in all senses save one: he is the arbiter whereby the scarce resources (whether money, houses or whatever) are allocated amongst the competing demands. This, of course, in a sense is a very tangible power which certainly gives the councillor a significance (status?) to make perhaps his powerlessness in other directions more acceptable! The roles of manager, defender and "gate-keeper"[33] are however a far cry from the functions which even pluralist theory expects of the modern political party.

Political education and skills

Of the functions listed earlier, those badly performed by local government are the *representative,* the *programmatic*[34] and the *educational:* of these it is perhaps the lack of the educational that is the most serious and where certainly recent community development theory and practice in Britain have performed well,[35] both in the sense of developing important concepts and of making such insights more widely available and comprehensible than political parties (or academics!) seem capable of. One does not sense, however, that political parties have been involved in this learning. They need to be, not so much to make the system more acceptable or skilful (which community workers understandably fear) but rather to make individual politicians better change agents.[36]

I argued earlier that councillors need to and can be encouraged to see community

development processes as *enabling* them better to pursue their real political function - and in so doing to run services more cheaply and effectively.[37] So here it seems to me that councillors would *not* require a great deal of persuasion about the benefits to him (his party and society) of breaking the conspiracy of silence and pretence, confessing his uncertainties and impotence and exploring with various groups the constraints on the achievement of ends which many share. This is *not* a doctrine of consensus.[16] The point is that encouragement and sensitive skills not currently available would be required.

There is, however, the third reason for the hostility or reserve between politics and community development which stems from the fact that, in its more coherent forms, community development represents almost the *opposite* of everything that a modern political party stands for - is a critique, that is, not just of certain operational deficiencies of liberal democracy but of its very essence. The modern political party has itself a hierarchial structure and associated itself a hierarchial structure and associated internal "rational-bureaucratic" procedures (and expects others to have the same features). Secondly its members accept this discipline because of their belief in the greater good which, it is assumed, will materialise from the occupation by their leaders of political power and/or the implementation of a particular programme. The third characteristic which modern parties share, to a greater or lesser extent,[38] is a belief in the *capability* of modern forms of government· structure (and of industrial organisation) *viz,* that plans and programmes conceived in essentially private processes imposed on society by traditional hierarchical structures will achieve specified aims with negligible negative byproducts.[39]

Political parties are about *achievement* - even if that is only the overthrow of their rivals' dogma (or their own!). They are organised to achieve something - be that power or specific changes in policy. Community development, on the other hand, is about a *process.* Its theory, in a sense, is one of permanent revolution[40] which despite its own gentleness and emphasis on trust and sharing, has to live with the uncomfortable recognition that societies based on modern technology - whatever their form of ownership - will subject minorities to more or less subtle forms of repression and exploitation.[41] The political system, however weak itself, is a symbol of this repression: the question is whether it can ever be detached from this role. At the moment it is this which explains the reluctance of the second and third schools of community development to allow "their" groups to be contaminated[42] - through bargaining or temporary alliances - by the political system. And their subsequent stress on "going it alone", "learning from their own

mistakes" (isolationism). This, of course, can be most frustrating to reformists within the political parties who have become impatient with what they see (maybe correctly) as the selfish parochialism of community groups and the dishonest romanticising[43] of their community workers. Add that to what other councillors see as the lack of accountability of community workers[44] and their readiness to poach on councillors' territory, and the history of strained relations is not surprising.

In conclusion

In a sense what I have been trying to say is that many community workers have fallen into the familiar trap of assuming that people called politicians possess political skills. At the local level the only skills which the experience of local government develops well are those of personal survival - not of social change! The missing political skills are, I suggest, twofold:

●*a sense of strategy* - of appreciating the importance of a rigorous understanding of the sense in which the present is deficient and *how* one can move from it to a more desirable state.

●*organisational skills* to knit together various groups to achieve this change in a manner which sustains their support and commitment.[45]

Specht recently highlighted the neglect by British community workers of organisational change.[46] One could argue that in that sense they share the weaknesses of the British politician!

Many community workers are indeed self-indulgent in choosing to work with community groups (and being a useful "conscience" for the rest of local government) rather than the more challenging environment of politics and other professions.[47]

The councillor is uniquely placed to learn dangerous truths about our power structure - and yet receives no resources or help to develop or share such insights.

What I have been trying to say is that no political system can review the operation of the community development functions without looking very profoundly at its own role and activities and those for which it has nominal responsibility - that is the administrative structures and the professional activities within government.

In doing this it paradoxically requires certain skills which political activists used to possess but which are now more evident - in a more technocratic form - in certain schools of community development.

This poses a dual challenge to community workers and local politicians: can community workers achieve a working relationship with the system which is neither sycophantic nor counter productive? Are they willing to rise to the challenge which Specht[46] left them with in 1975? As for the politicians - John Benington presented us with a challenging descriptive and prescriptive analysis of our

operations[48] which involved us being willing to make available the skilled analytic resources (professionals and social scientists) at our disposal in local government (a) to the community (which includes the unions), and (b) to ourselves for political rather than managerial' tasks. We have depoliticised ourselves for long enough - castrating in the process not only the community we supposedly represent but an increasing number of officers who are not persuaded that many of the problems they confront can be ameliorated within the present conventional and bankrupt wisdom and structures of government. Is the political system willing to try to develop political skills and administrative structures of the sort our society needs, to move from a "controlling" to an "enabling" view of its role? Or is that an inherent impossibility?

References

1 See the 2nd Annual Report of the Labour group.
2 For a useful bibliography, see Chapter 1 of *Planning and Organising For Social Change* by Jack Rothman. Also the article by N Gilbert and H Specht in the *Sociology of Community Action,* ed P Leonard.
3 For various typologies and descriptions, see *Elements of Community Work* by Gulbenkian. Richard Bryant's article *Community Action* in *British Journal of Social Work,* Vol 2, No 2, and the paper by Smith and Bryce Anderson in *Participation in Politics,* ed G Parry.
4 Article by S Lukes on *The New Democracy* in the Political Studies, June 1963.
5 See, for example, *The Bias of Pluralism,* ed W Connelly.
6 See W Ryan's *Blaming the Victim* and also Bob Holman in the *British Journal of Social Work,* Spring 1973.
7 See my paper on the *Politics of Information* in the proceedings of the Scottish Library Association Annual Conference of 1976.
8 These four questions raise basic issues of perception and political socialisation and community organisation and touch on a vast literature. W G Runciman's book on *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice* (Penguin) is important to the first two questions.
9 Sociological Studies of the detailed processes of Public Administration in Britain are fairly rare but see Michael Hill's *The Sociology of Public Administration* and his most recent book *The State, Administration and the Individual.*
10 As the argument in the final section of this paper indicates, while these are important questions, they still take as granted the distribution of power between the people and government.
11 See Barry Hindess' *The Decline of the Working Class.*
12 Page 349 of *Dilemmas of Social Reform* (1974 Penguin edition).
13 See D Schon's *Beyond the Stable State* and the writings of Ivan Illich.
14 See the Dennis, Davies and Simie books on planning and Colin Ward's book on *Tenants Take Over.*
15 See Miliband's *The State in Capitalist Society* and Westergaard's recent *Class in Britain.*
16 See Bryce Anderson and Smith article in G Parry *Participation in Politics* and the pp10-

11 of part 1 of final report of the Coventry CDP.

17 "Adjust to" is perhaps the phrase which some would use. See Dearlove's paper in *Community Work One.*

18 As has John Benington and those who reckon that networks of communal economic projects are the real way to change society - that is, by example, rather than by political preaching.

19 See J Klein's *Working in Groups.*

20 The deep cynicism of those in local government (professionals?) about the competence of ordinary people was starkly revealed last year in a "problem" West of Scotland housing scheme whose community efforts had attracted national attention and whose youths offered to save the District Council at least £20,000 a year (and incalculable savings from reduced vandalism and more responsible and skilled citizens) by taking over the management of a new Sports Centre. It took more than a year of hard bargaining with a highly suspicious Council whose officers - whether deliberately or not - were very obstructive before this was achieved.

21 The question about how to vote when one lacks either the knowledge or passion about an issue is a complex one: one has to choose from the following list of tactics - abstain, support the likely winner, support a friend or one whose friendship one wants, follow the lead of those whose judgement one values. The party makes this dilemma an easy one to resolve!

22 In my paper *What Sort of Overgovernment?* in *The Red Paper for Scotland* and *From Corporate Planning to Community Action?,* Local Government Unit Occasional Paper.

23 The sacrifices entailed in being a local councillor considerably restrict the type of people who can contemplate service and hence the numbers. Equally the poor health of local parties place the selection of decisions in a few, unrepresentative hands.

24 A few exceptions have been Nottingham's Manifesto and that of Strathclyde Region. But see chapter 3 of John Gyford's recent *Local Politics in Britain.*

25 See K Newton's *Second City Politics* particularly chapter 7. See also R Rose's *The Problems of Party Government*, p367 for a discussion of the central government situation.

26 See my article in The Red Paper and G Green's paper in *Local Government Studies,* June 1974.

27 For a discussion of different types of politics, see p210 of Hill and p12 of Gyford.

28 See p77 in The Red Paper for Scotland.

29 Cox and Morgan: *City Politics and the Press,* and *The Silent Watchdog* by D Murphy.

30 Various studies have been done on the separate ideologies of the various professions in local government. For good general studies see chapters 6, 8 and 9 of Michael Hill's new book on *The State, Administration and the Individual* and Keele Sociological Monograph 20 on Professionalisation.

31 See the work of J D Stewart and John Benington - particularly the latter's *Local Government Becomes Big Business* and my guide to the Scottish local government system (Local Government Unit - forthcoming).

32 For a list of the nine groups to whom, in one sense or another, councillors are accountable see my paper on The Scottish Local Government system.

33 For a discussion of the concept of the "gate-keeper" see Deutscher's paper in *Among the People: encounters with the Poor,* eds Deutscher and Thompson.

34 See chapter 14 and 15 of Rose's *The* initiation see chapter 14 and 15 of Rose's *The Problem of Party Government,* Heclo and Wildavsky's *The Private Government of Public Money* and my paper on *Performance Review* (Local Government Unit).

35 Particularly the Coventry CDP. For a review see *Action-Research in Community Development* ed R Lees and G Smith, and *The Sociology of Community Action,* Keele University, Sociological Monograph.

36 See the chapter 17 of *Public Planning: the inter-corporate dimensions* by Friend, Power and Yewlett. Also Power's article on *Planning: Magic and Technique.*

37 See note 20 and the writing of such people as Ivan Illich, Colin Ward and John Turner.

38 Obviously the liberals and the Powellites to a "lesser" extent.

39 Chris Hood's book on *The Limits of Administration* is good on this.

40 One of the few articles to explore the obvious lessons for community work tactics and philosophy of the Bolshevik revolution is P Corrigan's paper on *The Sociology of Community Action.* There is, however, a significant phase in Midwinter's *Priority Education* to the effect that when asked by visitors for books on community work he referred them to E H Carr's The Bolshevik Revolution.

41 See the writings of Illich on this.

42 See Dearlove's contribution to *Community Work: One,* ed Jones and Mayo.

43 "Romanticising" in the sense of falsely attributing credit in order to develop the necessary self-confidence and challenge and destroy the myths about the capacity of ordinary people on which rests the present power structure. For some of the ethical problems this causes see Cheetham and Hill's article on Social Realities and Ethical Dilemma in *British Journal of Social Work* Vol 3 No 3 and Alinsky's *Reveille for Radicals.*

44 That the accountability of particularly local politicians may be rather tenuous never occurs to politicians. See my *Politics of Change in Local Government* (Local Government Unit).

45 See: *Searching,* ed M Emery.

46 H Specht: *"Community Development in the UK"* in *Policy and Politics* Winter 1975 "British Community workers tend to put great value on becoming engaged with people and problems and getting into action as soon as possible. When I speak of the neglect of structure I refer to such things as systematic problem analysis, the identification of actors or programme goals, the building of organisations and communication systems . . . and skills for evaluation and review".

47 How many courses of local government professions cover community work or give an opportunity for community placements? On another front, one suspects that many community workers are as schizophrenic as some councillors in, on the one hand, being clear that a more effective educational, housing, etc, service could be run with half the staff (on Illich lines) but being unhappy about the immediate employment implications.

48 In the final Coventry CDP Report.

The author

Ronald G Young is Director of the Local Government Unit (Paisley). He has been a councillor since 1968. From 1971 to 1974 he was chairman of Greenock and Port Glasgow Social Work Committee, from 1974 to 1975 chairman of Strathclyde Region's General Purposes Committee and since 1974 has been secretary of Strathclyde Region Labour Group and prime mover in its deprivation strategy.