CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Community development: a critical analysis of its “keywords” and values
Authors	Meade, Rosie R.
Publication date	2009
Original Citation	Meade, R.R. (2009) 'Community development: a critical analysis of its “keywords” and values', in Catherine Forde, Elizabeth Kiely and Rosie Meade (eds) Youth and Community Work in Ireland: Critical Perspectives, Dublin: Blackhall Publishing, pp.57-80. isbn:9781842181737
Type of publication	Book chapter
Rights	© Blackhall Publishing 2009.
Download date	2026-11-07 10:00:35
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/16770

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Citation: Meade, Rosie (2009) 'Community development: a critical analysis of its "keywords" and values', in Catherine Forde, Elizabeth Kiely and Rosie Meade (eds) *Youth and Community Work in Ireland: Critical Perspectives,* Dublin: Blackhall Publishing, pp.57-80.

Final Version

Community Development: a Critical Analysis of its 'Keywords' and Values

Rosie Meade

Introduction

This chapter does not evaluate the real life failures and successes of the many different community organisations currently active in Ireland. Nor does it offer a general diagnosis of the health of community development: what it can or cannot do for social policy; its status a la the state, the market or the 'people'; what's hot and what's not in terms of practice methods or issues on the ground. Instead this chapter is preoccupied with some of community development's 'Keywords' (Williams, 1983), by which I mean those concepts and values that are invoked in order to cultivate, legitimate and advance its public image. Community development is a curiously polygamous idea. It is coupled with the most beguiling and worthy concepts in the English language; democracy, participation and empowerment; in relationships that are often represented as rock solid, regardless of what is actually happening on the ground. This chapter starts from the premise that community development *can* generate actions, initiatives and opportunities that challenge oppressive or unequal social relationships, but that it does not always or inevitably do so. If there is progressive potential, then there are also countervailing tendencies: community development that is politically pragmatic, manipulative of or irrelevant to people's needs. You could put this down to the inevitable gap between theory and practice, the strong probability that we academics begin our analysis with inflated and abstracted expectations that could never be realised in the cold hard reality of the field. Theory

or social science thus appears to be a useless encumbrance, adding nothing, devaluing everything.

While there is a real risk of overstatement with it comes to community work, the problem is more suggestive of a theoretical deficit than theoretical surfeit. Firstly, terminology and theory are not the same. Simply juxtaposing community development with highly suggestive 'keywords' offers little in the way of detailed understanding or analytical depth, and the pretence of definitional clarity deflects important questions about those words. As Raymond Williams (1983: 16) explains, those questions are not 'only about meaning; in most cases, inevitably, they are about *meanings*' (my italics): plural, disputed and evasive *meanings*. This chapter focuses on the 'keywords', or as they are more usually described, 'core values' of *process*, *participation* and *empowerment*. It emphasises and demonstrates that their meanings are fundamentally contested, that they can be co-opted for contradictory political ends and that ultimately, rather than guiding values they are obscure scratches on community development's moral compass.

Secondly, critical sociological analysis destabilises certainties, unearths relations of domination and illuminates the connections between the personal and the public, the local and the global. It also helps us to trace the limits and intersections of 'out there' structures and 'in here' agency. For community activists and workers, this knowledge is useful, not as set of alternative truth claims, but as an intellectual armoury that protects against the ideological onslaughts of political, business, academic, media, and community leaders. Furthermore, theory helps us to clarify our intentions and maybe even our methods. For example, to claim that communities need empowerment demands a nuanced analysis of the different dimensions and forms of power, a consideration of what power communities already have and recognition of how and why vested interests may resist meaningful change. With his emphasis on 'praxis', Paolo Freire (1972a; 1972b) reminds us that social enquiry and social action are mutually rewarding, that they should never be detached and that both are central to the purpose of community work. I believe that community development's value base is an appropriate focus for such enquiry and this article draws on useful sociological concepts and literature in order to explore its dialectical potential.

Community Work or Community Development?

The first step in any critical analysis of the discourse and values of community development is to clarify what it is we are talking about, a more challenging task than it initially seems. Some textbooks represent *community work* as *the* generic term, incorporating a range of approaches or models, among which can be found, *community development*, *social planning*, *community education, feminist community work* and *community action* (Dominelli, 2006; Popple, 1995; Twelvetrees, 1991). Here community development signifies a distinctive praxis – i.e. its core values and modus operandi are recognisably different from those applied in alternative models of community work. In other instances the terms *community work* and *community development* appear to be synonymous (Commins, 1985; O'Cinneide and Walsh, 1990), and community development itself is represented as a potentially variegated field of practice.

Keith Popple (1995: 65-66) typifies the Community Action model as 'conflict' and 'direct action' oriented, whereby groups contest the limitations, excesses or misadventures of state and market intervention in their communities. The 'Shell to Sea' campaign in Mayo, might serve as a contemporary example. In contrast with what he terms community action's 'radical' or 'socialist approaches' (Popple, 1995: 72), community development is concerned with self-help in neighbourhood contexts and is more consensus orientated. Rather than fight the power groups attempt to become players in the broader field of power relations, perhaps through involvement in local state-partnership structures. Patrick Commins (1985: 166-168), distinguishes a 'classical model' of Irish community development, emphasising community as a 'harmonious entity' and where issues 'are reconcilable in the "common good"', from a social/community action model that adopts a structural analysis of inequality. Chris Curtin and Tony Varley (1995) have used a somewhat looser but complementary categorisation to differentiate 'integrationist' from 'oppositional' tendencies in Irish community action. Whatever their preferred terminology, authors agree that community based activism and interventions take a variety of organisational forms, are oriented towards a diversity of social outcomes and are led by a complex range and combination of actors. Furthermore, activity is underpinned by contrasting political claims and expectations; whether in terms of the composition and role of the community, or in terms of that community's relationships with the state, market, mainstream political processes, and other sites of power (Commins, 1985; Dominelli, 2006; Ife, 2002; O'Cinneide and Walsh, 1990; Popple, 1995; Powell and Geoghegan, 2004; Twelvetrees, 1991).

This chapter uses the concepts of community work and community development interchangeably, partly for convenience and partly because I am unconvinced that this field can or should be carved up in to precise or definitive models. Firstly, since the 1990s a consensus driven conception of community development has become hegemonic in Ireland and Britain (Forde, this volume; Meade, 2005; Popple, 2005; Shaw, 2006). This is neither to deny the possibility or actuality of dissent and resistance on the ground, rather it is to recognise the current marginal status of protest strategies in 'mainstreamed' community work. By mainstreamed I refer to community development that is core-funded, and in some cases initiated, by the state. Furthermore, a rigid classification of models may be of limited utility in the practice context, not least because of its potential to reify what are, to use the sociological parlance, 'ideal types'. Within the Weberian social scientific tradition, ideal types are academic constructs rather than descriptions of reality; they 'portray in heightened, indeed sometimes caricatured, form characteristic social relationships' (Callinicos, 2007b: 157) so that those relationships might be more easily subject to academic analysis or comparison. By emphasising too strongly the distinctiveness of particular models, we are liable to forget that community work is probably messier or more contradictory in practice. Ultimately, the boundaries between approaches are permeable. Groups may oscillate between oppositional and conciliatory tactics or they might adopt different organisational structures at particular points in their history. Community education or community care strategies may be subsumed within the work plans of an individual community development project. Depending on the issues or crises that emerge in communities, projects may shift from advocacy, to service provision, to information giving and back again.

Despite its fungibility, community development boasts a disparate range of advocates and supporters, including Shell Nigeria, the World Bank, the WK Kellogg Foundation, New Labour, former Taoiseach Bertie Ahern, the Combat Poverty Agency[1] and a host of locality based and identity groupings in Ireland. Among state and non-governmental organisations, it has become official short hand for a more participatory and socially inclusive approach to planning (Department of Social Community and Family Affairs, 2000). It is credited with offering, potential solutions to the most entrenched problems of Irish society: racism,

[1] The Combat Poverty Agency has since 1986 been centrally involved in the measurement of poverty in Ireland. As a state body it has played a significant role in supporting and celebrating anti-poverty work; in particular acting as a strong advocate for community development. In summer 2008 its future seems uncertain as Mary Hanafin, Minister at the Department of Social and Family Affairs is reported as 'giving strong indications that she wants to abolish the organisation' (Irish Examiner, July 28th, 2008)

inequalities in health, criminality, poverty and social atomisation. Fusing two of the most desired, yet elusive goals of contemporary living, our hankering after community and our insatiable pursuit of development, it links the best bits of traditional life to the promise of the modern. When it presents past and future in perfect symmetry, who could be 'against community development'? And what is the alternative? Barbarism, unbridled individualism and the death-knell for all that is social.

It is precisely because it is so universally popular that we need to be on our guard when community development is invoked. For one thing, it trades on our longstanding but nonetheless problematic affection for 'community'; a concept that magically confers democratic properties upon all words paired with it. As the US based political scientist and left-wing activist Adolph Reed Jr (2000: 10) has observed,

> [A]ssertion of links to, roots in, messages from, or the wisdom of the "the community" is more of a way to end a conversation about politics than to begin one. It is often the big trump in a game of one-upmanship, an attempt to validate one's position or self by alleging privileged connection to the well-spring of authenticity, to preempt or curtail dissent by invoking the authority of that unassailable, primordial source of legitimacy.

In this volume Hilary Tovey explores the sociological claims and counterclaims surrounding the idea of community. The concept of development deserves equally rigorous assessment. Theorists including Gustavo Esteva (1992) and Arturo Escobar (1992; 1995) argue that development is an 'ideology'; that we must learn to deconstruct the truth-claims and value judgments that it masks. When US President Truman launched the 'era of development' in 1949, progress came to be understood internationally as uni-directional, evolutionary, with all roads leading towards the standards of consumption, growth and wastefulness normalised by the 'modern' countries of the West. New scientific practices of development were invented - along with an associated lingua franca - that were framed as neutral, expert led and rational (Escobar, 1995; Esteva, 1992). Economic and cultural inequalities were redefined in technical terms, as glitches in the machine that could be repaired without any significant reordering of overarching systems of power and domination.

The Irish state's discursive commitment to community development and more recently to sustainable development implies that it is willing to accommodate diverse and pluralized perspectives on the best way forward for its citizens. But, in my view, a rigidly economistic vision of development still dominates the public sphere. It is articulated through the actions

and pronouncements of government, and elevated to the status of *the* truth in mainstream newspapers. Just think how regularly the bottom line of money and jobs is invoked to disparage alternative visions; be they May Day protesters in Dublin or community activists in Mayo (Meade, 2008; Rossport 5, 2006). As O'Dalaigh (2006: 144) wryly observes with reference to the ongoing dispute over the location of the motorway in the Tara/Screen Valley, ours is a public culture that finds 'scholars dismissed as tree huggers, environmental scientists damned as romantics'. This is because a genuinely open conversation about development demands searching questions about the role and legitimacy of the state's own actions, and those of the business and corporate sectors. It may even elicit troubling questions about the cohesiveness and democracy of communities themselves.

The Progressive Values of Community Development

Notwithstanding the academic ruminations about what to call or how best to define community development, there is general agreement that it is underpinned by a socially progressive value base. A recent draft document 'Standards for Quality Community Work' (2007) circulated by the Community Workers Co-op (www.cwc.ie) notes that 'community work is rooted in a set of core values' (2007: 13) that are the basis of its 'unique purpose and perspective' (2007; 13). Those values include *collectivity*, *empowerment*, *social justice*, *equality* and *anti-discrimination*, *participation*, *integrity* and *competence*. Fred Powell and Martin Geoghegan's (2004) research suggests that 'humanistic' and 'liberal' values strongly influence the practice of community organisations in Ireland. Writing in Australia, Jim Ife (2002: 269-70) rejects technocratic accounts of community work that construct it as a neutral or politically disinterested practice; inevitably it embodies the values of 'community itself,' 'democracy, participation, self-determination'. In 2004 a gathering of policy makers, researchers, academics and practitioners endorsed what has become known as the Budapest Declaration on 'Building European civil society through community development'. A vision of how community development might be supported by EU and national governments, it identified priorities in terms of research, training, sustainable development, justice and economic growth. It also explicitly referenced community development's 'core values/social principles' as 'covering human rights, social inclusion, equality and respect for diversity' (http://www.iacdglobal.org).

Accepting that community development is value driven, that people's intentions impact on their worlds, means recognising that social change is not delivered from on high through the intercession of governments or great leaders alone. Nor is change crudely determined by the onward march of historical or economic forces. With regard to the perennial debate about the sociological significance of structure and agency, community development comes down on the side of agency: that we can – and must - *actively* and *knowingly* participate in the construction of social reality. By coming together in communities, by purposefully interacting, negotiating and endlessly making demands, we can fundamentally shape the texture and content of our political, cultural and social lives. To find evidence of this agency we must reinterpret what might otherwise appear to be local or mundane experiences. For example, the building of a community resource centre is significant not only for the physical act of construction, the suitability of its design or for the services it provides, but also potentially for the new visions of possibility that it engenders. It may transform relationships between neighbours, lead to a renegotiation of roles between communities and state agencies, challenge the norm of private ownership by expanding communal or public space, and it may generate a new spirit of efficacy among those who work towards its completion. All of this can be seen as desirable social change, microscopic perhaps, but real in its consequences for particular communities. It can also be seen as public enactment of the kind of values to which community development lays claim. If similar kinds of collective agency are unleashed in other places, among other groups, micro experiments in community development might merge to become national, even international, movements for change.

Except, of course, for the fact that they might not. We should not get too carried away with either the promise of our own agency or our conviction that values can change the world. In 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte', Karl Marx (trans 1973: 146), warned that '[M]en make their own history, but not of their own free will; not under circumstances they themselves have chosen, but under the given and inherited circumstances with which they are directly confronted'. Community workers and activists practise in complex political, economic and cultural contexts, where local, national and global forces intersect and interact. Their actions are shaped, and often constrained, by new trends in social policy, legislation, the availability of funding and resources, community power dynamics, moral panics, unforeseen crises or the waxing and waning of voluntary effort. Because communities are rarely homogenous and most community development projects are answerable to a range of what are increasingly referred to as stakeholders, pragmatism, rather than values, may be the final

determinant of outcomes. Moreover, the State plays a decisive role in defining community development's character. Mae Shaw (2006: np) distinguishes between 'provided/invited spaces' and 'claimed/demanded spaces' as sites of practice (see also Forde and McInerney this volume). She argues that priorities are predominantly defined in relation to issues, structures and policies determined by government – the 'invited spaces'. 'Demanded spaces', where communities call the shots with reference to their own values are all too rare by comparison.

When community development activists or workers identify their values, they engage in a process of reflexivity - a kind of 'rational "monitoring" of their own conduct' (Giddens, 1995: 235) – whereby they admit to the aspirations and assumptions that underpin their actions. They also seek to demonstrate the 'uniqueness' of community development, how it differs from social work, for example, because it is concerned more with the autonomous organisation of people than it is with intervention in their private lives or with working on them. There is, however, a fundamental and irresolvable paradox in these claims of uniqueness. Alan Twelvetrees (1991: 15) finds that the 'uniqueness of community work derives from a value system which emphasises the importance of people discovering what they want to do, doing it, and not having it imposed on them.' Surely then, we must allow for the possibility that people will pursue agendas that are out of step with other putative community work values. To assume that communities will ultimately act in honourable or mutually beneficial ways is to be guilty of populism. In some, obviously extreme, cases exploitative or abusive employment practices, financial irregularity, corruption, nepotism, and unreasonable demands, are the realities of community development irrespective of the high-minded claims that groups insert in their mission statements. In the 1970s, Jo Freeman's classic feminist text *The Tyranny of Structurelessness* (c.1972), railed against the tendency of activist groups to give lip service to progressive values. She argued that once named, values were frequently abandoned; the inevitable consequences being frustration, cynicism, power struggles, burnout and new unaccountable forms of hierarchy.

The problems with values are more apparent when we take an internationalist and historical perspective. Marj Mayo (1975) has demonstrated how in the early to mid decades of the 20th Century the UK Colonial Office actively promoted community development as a bulwark against anti-colonialist movements in the British Empire. Reminiscent of the *Killing Home Rule with Kindness* approach that had been adopted in Ireland this was effectively a last-ditch strategy to stave off or, at the very least, to shape the post-colonial futures of the emergent

nations. In a similar vein, James Midgley (1986: 18) notes that during the 1950s and 1960s US Aid programmes provided significant ideological and financial resources to community development programmes in 'Third World' countries, most notably Thailand and Vietnam, in order to 'contain subversive influences'. This was community development in anti-communist mode. More recently Liam Kane (2006) has criticised the World Bank's peddling of a neo-liberal friendly model of community development in the Global South. In urban USA, Randy Stoecker (2003) finds the dominant model of community development, typically delivered through Community Development Corporations (CDCs), to be pragmatic; largely focused on building construction, a narrowly framed model of economic development and the gentrification of poor neighbourhoods. On both sides of the Atlantic, Bush and Blair have lauded and increased public expenditure on faith-based community development initiatives, through the 'White House Faith Based and Community Initiative' for example, thus raising serious concerns about the comparative influence of religious and secular values in community work.

> [W]hat are espoused as 'community development values' are more truthfully a rather muddled accretion of well-intentioned and often passionately held aspirations drawn from its rather disparate and complex provenance. (Shaw, 2006: np)

It is difficult to reconcile the idea of community development as an organic expression of popular expectation with an insistence that it has an *a priori* value system. This chapter suggests that we treat community development's values with a fair degree of scepticism. This does not mean dispensing with optimism or denying any role for community development in the making of a better society. We should recognise, however, that the discourse of community development *can* be dishonoured by its practice. It also invites a more profound enquiry; whether it is merely in the application of that discourse or in its very construction that the roots of those anomalies lie.

Locating the Importance of Process

'[T]he community development approach is generally described as an educational *process* through which communities achieve personal and social change' (Shaw, 2006: np, my italics). Here 'process' suggests a singular concern with the *means* by which development is to be achieved: an admission that the building of active and socially engaged communities requires

slow and deliberate steps. Where people feel isolated, fearful, apathetic or deskilled, it is a task in itself to mobilise the collective will and spirit of optimism that community development demands[2]. It is a further challenge to find some grounds for consensus regarding mutually beneficially actions, particularly where conflict or distrust bubble below the surface of daily encounters. In a sense workers and activists must become evangelists for community development, and when the pace of change is slow or tedious, it is often the most modest indicators of personal growth or new found assertiveness that become the hooks on which more long term commitment is secured.

For Margaret Ledwith, the community development process begins with 'listening, valuing and understanding people's particular experiences' (Ledwith, 2005: 32). Across the literature, this core idea is repeated; that local wisdom has its own inherent value but that it is also the raw material for more sustainable and effective public policy (Ife, 2002; Twelvetrees, 1991; Wates, 2000). Even when state agencies, outside NGOs or established interest groups initiate community development, it is underwritten by the populist claim that ultimately it will and should be owned by the people. For example the Department of Community Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (2005: 2), claims its role is 'to provide support to communities in the most appropriate way as they work to shape their own futures, address their common goals and achieve their full potential'. However, in order to make the transition from objects to subjects of development, community members may be judged as needing 'capacity building'; the refining of skills, knowledge, values and attitudes so that they are better equipped to participate in the processes of change. Consequently, community workers often devote considerable time to management training, group work and introductory courses in community development. The underlying assumption is that community development requires community development and that ultimately it begets more community development; method and outcomes are indistinguishable in a process without end.

The sanctity of the process is moderated by projects' actual dependency on state funding for their material welfare. They operate in a policy context whereby increasingly ambitious claims are made about community development's capacity to respond to and resolve social contradictions. It is commonly assumed that community organisations will serve as a conduit

[2] In using the term community worker, I do not necessarily suggest that this worker is either paid or a 'professional'. I am referring instead to any individuals – activists, volunteers, paid workers – who attempt to activate and support community organisation based on a conscious commitment to the improvement of those communities. Dilemmas associated with professionalization of community development are discussed by Seamus Bane in this volume.

for ordinary citizens to shape public policy. However, policy making is a highly complex business, with political and institutional factors each playing their part and with power formations often disguised or indistinguishable (Hill, 2005). Furthermore, because projects' greatest achievements generally occur in the more amorphous and localised zones of capacity building, they may find it easier to articulate successes and failures in qualitative rather than quantitative terms (Lee, 2006; Motherway, 2006). Nonetheless, accountability and budgeting conventions typically stipulate the kind of hard and incontrovertible data that demonstrates efficient use of taxpayers' money; e.g. services provided, working groups established, courses organised or matching funds raised. The timeframes within which projects return annual reports or develop strategic plans are usually determined centrally and can be out of sync with the needs and pace of community living. More ominously, the state may construct accountability in punitive terms. In Spring 2003, a quite positive evaluation of the Community Development Programme[3] that had been commissioned by the Department of Community Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, was followed by a controversial suspension of the Department's commitment to tri-annual funding of projects. In an exercise that seemed primarily concerned with tightening the Department's control over the programme, a 'review' of the CDP was instituted. Projects were plunged into a period of uncertainty regarding their futures, as they were required to resubmit their work plans in line with the new funding regime. Although, business as usual has been restored, this episode serves as salutary reminder of how the state may use its power arbitrarily to override the processes of community development (Meade, 2005).

Community development's privileging of 'process' reflects the influence of Paolo Freire's concept of 'critical pedagogy': 'a democratic process of education that takes place in community groups and forms the basis of transformation' (Ledwith, 2005: 95). Recognising that oppression is sustained through the interaction of coercion from above and consent from below, Freire (1972a; 1972b) was concerned with how the 'oppressed' might develop the kind of consciousness that permits ruthless critique of things as they are, yet also nurtures the imagination of alternatives. His was a radical vision of a society transformed, where education ceases to service dominant economic and social relations, becoming recast as 'cultural action for freedom'. The role of the

[3] The Community Development Programme is core funded by the Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (2003; 4) and it is, perhaps, the most high profile and extensive programme of community development in the history of the southern Irish state. According to the Department, projects are 'designed to mobilize the capacity of disadvantaged communities to participate in mainstream local development, training, education and employment opportunities'.

worker/activist/educator is to create spaces for and bring momentum to dialogues that allow the issues, fears and aspirations of communities to be laid bare. This role demands problem posers not problem solvers: asking why, how and where to next. It also requires new forms of leadership that are founded upon an unequivocal commitment to radical change, but that are not doctrinaire about the route to achieving it.

Henry Giroux (2000) argues that Freire's ideas are often applied in superficial ways, and thus he reveals some of the risks posed by the fetishisation of process. Freire championed more participatory educational methods, emphasising interaction over didactic instruction, deconstructing the hidden hierarchies of the classroom. So, it can look as if we are following his intellectual lead when we purposefully democratise the spaces in which we work. Arranging the chairs in a circle, faithfully committing all opinions to the flip chart, discussing issues in detail, ensuring that everyone has their say, these are typical aspects of day to day community work. Stephen Duncombe (2007: 171) explains the concept of pre-figurative politics, where 'the vision of the future is prefigured in the practices of the present, thereby erasing the distinction between mean and ends'. In other words, if community development means working towards the creation of a more discursive, open and respectful society, why not start as we mean to go on by, quite literally, practising change in the resource centre or the community forum. Often though, the process stops there. Giroux (2002) reminds us that Freire wanted to radically reframe education's social role by asserting its place in the battle against oppression: a battle that calls us to recognise that society is conflict ridden and requires us to confront the roots of injustice. When Freire's methods are detached from their revolutionary purpose, his vision of the educational or community work process is reduced to feel-good encounter sessions. Even if we do not accept that community development has a higher calling in terms of social transformation, the absence of tangible outcomes can be demoralising. If people get involved because they lack services, jobs, or facilities, there is probably a limit to how long they will be buoyed along by a process. 'Things' need to change, not just feelings or mindsets but 'things as they are' in the real worlds of community and society, otherwise momentum is lost and solidarity dissolves.

The Limits of Participation

Perhaps more than any other value, community development stands for participation. This can mean that otherwise disengaged individuals become actively involved in the management of projects or at the very least that they are consulted about the course of development as it impacts

on their daily lives. It can, however, mean much more; that citizens begin to play a more central role in the definition of public policy. Here participation is orientated towards local, national and, increasingly, global sites of influence and decision making. It may involve making better use of the structures and processes of liberal democracy, running as candidates in elections or getting the vote out in support of community campaigns. Going even further, it might signal a richer and broader conception of democracy itself.

Liberal democracy is a compromise between individual liberty, political participation and state control, based on the assumption that the masses must be allowed speak, but only through carefully managed processes and at clearly defined times. Effectively it offers democracy 'lite'. Elections are crude instruments for accessing popular opinion, particularly in light of deficiencies in voter registration, a general trend towards reduced voter turnout, albeit one reversed in the most recent Irish general election, and declining membership of political parties (see Hughes et al, 2007). Rhetorically we accept that democracy is government of the people, for the people, by the people; calls for participation concentrate our attention on the final fragment of that hackneyed phrase asking what else can 'by the people' mean. They ask us to envision and create a participatory democracy, the kind of society in which 'all collective decisions involve active participation by some of the people that they effect and nearly everyone participates in some of the decisions that affect them' (Baker et al, 2004: 99).

In Ireland and internationally, social movements and community groups have attempted to renegotiate the terms of really existing democracy, in order to move towards such a participatory vision (see also McInerney this volume). The Community Workers Co-op had framed its own involvement in national social partnership as a form of participative democracy, one that allowed it and the other social partners 'to enter discussions with government on a range of social and economic issues and to reach a consensus on policy' (http://www.cwc.ie/work/sp.html). The World Social Forum, an international gathering of civil society organisations and social movements, has since 2001 converged on Porte Alegre and other regions, in order to explore and demand new configurations of democracy (Mestrum, 2004). Its charter of principles 'upholds respect for Human Rights, the practices of real democracy, participatory democracy' and 'peaceful relations, in equality and solidarity' (WSF, 2002: np). The Irish Government has also joined the chorus. Drawing inspiration from developments in the EU Commission, its White Paper 'Supporting Voluntary Activity' (2000: 14) endorsed the concept of active citizenship, meaning the 'active role of people, communities

and voluntary organisations in decision-making which directly affects them'. It further agreed that 'the concept of formal citizenship and democratic society' must be extended to incorporate direct forms of 'participation' and 'responsibility'. Of course, we should be wary of the political expediency and cynicism that is masked by the rhetoric of active citizenship. As Zygmunt Bauman (2007:145-146) has witheringly observed with reference to Britain, government discourses on 'responsible' communities define new 'sites where the problems abandoned by the 'great society' can be 'tackled in cottage industry mode' thus allowing the state to disengage from public provision.

Obviously the implications of participatory democracy are far reaching. The political landscape could be transformed by the creation of new forums for negotiation and decision-making and, ultimately, through the erosion of the centrality and status of the parliamentary system (for interesting critiques, see O'Cinneide, 1998/99; Furedi, www.geser.net/furedi.html,). This vision requires the equalisation of access to economic, social and cultural resources, the absence of which skews political influence towards already privileged groups (Baker et al. 2004; Hughes et al, 2007). In the current political climate, however, egalitarian politics has lost its lustre. Nancy Fraser (2000; 2003) observes that, with the global ascendance of the neo-liberal paradigm, political interest in the contentious idea of economic redistribution has been decentred and diluted (see also Treacy this volume). Justice is now framed primarily in terms of 'recognition', whereby minority or oppressed groups seek visibility and respect for their cultural identities and pursue 'participatory parity' in political life (Fraser, 2000; 2003). Often these are vital struggles, not only for the well-being of those minorities, but also for the health of democracy itself. For example, in Ireland the ritual demonisation of Travellers and Traveller culture has real material consequences; impacting negatively on their health, welfare and social standing (see Lentin and McVeigh, 2006). By challenging dominant ideologies of sendentarism and possessive individualism and by confronting institutionalised forms of oppression, Travellers' demands for recognition invigorate the broader struggle for equality on this island However, if community development's politics is reduced solely to questions of recognition, if our sensitivity to cultural or social inequality is shorn of an awareness of economics[4] – and specifically neo-liberal

[4] According to the Equality Authority (www.equality.ie) '[T]he Employment Equality Act, 1998 and the Equal Status Act, 2000 outlaw discrimination in employment, vocational training, advertising, collective agreements, the provision of goods and services and other opportunities to which the public generally have access on nine distinct grounds. These are: gender; marital status; family status; age; disability; race; sexual orientation;

economics - how it liberates some but constrains most, then opportunities for genuine participatory parity will be diminished.[5]

Some community development organisations have made the leap to broader political participation through their membership of the 'social pillar' in national partnership negotiations. By securing a place at the table, and effectively forcing the state to concede that many groupings - including women, Travellers, young people, the poor - were inadequately represented by mainstream political parties or the other partners, the social pillar won a significant victory in terms of official recognition. The community sector has used the processes and forums of social partnership to challenge dominant representations of minority communities and to lobby for progressive reforms. Whether these achievements amount to a new era of 'participatory democracy' is dubious, especially since the state has abdicated little in the way of real influence to the social pillar (see Forde this volume, also Kirby, 2002, Meade, 2005, Meade and O'Donovan, 2002, Murphy, 2002). Youth, community and voluntary sector organisations, are widely regarded as junior partners who lack the muscle of both the employer and trade union sectors. Furthermore, the social pillar organisations are not unanimous in their commitment to partnership or in their estimation of its usefulness. Individual members are ambivalent about the effort, compromises and lost opportunities for protest that participation entails (Meade, 2005; Murphy, 2002). Finally, social partnership is a highly institutionalised process of decision-making. It engages a select group of negotiators from organisations that have been picked by the government not freely chosen by the majority of citizens. Irrespective of the progressive and insightful contributions of those involved, partnership is insufficiently transparent, accountable and broad based to constitute a genuinely participatory model of democratic life.

religious belief; and membership of the Traveller Community'. Notably class and economic status do not feature as grounds for discrimination and exclusion.

[5] The primacy of economic and material considerations in the Irish policy making sphere has been crudely illustrated by recent proposals to merge the state's key equality bodies; The Equality Tribunal, National Disability Authority, Equality Authority, Irish Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner. According to the Irish Times (De Breadun, 20/08/2008) the plans have been criticised by Labour Party spokesman on Human Rights, Joe Costello; "It now seems that the tightened Exchequer situation is going to be used to neuter organisations like the Human Rights Commission and the Equality Authority that have been critical of the Government," he said'.

Aside from its democratising potential, participation may address other, more existential needs. In recent years, a range of sociological, philosophical and popularising texts have diagnosed profound levels of alienation within contemporary Western society. Among the most famous is possibly the US best seller, 'Bowling Alone' (2000; also Putnam et al, 2003) in which Robert Putnam records the decline of active-community in the USA. He explains that citizens have retreated into privatised realms of TV viewing, travelling by car or workplace ambition, thus sacrificing the social networks, bonds of trust and norms of reciprocity that otherwise give life meaning. His book demonstrates that human interaction and connectivity – or in a phrase 'social capital' – significantly enhances health, wealth and happiness, while their absence generates tremendous costs in terms of criminality, suspicion and social breakdown.

There is much that is vague and analytically lightweight about this discussion of social capital (see Navarro, 2002; Mowbray, 2005; Smyth and Kulynych, 2002). Problematically, it is underwritten by a benign view of market and state. Putnam fails to interrogate how the political and economic structures of advanced capitalism have contributed to the processes of atomisation and alienation that he describes. Nonetheless, his work is notable because it encapsulates a mood of popular disquiet regarding modernisation's collateral damage. In Ireland, it has informed the public statements of former Taosieach Bertie Ahern, the research agenda of the National Economic and Social Forum (2003) and the establishment of a government Task Force on Active Citizenship in 2006[6]. Discussions on social capital tend to focus on two questions: how can we maintain and extend existing levels of voluntary action *and* how can we re-energise a 'spirit' of community, so that trust and neighbourliness are once again normalised in Ireland. Participation, it seems, builds community and community builds participation. If we are to reveal and evaluate community participation's ultimate purpose, we need to raise some additional questions. What vision of power, and power relations, is participation expected to serve? Can all interests and agendas be reconciled so that everyone participates as equals? How can we distinguish the healthy and unhealthy, the acceptable and unacceptable forms of participation? And finally, who makes those distinctions and in doing so whose interests do they serve?

[6] Interestingly the report of the Task Force suggested that there is no obvious decline in rates of volunteering but that voting trends should give more cause for concern. It did also acknowledge the difficulty in measuring qualitative experiences of community life. Its report suggested that it is these dimensions of social capital that give most concern.

Empowering the Concept of Empowerment

Empowerment still has some radical cachet. The concept is rooted in Freire's educational philosophy and the progressive discourses of the New Social Movements (Cleaver, 2001). Empowerment implies that community development is an inherently political process with an inherently political purpose (see CWC, 2007, Ife, 2002; Ledwith, 2005; Lee, 2006, for definitions). It promises that community power can be unleashed and redistributed, that social relationships will be reconfigured in favour of the poor or dispossessed. Unfortunately, overuse has left the concept almost threadbare. Marketeers and the market, government and international governmental organisations have appropriated the word, effectively erasing its unsettling connotations of power, inequality and politics. Adolph Reed Jr (2000: 116) dismisses it as a 'negative keyword' representing everything from 'self-help psychobabble to bootstrap alternatives to public action, to vague evocations of political mobilisation'. Now it serves 'technical' and 'project-dictated imperatives' in the fields of local and international development (Cleaver, 2001: 37) or as a byword for individualised voyages of self-discovery that have no broader political or public importance.

Maybe there is a case for abandoning empowerment to its fate, for using better or more robust concepts to define the purpose of community work. Maybe it is possible to reclaim the concept for the left, to anchor it more securely in discourses of solidarity, democracy and equality. Either way, an analysis of power must remain central to the theory and practice of community development. Of course this in itself is no easy task, because 'power' is a much contested sociological concept (see Crossley, 2005) and there are ongoing debates regarding the primacy of conflict or consensus approaches; whether power is 'something' that others have 'over' us and at our expense or an inexhaustible resource that can service all social interests simultaneously. Marxist and Weberian sociologists typically adopt the former construction, with the latter, somewhat benign understanding, associated with the functionalism of Talcott Parsons (see Giddens, 1995).

Saul Alinsky, the infamous community organiser from Chicago, was a committed advocate of the conflict perspective on power. As a self-styled political realist, he believed the world to be 'an arena of power politics' (1971/1989: 12) that communities must get down and dirty in the battle for influence. He argued that community workers 'must rub raw the resentments of the people of the community; fan the latent hostilities of many of the people to the point of overt

expression' (1971/1989: 116). To contemporary readers, these might seem brazen and alarming sentiments, particularly in Ireland, where partnership and consensus approaches to community development are elevated above all others. Scenes from Bellnaboy in Mayo, where activists resist the combined forces of Gardai, Shell and Government in order to renegotiate the terms of the Corrib Gas Project, remind us that vital undercurrents of opposition still survive in this country (see Rossport 5, 2006). In contrast, mainstream or state-resourced community development organisations may fear – with some legitimacy - that resistance or confrontation will provoke a backlash from authorities, endanger future funding or diminish public approval.

In 2007, then Minister for Justice Brian Lenihan asked Department officials to report on the conduct of Travellers' Rights organisation Pavee Point in supporting a group of Roma who camped on a roundabout on the M50 (Lally and Healy, 2007). His comments suggested that government is less than tolerant of the social justice demands of community organisations, even when they are not framed in overtly conflictual terms. Justifying his intervention, he is reported as saying,

> If their [Pavee Point's] involvement was simply to provide humanitarian assistance to these individuals, then I do understand their position. But if their position was that these individuals should be permitted to stay here and that we should set aside the whole immigration law of the State, and have a back-door entry policy, then that would be wrong. (Lenihan in Lally and Healy, 2007: np)

Given that the Irish government poses as friend and enabler of community development organisations (DSCFA, 2000), this is an extraordinary statement. The Minister suggests that organisations should stick to service provision – note the echo of charity in his reference to 'humanitarian assistance' - that matters of policy or procedure pertaining to the immigration system are beyond their ken. Furthermore, his statement reveals the hierarchical nature of state/community relationships, a hierarchy that is often obscured by the dominant rhetoric of consensus. He therefore sends out a pre-emptive warning to community groups that might otherwise seek to defy or re-imagine the unwritten codes of their relationships with the state.

If we accept that power is a capacity for action or a resource that is shared unequally, then we need to consider how power is divided out and used in communities. The classic 'Community Power Debate' (Crossley, 2005; Gaventa, 1980; Lukes, 1974; 2005) focused on these questions with particular reference to political life in the USA. Pluralist contributors asserted that the

public sphere was relatively open and responsive to a wide range of interests, while critics such as Stephen Lukes (1974; 2005) portrayed more insidious and subtle expressions of power that bolstered the fortunes of dominant social groups. A detailed discussion of the terms of this debate is beyond the scope of this chapter but collectively its chief disputants produced a three-dimensional conceptualisation of power that still is of great relevance for our analysis of Irish community development.

The first dimension of power is revealed when we get our 'opponents' to do things they would otherwise not do; they concede to our might and act against their interests. A community organisation that is battling the County Council over the location of a dump might, due to the force of its counterargument or its recourse to legal measures, convince its opponents to drop their plans. Empowerment in this instance involves mobilising local people and resources to fight for the cause; a cause that is presumed to have some hope of success in a relatively pluralistic political system. The second dimension of power relates to the parameters of public debate, how some issues are ignored, deemed non-negotiable or rendered invisible, despite their serious implications for minority or disadvantaged groups. It calls into question the pluralism of the political, social and cultural spheres and draws our attention to a 'behind the scenes' operation of power that reinforces existing hierarchies. As Bacharach and Baratz (1962: 948) explain, power holders or elites protect their own interests or world view by devoting their energies 'to creating or reinforcing social and political values and institutional practices that limit the scope of the political process to the public consideration of only those issues which are comparatively innocuous'.

For arts activists who are committed to a multi-dimensional conception of cultural democracy that embraces participation in the consumption, production and distribution of the arts, this second-dimension of power is an ongoing site of struggle. Declan McGonagle (2007: 425) former director of the Irish Museum of Modern Art, argues that community arts, such as is practised in or by community development projects, is generally perceived as occupying a 'marginal' status in 'the culture' of Ireland; disregarded or disrespected as second rate by mainstream cultural commentators and institutions. Established selection and validation procedures ensure that most museums and galleries neither engage with these artforms nor with the communities that make them. McGonagle (2007: 426), therefore, asserts that '[D]evelopment requires a connection to power but to redistribute and to refocus that power,

not to destroy it', and so activists must contest and remake the institutional, policy and cultural processes that define what art is and what it is not.

The third dimension reflects what Lukes (1974: 23) calls 'the supreme exercise of power'. There are strong parallels between this theorisation of power, and those of Paolo Freire (1972a) and Antonio Gramsci (Trans 1971), insofar as all three emphasise the distorting effects of ideology on the behaviour of ordinary people. Complex and unseen, power robs us of insight into our objective circumstances; we interpret the world through false or alien frames of reference and our compliance to the status quo is secured as dominant interests control our 'thoughts and desires' (Lukes, 1974: 23). In other words, many communities appear to have real and legitimate reasons for protest but their apparent apathy, acquiescence or fixation with irrelevant concerns is a regular source of disappointment to politically committed activists who dream of change. Contrast the vivid and highly charged exchanges that surrounded the Roy Keane/Mick McCarthy imbroglio, with the impoverished debate associated with the Citizenship Referendum of 2004. Worse, the high level of electoral support for that constitutional amendment suggests that public opinion *was* decisively shaped by the negative constructions of migrants and migration that had been a feature of government and media discourses for almost a decade. Of course, it is both discomfiting and impolite to say that 'other people' get it wrong because they are duped by power; at the very least it invites the charge of arrogance or cultural imperialism. In the world of community development where so much emphasis is placed on the wisdom of communities and the importance of listening to people's voices, it might appear to be the ultimate betrayal of practice values. Nonetheless, Lukes's critical theorisation of power raises fundamental questions for community activists and workers who are driven by progressive political aspirations. It suggests that argumentation towards what communities don't know rather than facilitation of what they already presume may be the true vocation of the community worker. Maybe projects should attempt to mould rather than mirror community expectations. More worryingly, it implies that there may be tensions between the participatory ethos of community development and its commitment to citizen empowerment; the seamless connection between one value and the other may be more rhetorical than real.

Community groups can pursue empowerment on any or all of the three power dimensions, and in doing so they will face active, institutionalised or even unwitting resistance from established power blocks. Frances Fox Piven and Richard A Cloward (2002) remind us that even when poor people's movements win critical victories in terms of welfare, labour or social rights, that

those victories can be reversed; that governments, employers or institutions can and will claw back concessions unless they are jealously guarded[7]. Consequently, empowerment should never be classed as a technical exercise or as a deliverable that can be quantified to universal satisfaction. If groups struggle to win campaigns, to publicise their concerns outside their own communities or to rouse the masses from their willing acceptance of the status quo, they might, out of sheer frustration, conclude that they have no real power. A key problem with the 'Community Power Debate' is that it treats power as 'something' that is 'out there', a kind of end-point that signals either ultimate success or ultimate failure. There are, however, other useful ways of understanding power; approaches that treat it as relational rather than as a fixed capacity, approaches that recognise how power is negotiated continuously in all human encounters.

Although acutely conscious of oppression, Michel Foucault (1994), also emphasised that some forms of power are socially dispersed, that power is more than repressive capacity, that it is 'the means whereby all things happened' including the production of pleasure and knowledge (Giddens, 1995: 263). He recognised that power is expressed not only in the obvious arenas of decision-making, but also in everyday routines, institutional arrangements, cultural practices, and in dominant and subaltern discourses (Foucault, 1994). For example, Colin Cameron (2007) describes how the Disability Arts Movement has consciously subverted mainstream discourses about disability by representing and celebrating positive, boisterous and creative images of the disabled subject. In doing so, the Disability Arts Movements has rejected the established canon of the arts world and asserted its own power to cultivate alternative ways of being, knowing and expressing. In his analysis, interestingly, 'non' or 'anti' participation is a manifestation of power. By supporting and validating resistant forms of living, talking, organising and imagining, community groups may subvert or inflect dominant relations of power. This resistance will not by itself radically transform overall patterns of

[7] Two examples from summer 2008 illustrate this point. The Small Firms Association has called for a decrease in the minimum wage (SFA, 15/07/2008), claiming that 'Ireland has "lost the plot" in terms of having a competitive labour market' and arguing for a €1 cut in the already paltry hourly rate. Meanwhile. Minister for Social and Family Affairs christened the recession with the inevitable 'Crackdown on Jobless Benefits Claims' (RTE, 21/07/2008); signalling the return of weekly 'signing on' for new applicants and increasing checks on the bona fides of existing recipients.

inequality or oppression, but it does at least reveal a capacity for contrariness and altered thinking that is immensely valuable in a homogenising world.

Conclusion:

Sometimes, I think that the words participation, process and empowerment could easily be replaced by a 'there, there, there now'; those vaguely encouraging noises our mammies made to calm us down when they thought we were too stirred up. Participation, process and empowerment should be meaningful concepts but all too often they are not. Often this is because the crucial responsibility of explanation is evaded when they are named as community development's values; explanation regarding what it is we might hope to achieve by pursuing them, who or what stands in their way and what are the kinds of sacrifices we might be forced to make in their honour. It is also because community development has become all things to all people: simultaneously attractive to the international and national architects of neo-liberalism and to activists with a deeply felt commitment to egalitarian politics.

Community development groups do useful, even essential work. They provide basic services, share information about welfare and entitlements, support people who are distressed, lonely or isolated and they create much needed spaces for sociability. They show that people have potential power: power that can be expressed as resistance, outright opposition, acquiescence and co-operation. Our agency is expressed both individually *and* collectively, often through community organisations, so that we leave discernible imprints upon the social, political and cultural spheres we inhabit. Adult literacy classes, community parades or lively public meetings can enrich and improve our society. At a time when the desires of the individual consumer almost invariably trump the needs of the collectively minded citizen, community organisations that claim a value for solidarity, mutuality and creativity are actively subverting dominant cultural and political discourses. They remind us that the 'self' is always social and so are our interests, so are our needs.

It is, however, more difficult to distinguish what kind of imprint community organisations are leaving locally, nationally and internationally, in terms of decisions made, policies followed through or progressive legislation enacted. William Gamson (1995) notes that for collective forms of action to be possible, people need to develop new 'frames' or frameworks of thinking through which we can re-appraise our worlds. Specifically, we must develop; 'injustice' frames that support the kind of moral indignation or anger that will fuel our desire for change;

'agency' frames that engender self-belief, that *our* alternatives are possible; and 'identity' frames, that position our 'we' in opposition to a 'they' who 'have different interests or values' (Gamson, 1995: 90). In contemporary Ireland, the mainstream narrative of community development presents a perpetual and all encompassing we, but no they. This ideology of consensus has been institutionalised both locally and nationally, in the form of partnerships. Many community activists and development workers believe that participation in these structures and processes offers the only viable route to empowerment; therefore they are strategically, if not ontologically, committed to partnership. Often this is articulated as a 'we have no choice but to be involved'.

There are choices, however, albeit uncomfortable and potentially painful ones. The consequences of alternative choices may be a community development that is less well funded, that has less status in policy discourses or a community development that embarrasses and alienates powerful interest groups. Protest is a gamble. It brings no guarantee of success and every likelihood of reprisal, but it does at least force our attention on to the impoverished scope, form and processes of Irish political debate. It reminds us of hierarchies of access, opportunity and outcome that partnership obscures. If community organisations are determined to stick with partnership, then they must demonstrate its effectiveness with more conviction. We need to hear and read about the tangible successes they have secured through partnership: if and how it incorporates good quality and rewarding process; evidence that their participation is not merely tokenistic, but that community groups can actually win out in instances of serious controversy; that the many rather than the few are engaged; that it supports new sources of power and a new spirit of efficacy within them. Sounds like a tall order? Of course it does, because it is precisely these kinds of expectations that are raised when community development becomes associated with words such as empowerment, process and participation.

Alinsky, S. (1971/1989) *Rules for Radicals,* New York: Vintage Books.

Baker, J., Lynch, K., Cantillon, S, and Walsh, J. (2004) *Equality: From Theory to Action*, Hamphshire; Palgrave

Bacharach, P. and Baratz, MS. (1962), '**Two Faces of Power'** *The American Political Science Review,* 56(4) pp. 947-952

Bauman, Z. (2007) *Consuming Life*, Cambridge; Polity.

Budapest Declaration (April 2004) *Building European Civil Society Through Community Development*, http://www.iacdglobal.org

Callinicos, A. (2007) *Social Theory*, Cambridge; Polity.

Cameron, C. (2007) 'Whose Problem? Disability Narratives and Available Identities', *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 501-511.

Cleaver, F. (2001) 'Institutions, Agency and the Limitations of Particpatory Approaches to Development', B. Cooke and U. Kothari (eds.) *Participation: The New Tyranny*, London; Zed, pp 36-55.

Commins, P. (1985) 'Rural Community Development: Approaches and Issues', *Social Studies*, 8(3/4): 165-178.

Community Workers Co-operative (c. 2007) *Draft Standards for Quality Community Work – A Statement of Values and Principles*, http://www.cwc.ie/

Community Workers Co-operative (No date) Areas of Work – CWC Social Partnership. At http://www.cwc.ie/work/sp.html

Crossley, N. (2005) *Key Concepts in Critical Social Theory*, London; Sage.

Curtin, C. and Varley, T. (1995) 'Community Action and the State', P. Clancy et al. (eds.), *Irish Society: Sociological Perspectives*, Dublin; Institute of Public Administration, pp. 379 – 409.

De Breadun, D (20/08/2008) 'State plans merger of five bodies instead of just three', *Irish Times*,
http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/ireland/2008/0820/1219158421157.html

Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (2005) *Many Communities – A Common Focus*. Dublin, DCRAG.

Department of Social, Community and Family Affairs (2000) *Supporting Voluntary Activity*, Dublin: Stationery Office.

Department of Social Community and Family Affairs (2000) *The National Community Development Programme,* Dublin: Stationery Office.

Dominelli, L (2006) Women and Community Action*, Bristol: Policy Press.*

Duncombe, S. (2007) *Dream: Re-imagining Progressive Politics in an Age of Fantasy*, New York; New Press.

Equality Authority, 'About Us: The role and functions of the Equality Authority', http://www.equality.ie/index.asp?locID=3&docID=-1

Escobar, A. (1992) 'Planning', W. Sachs (ed.) The Development Dictionary. London: Zed, pp: 132-145

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development,* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Esteva, G. (1992) 'Development', W. Sachs (ed.), *The Development Dictionary*, London: Zed, pp. 6-25.

Foucault, M. (1994) *Power; Essential Works of Foucault 1954-84*, Harmondsworth; Penguin.

Fraser, N. (2000) 'Rethinking Recognition', *New Left Review, 3* (May/June: 107-120

Fraser, N. (2003) 'Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation' in N. Fraser and A. Honneth (eds.) *Redistribution or Recognition?* London; Verso, pp. 7-109.

Freeman, J. (c.1972) *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, www.jofreeman.com

Freire, P. (1972a) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth;Penguin.

Freire, P. (1972b) *Cultural Action for Freedom*, Harmondsworth; Penguin.

Furedi, F. (No Date) 'Consuming Democracy: activism, elitism and political apathy' at www.geser.net/furedi.html

Gamson, WA. (1995) 'Constructing Social Protest', H. Johnston and B. Klandermans (eds.) *Social Movements and Culture*, London; UCL Press, pp. 85-106.

Gaventa, J. (1980) *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley*, Clarendon; Oxford.

Geoghegan, M & Powell, F (2004) *The Politics of Community Development*, Dublin: Farmar.

Giroux, H. (2000) 'Counter-Public Spheres and the Role of Educators as Public Intellectuals: Paolo Freire's Cultural Politics' in M. Hill and W. Montag (eds.) *Masses, Classes and the Public Sphere*, London: Verso pp. 202-225.

Giddens, A. (1995) *Politics, Sociology and Social Theory*, Cambridge; Polity.

Gramsci, A. (Trans 1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, London; Lawrence and Wishart.

Hill, M. (2005) *The Public Policy Process*, Harlow; Longman.

Hughes, I., Clancy, P., Harris, C. and Beetham, D. (2007) *Power to the People*, Dublin; TASC.

Ife, J. (2002) *Community Development*, Frenchs Forest: Longman.

Irish Examiner (28/07/08) 'Poverty agency demands plans for future' *Irish Examiner.*

Kane, L. (2006) 'The World Bank, Community Development and Education for Social Justice', Community Development Journal, Advanced Access, 10.1093/cdj/bsl043

Kirby, P. (2002) *The Celtic Tiger in Distress.* London: Palgrave.

Lally, C. and Healy, A. (27/07/2007) 'Pavee's Roma Role Questioned', Irish Times, www.iristimes.com

Ledwith, M. (2005) *Community Development*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Lee, A. (2006) *Community Development: Current Issues and Challenges*, Dublin; Combat Poverty Agency.

Lentin, R. and McVeigh, R. (2006) *After Optimism. Ireland Racism and Globalisation*, Dublin; Metro Eireann.

Lukes, S. (1974/2005) *Power: A Radical View*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marx, K. (Trans, 1973) *Surveys from Exile*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mayo, M. (1975) 'Community Development A Radical Alternative?' R. Bailey and M. Brake (eds.), *Radical Social Work*, London: Edward Arnold Publishers, pp129-143.

McGonagle, D. (2007) 'A New Deal': Art, Museums and Communities - Re-imagining Relations', *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 425-434.

Meade, R. (2005) 'We Hate it Here, Please Let us Stay! Irish Social Partnership and the Community/Voluntary Sector's Conflicted Experiences of Recognition', *Critical Social Policy*, 25(3), 349-473.

Meade, R (2008) 'Mayday, Mayday! Newspaper Framing Anti-globalisers! A Critical Analysis of the Irish Independent's Anticipatory Coverage of the 'Day of the Welcomes' Demonstrations', *Journalism*, 9 (4): 330-352.

Meade, R. and O'Donovan, O. (2002) 'Editorial introduction: Corporatism and the Ongoing Debate about the Relationship Between the State and Community Development', *Community Development Journal, 37(1): 1-9.*

Mestrum, F. (2004) 'The World Social Forum: A Democratic Alternative' in F. Polet and CETRI (eds.) *Globalizing Resistance*, London: Pluto Press.

Midgley, J. (1986) 'Community Participation: History, Concepts and Controversies', in J. Midgley (ed.) *Community Participation, Social Development and the State*, London; Methuen, pp. 13-44.

Motherway, B. (2006) *The Role of Community Development in Tackling Poverty in Ireland,* Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.

Mowbray, M (2005) 'Better Together – Restoring the American Community' *Community Development Journal* 39(4), 458-465.

Murphy, M. (2002) 'Social Partnership – 'Is it the Only Game in Town'?', *Community Development Journal*, 37 (1): 80-90

National Economic and Social Forum (June 2003) *The Policy Implications of Social Capital*. Dublin: NESF.

Navarro, V (2002) 'A Critique of Social *Capital' International Journal of Health Services*, 32(3) 423-432

O'Cinneide, S. (1998/99) 'Democracy and the Constitution', Administration, 46(4): 41-58

O'Cinneide, S. and Walsh, J. (1990) 'Multiplication and Divisions: Trends in Community Development in Ireland since the 1960s', *Community Development Journal*, 25(4): 326-336

O'Dalaigh, D (2005) 'Tara', *Chimera*, (20): 142-146.

Piven, FF. and Cloward, RA. (2002) 'Eras of Protest, Compact and Exit' in S. Aronowitz and P. Bratsis (eds.) Paradigm Lost - State Theory Reconsidered. Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press, pp. 143-169.

Popple, K (1995) *Analysing Community Work*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Popple, K (2005) 'Community Development in the 21st Century: A Case **of** Conditional Development', *British Journal of Social Work*, 36 (2): 333-340.

Powell, F. Geoghegan, M. (2004) The Politics of Irish Community Development, Dublin; Farmar and Farmar.

Putnam, R. (2000) Bowling Alone, New York; Simon and Schuster

Putnam, R., Feldstein, LM. and Cohen, D. (2003) *Better Together*, New York; Simon and Schuster.

Reed Jr., A. (2000) *Class Notes*, New York; The New Press.

Rossport 5. (2006) *Our Story*, Wicklow: Small World Media.

RTE (21/07/2008) 'Crackdown on Jobless Benefit Claims', http://www.rte.ie/news/2008/0721/welfare.html

Shaw, M. (9/3/2006) 'Community development – Everywhere and Nowhere? Rediscovering the Purpose and Practice of Community Development', Transcript from seminar organised by CDX and Scottish Community Development Network. http://www.cdx.org.uk/resources/library/docs/

Small Firms Association (15/07/2008) 'SFA calls for Decrease in Minimum Wage', http://www.sfa.ie/Sectors/SFA/SFADoclib4.nsf/wvPRYCS/0C5698526489673B802574860004E4B93?OpenDocumentSmyth, SS & Kulynych, J (2002) 'It may be social but why is it capital?' *Politics and Society,* 30(1) 149-186

Stoecker, R. (2003) 'Understanding the Development-Organizing Dialectic' *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 25(4): 493-512.

Taskforce on Active Citizenship (2006) *Taskforce on Active Citizenship: Public Consultation Document*. www.activecitizenship.ie

Twelvetress, A. (1991) *Community Work*, Basingstoke; Macmillan.

Wates, N. (2000) *The Community Planning Handbook,* London; Earthscan.

Williams, R. (1983) *Keywords,* London; Fontana.

World Social Forum (2002) ***World Social Forum Charter of Principles*** **, accessed at**

http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.php?id_menu=4&cd_language=