

# JOINED-UP- GOVERNMENT...BUT WHY THROUGH GOVERNANCE AND NOT LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

Professor J. A. Chandler  
Sheffield Business School,  
Sheffield Hallam University

## Abstract

*The paper will consider the attitude of New Labour Governments to local authorities in the context of their enthusiasm for joined-up government. It will observe that the rationale for local government among many recent justifications, is its capacity to bring together diverse interests to resolve complex problems at a local level. New Labour Governments have, however, created agencies such as LSPs and frameworks such as Local Area Agreements to resolve complex problems of deprivation and thereby create additional institutions rather than fostering local government as the single agency to secure 'joined up' solutions. The paper will consider whether this is a consequence of a vacuous ill determined attitude within New Labour concerning the role of local government or an attempt to remodel local governments as but one of many agencies securing local governance under the guidance of central government.*

---

The first administration of Tony Blair came to power promising new initiatives to deal with what had become known as the 'wicked' issues of social exclusion that had led the poor and uneducated to drift into, and remain within, pockets of social and economic deprivation. The problems faced by these neighbourhoods were multi-faceted and could not be resolved by any one specialist agency but required partnerships involving public, private and not-profit agencies (Blair, 1996, 207). This common sense view to resolving such complex policy problems was appropriated from centre left think tanks such as Demos (Perri, Leat, Seltzer, Stoker, 2002). There had to be a 'joined-up' approach to such social problems in which a number of specialist professions and their agencies developed a coordinated multi faceted approach to deal holistically with every facet of the interrelating causes of long term deprivation. Thus, a run down urban estate required help not only through the provision of jobs but also improved education facilities, better housing, health centres, cheap accessible transport and strong policing to ensure law and order.

It might seem an obvious strategy that New Labour should have considered that the most appropriate institutions for resolving these 'wicked' problems should be local authorities given their responsibility for a wide range of services. Some of the most revered rationales for local government are based

largely on their capacity to bring different professional insights together. As L.J. Sharpe has argued in one of the most frequently cited essays on the value of local government.

In short, the social and economic unity of each locality should be matched by an equally unified service providing agency. This coordinative function is crucial in the British context because alone among advanced industrial democracies it does not have an intermediate level of administration responsible for the bulk of public services within its area between central government and local government proper. Federal systems have it by definition and most other comparable states follow, with variations, the French protectoral pattern (Sharpe, 1970, 167).

New Labour seemed to recognise this position in the 2000 Local Government Act by giving local authorities a duty to protect and enhance the economic, social and environmental well being of their communities and has in a series of White Papers emphasised the role of local government in leading strategic developments in their areas. However, despite the rhetoric concerning leadership and responsibilities for local economic, social and environmental well being, the task of ensuring joined up governance has in practice led to the creation of numerous *ad-hoc* ventures that are outside the direct control of local government. Such initiatives include the formation of Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) to channel funding and support for areas of social and economic decline and later the development of local service agreements that require a co-operative strategy between local governments and other agencies including the private sector. New Labour has also continued the Conservative policy of hiving off direct implementation of many traditional local services to non-government agencies. They have pressurised local authorities to place their responsibility for public housing into arms length agencies such as housing associations. Problematic schools in deprived areas are removed from local authority control and restructured as City Academies with little involvement with the local authority. Many aspects of social services and especially care for the elderly have been transferred to private sector provision whilst children's services are merged strategically with education responsibilities and hived off into Trusts which involve other agencies such as health authorities.

Sullivan and Skelcher (2002, 222) conclude that the trend to greater cross boundary collaboration is driven by the development of new demands on governance framed by an outcome rather than a professionally functional orientation to service delivery. This requirement reflects a central concern to control and target the distribution of services but also by a 'vision driven by values of social justice and public service...to deliver improved outcomes'. It will be argued in this paper that in a capitalist society driven by 'catch all' values these two requirements are unlikely to lead to outcomes of social justice rather than, as in the case of local governance, a confused patchwork of policies and local accountability.

## How far is local government a joined-up organisation?

In the 1970s there were strong grounds for arguing that there needs to be a multi-agency approach to joined up governance since local government is in itself far from being a joined up organisation. Historically, the development of many local governments could be viewed as a movement to secure joined up government that has enjoyed only partial success or fashionable support. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century parish, county and the chartered boroughs served as the central agents at the local level to bring together public services in a coordinated structure. The parish was, for example, empowered to collectively provide for the poor and destitute within their community, secure reasonable roads and bridge networks in their area and maintain law and order. These tasks were habitually brought together with the poor being frequently obliged to repair roads in return for support from the parish and were supervised in their tasks by officers of the parish including a constable and beadle (Chandler, 2007). The pattern of joint working as exemplified by many parish and borough councils broke down in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century through the demand for more modern approaches to poverty that would better suit the interests of an emerging society based on industrial and commercial trade rather than capital held in lands and rent. The reform of the Poor Law in 1834 is a comprehensively analysed exemplar of the process in which new social and economic demands led to a restructuring of a specific pattern of institutional connections between or within an agency to create a more fragmented political structure (Rose, 1971; Fraser, 1984). The piecemeal modernisation of poor law reform in rural Britain was followed by a range of further *ad-hoc* arrangements to deal with local problems from highway maintenance to the burial of the dead. By the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the chaotic framework of separate agencies led to a succession of local government acts that incorporating many of these separate agencies into county, borough and district councils (Chandler, 2007 49-69). The process of consolidating local governments into multi-purpose agencies dealing with a wide range of policies was never fully completed but, by the 1930s, boroughs and county boroughs brought together both policy making and implementation for a wide range of productive services such as gas and electricity supply, and social services including health care for the uninsured, as well as road maintenance, education services, council housing and care for vulnerable children and the elderly.

Local Government in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century was not, however, a system that provided public services on a monopolistic basis without regard for private or voluntary assistance. Whilst the county boroughs often had the resources to supply services largely in-house, the smaller districts were normally reliant on other public agencies including the county governments or on occasion neighbouring boroughs to supply services. Many major capital tasks required help from the private sector. Small districts and boroughs for example contracted with private building firms to develop their stock of council houses and might even, for example, enlist the help of local farmers for snow clearance or cutting road side verges. Whilst, implementation was contracted out in these areas to other agencies, the local authority still maintained effective leadership of service provision and were free to choose what forms

of partnership they chose to accept without fear of central government intervention through a framework of inspectorates.

The system however had its failings which by the 1960s became a fashionable area of study. A particular concern was that the large unitary county boroughs fragmented internally as powerful councillors in charge of a specific service department refused to co-operate with other departments in the local authority. Greenwood and Stewart (1974) pioneered a movement for more corporate management which was readily accepted by Government and Local Authority Associations and led to enquiries into local government management such as the Maud (1967) and Bains (1972) Reports that advocated the appointment in each local authority of a Chief Executive chairing a management board with powers to co-ordinate the internal departments of a local authority. The framework set up following the Bains Report for internal co-ordination has received little critical analysis in recent years largely because the creation of the chief executive and a management committee in most local authorities has in terms of joining up the specialised departments of the local authority stood the test of time.

Following the efforts to ensure corporate decision making within local government during the 1970s, the policies of the Thatcher and Major Governments did much to unravel the efforts to create effective unity within the institution. The Conservative Governments by the mid 1980s, particularly through the activities of Nicholas Ridley as Secretary of State for Transport and later the Environment, broke up the preceding assumption that most local authorities should both establish policy and implement the processes of local government. The enabling authority was based on the idea that implementation of policy and, in the Major Governments, even internal housekeeping procedures such as the collection of rates should be farmed out to private sector organisation through contracts (Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg, 2000, 173-5). The contracting process led many authorities to separate departments into groups that set the contracts and those that administered or monitored their implementation. In addition, several services such as further education or bus services were wholly removed from local government. Conservative policy under Thatcher was also focused upon removing local authority initiatives to restore deprived areas through the creation of Urban Development Areas and Economic Action Zones.

### **New Labour and the coordination of local government**

New Labour has been far more assiduous than the preceding Conservative Governments in seeking to ensure local government remains internally a coordinated agency capable of setting strategic policies for an authority as a whole and securing the implementation of such policies. New Labour rhetoric often claims for local government a co-ordinating role. Successive White Papers and Acts have suggested that the local authority's position is to lead the local community and to bring together the many agencies of governance to secure this aim. The seminal 1998 White Paper 'Modern Local Government: In Touch with the People' in its introduction appeared to recognise the capacity of local government to co-ordinate policy

Among all our public institutions councils have a special status and authority as local, directly elected bodies. They are uniquely based to provide vision and leadership to their local communities. They are able to make things happen on the ground – where it really matters. (p. 1)

The 2000 Local Government Act was intended to further enhance local authorities' leadership capacity through the creation of directly elected mayors and cabinet/ leader government to streamline their decision making capability. Local leadership credentials for local government were further emphasised in 'Strong Local Leadership – Quality Public Services' of 2001 but in a form that began to attenuate the idea with an increasing emphasis on partnerships.

We will help them (councils) to develop the democratic legitimacy and sound governance needed to underpin community leadership and effective service delivery building on the new well-being powers and local strategic partnerships (p. 10 Para 1.11)

The 2006 White Paper *Strong and Prosperous Communities* continued to develop the theme of local leadership with 'Local Government as a strategic leader and place shaper' (p. 10)

Whilst New Labour have greatly fortified the capacity of local authorities to internally coordinate their policies, successive post 1997 Labour Government have done little to consolidate local government's direct control over services. The enabling philosophy of the preceding Conservative Administration has been retained, albeit in a modified form. Local authorities must through a succession of Best Value initiatives demonstrate to the Audit Commission that the in-house implementation of a service is superior to any possible private sector or third sector business rivals. In areas such as housing and schools legislation has made it increasingly difficult for local authorities to directly implant policies without handing over some authority to private organisations or creating arms length or wholly independent public or social ownership organisations.

### **How far is local government strategic leadership effective?**

There is little evidence that a strategy that gives local government the role of leading partnerships to resolve problems of urban deprivation but not itself implementing such policy is realistic and workable. Evaluating the extent to which local government may have the capacity to promote and lead partnerships capable of restructuring a depressed community is also bedevilled by the problem of ascertaining what local government actually entails. Research on the efficacy of the New Deal for Communities (NDC) that has led to the sponsorship of LSPs has painted a mixed picture. The evaluation of the New Deal for Communities programme from 2002 to 2005 commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) showed that for thirteen indicators changes in NDC agencies were similar or slightly better than for equivalent national figures and six indicators were substantially higher but three indicators suggested adversely a widening

of the gap between NDC agencies and other communities. Moreover, in comparing NDC areas with non supported areas of deprivation the NDCs showed greater improvement for eighteen indicators but not for thirteen other indicators. The results still keep open the issue of whether a local authority funded directly to resolve problems in deprived areas may fare as well as the arrangement based on *ad-hoc* LSPs. (CLG, 2006, 6-7). Other New Labour attempts to force partnerships on local authorities similarly do not suggest that strategic leadership, bereft of the capacity to control implementation and planning, necessarily occasions more efficient or less expensive government. There has been considerable criticism of PFI arguing that in the long run the private sector companies will gain far more in payments than local government would have had to have paid in interest rates were they to have funded projects by borrowing through government agencies (Connolly; Martin; Wall, 2008). Evidence that City Academies have successfully turned round failing local authority run secondary schools is very patchy (Chitty, 2008), Housing Associations have absorbed many of the housing roles formally operated by local authorities but have not solved the problems of housing the poor (Malpass, 2000).

Given the uncertain results from the twelve years experience, it might be concluded from the steadfast support among New Labour leaders for the view that local government should lead, rather than be in charge of fully enacting change, is one of ideological faith rather than an exercise in evidence based policy making. Indeed, the proposition is almost impossible to fully evaluate. Surveys of the efficacy of LSPs, Local Service Agreements or PFIs may measure average performance in raising specific performance measures but must in themselves leave open the question of whether any progress was a consequence of local, central or community leadership, the effectiveness of private or voluntary implementation of policy to the standards required by the partnership, or simply a consequence of local or national economic or social circumstances. The reasons behind New Labour's enthusiasm for partnership working and their unwillingness to see local government as joined up government at the local level lies not in any serious evidence that the partnerships actually work but rather on how the idea of partnership and local leadership fits into the broader values of the Party's 'third way' values.

### **New Labour as a catch all Party**

To understand the trajectory of New Labour's policy towards local government in general and, in particular, the demand that local governments must work in partnership with other agencies, it is necessary to place the policies within the framework of New Labour's *raison d'être*. Even before the rise of New Labour there was a substantive bibliography that argued that the Labour Party either never had socialist roots or had lost its socialist aspiration by 1945 (Miliband 1972; Howell, 1976). The Party was, however seen between 1945 and 1992 to be to the left of the Conservatives and appealed predominantly to working class voters. Following the leadership of Tony Blair it is far more difficult to differentiate the Labour Party from the Conservatives as a Party of the left as opposed to being a centrist 'catch all' party seeking to maximise votes by evolving a portfolio of policies that through the divination of the

entrails of mass opinion survey results appeals to the largest number of electors.

The starting point for New Labour's policy design for ideological ends is to win the centre-ground in British politics....the overarching assumption in contemporary British politics is that the centre ground represents the median voter. Relatively few votes are won at the edges of mainstream politics let alone in the space occupied by the extreme left and right (Beech, 2008, 3)

Eric Shaw (2007, 196) argues that New Labour has adopted a 'big tent' approach to gaining political power which entails a 'determination to minimise political risks by sedulously avoiding serious offence to those – in the City, the corporate sector and the media'. This is not to argue that New Labour has jettisoned a social conscience and wholly abandoned the under privileged. Indeed to abandon its working class roots would lessen the Party's capacity to mop up the majority of voters. Given the 'catch all' status of New Labour under Blair and Brown, the Party thrives on pragmatically seeking policies that may ensure electoral support sufficient to secure the return of its leading interests to office following each general election.

One component of New Labour's enthusiasm for joined up governance is their propensity to seize on fashionable and deceptively simplistic terminology, such as the use of partnership rather than privatisation, to market their Party (Fairclough, 2000, 127-9). New Labour enthusiasm for joined up government is not solely based on the electoral lure of a fashionable idea. In terms of domestic policy New Labour policy has been shaped since 1997 by picking up on failures of preceding governments to make clear promises and deliver on what has been promised. Blair exchanged Clause IV as the Party's ideological mantra by selected promises on health service waiting lists, primary school class sizes and youth unemployment. Many of the policies which New Labour has considered to be essential for garnering support from the public are delivered by public agencies that are not directly under the command of the core executive of central government. These included issues such as improvement in schools, tackling homelessness or improving life in rural areas (Labour Party, 1997). If, therefore, New Labour was to be seen to deliver on its manifesto policies it could not leave public bodies such as local government to their own devices. New Labour found it necessary to steer the agenda of local governance as much as the preceding Conservative new-right governments. The Thatcher and Major Governments had developed their strategies to decrease public spending and privatise the profit making elements of government working on an impression that local authorities were effectively direct agencies of the centre and should be coerced to accept their views. New Labour ideology, whilst not opposed to the allures of privatisation, has never placed all its hopes within the private sector and the market as a means of generating economic efficiency let alone social justice. The need to ensure local solution to problems of social underdevelopment and the concern to avoid policy overload at the centre has promoted a rather schizophrenic attitude within New Labour towards local governance. On the one hand local public agencies and governments must deliver the targets promised by the

Labour Governments to their electorate but this must be achieved not through coercion but by creating local solutions to local problems and by ensuring that the centre is not overloaded with community concerns.

The dilemma faced by New Labour of securing the delivery of local policies through cooperation rather than coercion has resulted in a trend to incorporate elements of local government into the executive core of New Labour. Local government leaders and more especially leading local administrators and their coordinating institutions such as the Local Government Association or the Audit Commission have been brought into an hegemony with the State (Wilson, 2003, Chandler 2009). Former local government officers are now recruited to senior positions into the Department of Communities and Local Government including currently in the post of Permanent Secretary. Government QUANGOs such ranging from the Homes and Communities Agency, the BBC Trust and the Institute for Government are directed or chaired by former local government chief executives. In terms of institutional joint working under New Labour there are close relationships with central government and working parties, several of which are formally elements of the Local Government Association, on issues such as sustainability. Such a framework creates a working ethos that is based on sufficient common consensus to ensure that local authorities can be party to negotiations which sets the targets that will be favourable to central politicians.

In order to develop senior administrators and politicians in local government who have the bureaucratic aspirations acceptable to the New Labour hierarchy requires capable career orientated technocrats rather than localised spokespersons. The attempt to manufacture a structure of political provincial leaders who would be close associates of the Blair faction was quickly disabused with the election of Livingstone as mayor of London and the fall of Alun Michael in Wales. Similarly, attempts to create directly elected mayors loyal to the New Labour hierarchy have also largely failed (Copus, 2006, 191). Success has been less apparent but much more real in the recruitment of senior local government officers as opposed to politicians into the New Labour core. The recent restructuring of local government into a smaller number of much larger institutions (Chisholm and Leach, 2008) may in part be seen as a response to the need to create a cadre of technocratic locally based administrators who can work closely with central government.

The Blair and Brown Governments have, however, been careful to retain the coercive restrictions on local authorities that were bequeathed to them by the preceding Conservative administrations. Such devices remain in the background should the New Labour Governments fail, through persuasion and incorporation to keep local authority activities in line with central government targets. Thus, central government still threatens spendthrift local governments with capping their council tax, three quarters of local authority revenue is determined by the Treasury and GLG, powers to transfer failing local government services to government appointed consultants have been strengthened and are frequently in use and the Audit Commission that sets targets and undertakes the inspection of many local authorities remains much

as it had been created in 1982. In as much as central government seeks to incorporate the favoured fellow travelling senior local government officers into the exalted ranks of the Whitehall core executive, New Labour Ministers have been assiduous in seeking the dismissal and public humiliation of senior officers, such as the luckless head of Children's Services in Haringey, when they fall foul of tabloid press hysteria.

## **New Labour and capital**

Labour's enthusiasm for ideas such as 'joined up government' and the encompassing framework of New Public Management (NPM) lie in their third way approach. The ideology favouring NPM is based on a belief that only market competition engenders efficiency. Such a belief endangers the traditional independence of local governments which are thought to be sources of monopolistic provision of services that are consequently prone to harbour serious inefficiencies in service delivery. The large predominantly 'Old Labour' controlled county boroughs and the inner London boroughs were prone whenever possible to take all their services 'in-house' and many had indeed pioneered innovative municipalized services from the distribution of clean water and creation of public cheap transport in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the development of municipal housing in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These developments were largely a consequence of remedying serious failures of the private sector to deliver necessary services to the less affluent. Municipalisation of essential local service as a necessity civilised for civilised communities was nevertheless constantly hounded as expensive burdens on the tax payer. In the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there was a ferocious onslaught on municipalisation which was counterattacked by Fabian intellectuals such as the Webbs (1975) and Shaw (1908) with such vigour that, until Blair had become leader of the Party, municipalisation had become an assumption for Old Labour ideologues. However, not all municipalised services were by the 1970s operating with the degree of municipal zeal and perfection that had been envisaged by the early Fabians. Many New Labour stalwarts accepted the new right opposition to municipal monopolies, widely publicised by the Adam Smith Institute, Beresford (1987), Henney (1984) and Walker (1983) with horror stories of local authority incompetence, as if such practices were endemic throughout local government. New Labour zealots such as Tony Blair and Gordon Brown saw the Trade Union, council networks that in certain authorities acted as a barrier to good efficient governance, as a threat to their electoral march into Government.

Whilst members of the Blair Governments may have had only a vague idea of the impact of the Webbs, Shaw or Lansbury on local government, they will have all been thoroughly versed on the dangers of local socialism during the early 1980s.

The destruction of local government is one of the most foolish- almost wicked-dogmas of the Thatcher year. The stupidity of one or two councils has been used as a cover for wholesale dismantling of a large

part of our machinery of government. Yet, properly harnessed to clear public policy objectives, we should be seeking to do more, not less at a local level (Blair, 1996, 220)

The 'stupid' councils appears for Blair to be the local socialist left. A major concern for a 'catch all' Party trying to ditch the remnants of serious socialist ideology was that they could not be tainted by the right wing press with the epithet of belonging to the loony left. Although careful not to seek rebellion in the Labour Party by denouncing local socialism, New Labour enthusiasts harbour a fear of independent urban local authorities that could provide serious independent leadership by condemning the free market activities that create widespread urban deprivation.

In much of the post 1990s academic literature on British local government the local socialist movement (Boddy and Fudge, 1984; Gyford, 1985) seems to be a forgotten and un-influential episode. The activities of the younger David Blunkett in Sheffield, Ken Livingstone in Greater London and the further shores of socialism followed by Ted Knight in Lambeth or the Militant tendency in Liverpool had, however, a major affect on the direction of local government. The movement ensured that local authorities were involved directly in developing the economic growth of their communities and were also involved in ensuring greater fairness between classes and end to sexual, and ethnic discrimination. The Blair Government took up these themes in laying out the responsibilities of local government in the 2000 Local Government Act but at the same time was concerned to ensure these goals were secured on capitalist or, at best, social democratic terms rather than on the basis of socialist theory. Any subsequent attempts by a Labour controlled local authority to develop strategies that appear to central government to be unorthodox in terms of the centralist Blair agenda have been quickly uprooted before the press gets too interested in a potential flaw in Party policy. Thus, the decentralising ideas of David Church in Walsall just prior to the 1997 election were quickly resolved following a visit by John Prescott by expulsion of the recalcitrant leader from the Party (Parker, 2003).

## **Conclusion**

The prime concern of New Labour is to win elections and this has in large part been through promising to deliver economic growth and efficient public services for those who are left behind by the market system. To provide this Rawlsian compromise of capitalism with safeguards, New Labour, following the traditions of their predecessors, promised as the measure of their success better and more efficient, that is, cheaper and lower taxed services. In these circumstances given their promises on improving education, housing, law and order and social services, the Blair Government could not allow local authority inefficiencies to continue. Much of their local government reformism was based on the view that the Thatcher and Major Governments had done much of the necessary work that was needed to break the power of monopolistic service delivery.

New Labour under Blair and Brown have valued the creation of joined-up government as a means of dividing power and influence that could be harboured by larger urban authorities and yet also ensure efficiencies of scale in the regulation of service delivery. However, if local authorities had to share the implementation of policies with other agencies they might become potentially dangerous centres of power harbouring extreme values in comparison with New Labour's third way stance either to the left of the Blair position or to the right. The role of local governments in resolving potential sources of serious instability and violence towards communities and the economic viability of urban cities could not be hived off to other agencies. Communities, if cut off from mainstream national economic activity, can be predatory on wealth producers and sources, as in the early years of Thatcherism when the Brixton and Toxteth riots was a source for serious instability. Business interests on their own are too diverse, competitive and concerned with harbouring their own growth rather than that of competitors to take on in any substantial way the task of developing the social and economic well being of deprived communities. If this were to be local government's role, the fear is that local authorities may easily go 'native' and side with, or be an expression of, the values of a deprived community and lurch either to the egalitarian anti-capitalist left, the exclusionary nationalistic right, or perhaps for government less seriously become an expression of free market capitalism. It must therefore fall to the task of local governments to coordinate the forces of community and business to work alongside the public sector to resolve the local 'wicked' issues. Local government had, however, like any other private or non-governmental agency to be regulated in order to prevent distortion of the free market by gaining a monopolistic position.

In practice these views were probably harboured in a much more prosaic form in the narratives of leading party members concerning the relatively recent experiences of dealing with local authorities. Thus, there remain memories not only of the Skinner Brothers and Clay Cross, of Militant in Liverpool, Ted Knight in Lambeth and the failures of local socialism of Blunkett and Livingstone and finally the decentralising David Church of Walsall. New Labour leaders were also aware of tales of inefficiencies and corruption that had been unearthed by New Right enthusiasts such as Henney's (1984), attacks on London Boroughs such as Camden or from the left Hindess' (1971) view of the weak Party systems of pre-Militant Liverpool. Such trends were seen as grist to the tabloid media and thence to opposition Parties. Moreover, on the right the London Borough of Westminster presented a scenario of ideological extremism and failure on the right of New Labour.

The idea that local government should have a leadership role is therefore paradoxically a statement that in practice conceals the view that local government should not be a monopoly provider of services that could work outside the framework of central government and the interests of capital. Leadership in terms of government discourse means co-ordinating the diverse elements that might root out economic deprivation in the interests of central government targets and economic growth. What is not implied is leadership in the sense of local governments exerting political control over their territories so that their political leaders may mould the communities to suit their own

political preference whether these are, in the case of New Labour, towards egalitarian socialism or towards the wholly uncontrolled free market values of the new-right. It is as Jessop (2000, 31) has observed a sufficing role that in itself is not a wholly satisfactory arrangement and may be fraught with failures as irreconcilable differences between market, state and community are brought together.

## REFERENCES

Atkinson, H. and Wilks-Heeg, S. 2000, *Local Government from Thatcher to Blair*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Bains, M., (Chair) 1972, *The New Local Authorities: Management and Structure*, London, HMSO.

Beech, M. 2008, 'New Labour and the Politics of Dominance' in Beech, M. and Lee, S., (eds.) *Ten Years of New Labour*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Beresford, P. 1987, *Good Council Guide: Wandsworth 1978-1987*, London, Centre for Policy Studies.

Blair, T. 1996, *New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country* London, Fourth Estate.

Boddy, M., and Fudge, C. (eds.) 1984, *Local Socialism?* Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Chandler, J. A. 2007, *Explaining Local Government*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Chandler, J. A. 2009, 'From Networking to Incorporation: Central-Local Relations in Britain' , presented to Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Manchester.

Chitty, C. 2008, 'The School Academies Programme: A New Direction or Total Abandonment' *Forum*, 50 (1) 23-32.m

Connolly, C., Martin, G., and Wall, A. (2008) 'Education, Education Education: The Third Way and PFI' *Public Administration*, 86 (4) 951-68.

Copus, C. 2006, *Leading the Localities: Executive Mayors in English Local Governance*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

DCLG. 2007, *New Deal for Communities: A Synthesis of New Programme Wide Evidence* Research Report 30 (London, HMSO)

- Fraser, D. 1984, *The Evolution of the British Welfare State*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Greenwood, R. and Stewart, J. 1974, *Corporate Planning in Local Government*, London, Charles Knight.
- Gyford, J. 1985, *The Politics of Local Socialism*, London, George Allen and Unwin.
- Fairclough, N. 2000, *New Labour: New Language*, London, Routledge.
- Henney, A. 1974, *Inside Local Government*, London, Sinclair Brown
- Hindess, B. 1971, *The Decline of Working Class Politics*, London, McGibbon Key.
- Howell, D. 1976, *British Social Democracy*, London, Croom Helm.
- Jessop, B. 2000, 'Governance Failure' in Stoker, G. (ed.) *The New Politics of British Local Governance*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave).
- Labour Party, 1997, *New Labour: Because Britain Deserves Better: Party Manifesto*, London, Labour Party.
- Malpass, P. 2000, *Housing Associations and Housing Policy*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Miliband, R. 1972, *Parliamentary Socialism: A Study in the Politics of Labour*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, Merlin Press.
- Maud, J. (Chair), 1967, *Report of the Committee on the Management of Local Government*, London, HMSO, Ministry of Housing and Local Government.
- Parker, S. 2003, 'A Step in the Right Direction' *The Society Guardian, The Guardian*, 12<sup>th</sup> March.
- Perri 6, Leat, D., Seltzer, K. and Stoker, G. 2002 *Towards Holistic Governance*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Rose, M.E. 1971, *The English Poor Law 1780-1930*, Newton Abbott, David and Charles.
- Sharpe, L. J. 1970, 'Theories and Values of Local Government', *Political Studies*, XVIII, 2, 153-74.
- Shaw, G. B. 1908, *The Common Sense of Municipal Trading*, London, A. C. Fifield.
- Shaw, E. 2007, *Loosing Labour's Soul?: New Labour and the Blair Government 1997-2007*, London, Routledge.

Sullivan, H. and Skelcher, C. 2002, *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in the Public Services*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Walker, D. 1983, *Municipal Empire: The Town Halls and their Beneficiaries* London, Temple Smith.

Webb, S and Webb, B. 1975, (1920) *A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, D. 2003, 'Unravelling Control Freakery: Redfining Central-Local Government Relations', *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 5 (3), 317-346.