

The left after social democracy: towards state-society partnerships

Stuart White

The idea of self-organisation and challenging the paternalist character of the state has a long history in our contemporary times. It goes back to the movements of the 60s and 70s, which combined a challenge to authority with a wider social critique including a commitment to the redistribution of power and wealth. Those left libertarian traditions critiqued both the state and the corporate-dominated market. Regarding the state, they made a key distinction between public resources, which they defended and wished to see expand, and how these resources were administered, which they tried to transform and to democratise. These movements, the first products of mass education, said: hang on a minute, we want a say in how public money, our money, is spent, and how public institutions, like universities and the welfare state, are run.

Hilary Wainwright, 2010¹

In 1976 the then Labour government committed itself to a policy of fiscal austerity as the price of getting the International Monetary Fund's assistance with the UK economy's balance of payments, a moment often seen as the final end of the road for optimistic post-war reconstruction around a generous welfare state. It was also later in this year that a then little known rock group, the Sex Pistols, recorded 'Anarchy in the UK'. Towards the song's end, John Lydon questioned the nature of 'the UK':

Is this the MPLA?

Or is this the UDA?

Or is this the IRA?

I thought it was the UK ...

It's just ... another ... country ...

Another council tenancy ...²

The words 'council tenancy' were spat out. They were contemptuous. It is hard not to interpret these words in the light of subsequent political developments. Having been elected leader of the Conservative party in 1975, Margaret Thatcher won the 1979 general election. Drawing from thinkers of the New Right, her governments from 1979-1990 broke in many ways with the post-war social democratic settlement. And, of course, one of the main lines of advance for the Thatcher governments' so-called 'popular capitalism' was (heavily subsidised) council house sales. Here, apparently, was the way to escape the supposed indignity of 'another council tenancy'.

Lydon's lyric, Lydon's snarl, should make us pause and reflect.³ It suggests an underlying disaffection with the post-war welfare state not confined to the New Right. Indeed, the welfare state was very much a focus of critique from the left in the formative and initially ascendant years of Thatcherism. My aim in this chapter is to revisit this 'state-critical' left. More exactly, I seek to trace in outline how specific policy ideas emerged and developed within and across the left in an attempt to find an alternative both to post-war social democracy and emerging Thatcherism. First and foremost is the idea of democratic state-society partnerships as a basis for reorganizing the welfare state, the idea captured in the quotation from Hilary Wainwright at the head of this chapter.

I structure the discussion as follows. First, I briefly review the rise of the welfare state in the post-war period and the impact of the Conservative governments after 1979 on some key variables. I then look at how three thinkers and writers of the left grappled with the problem of statism at the time of Thatcherism's emergence and initial ascendancy. These thinkers are, respectively, Colin Ward, Sheila Rowbotham and Stuart Hall. Finally, I look briefly at how the later work of Paul Hirst and Hilary Wainwright continued the critical and reconstructive analysis of these thinkers in a period when Thatcherism had decisively reshaped the assumptions behind policy-making.⁴ I conclude by summarizing the key ideas emerging from our discussion and considering their continuing relevance.

The rise and tempering of the welfare state

The Second World War saw a substantial rise in the share of GDP devoted to public spending.⁵ Table 1 gives some indication of how public spending then developed in the post-war period, into the crisis of the 1970s, and under the Conservative governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major. As a percentage of national income, public spending was in the high 30s up to the mid-1960s. It then rose into the high 40s by the mid-1970s. Labour's fiscal austerity after 1976, followed by that of the Thatcher governments, brought the share back down to the high 30s by the end of the 1980s.

What about spending on the welfare state in particular? So far as cash benefits (including state pensions) are concerned, Table 1 shows that spending on these increased as a share of national income up to the mid-1970s and, indeed, continued to grow after this point, including under the Thatcher governments (albeit at a slower rate than in the previous decade). Education spending rose up to the mid-1970s and was then brought down as a share of national income. Health-care spending rose as a percentage share of national income in the post-war period and continued to grow in the 1980s and after.⁶

A corollary of the overall growth in public spending in the post-war period was a growth in the tax share of national income and, related to this, in the number of families paying income tax. The tax share of national income fell from the mid-1980s, however. Comparatively speaking, the UK was a relatively high tax country up to the 1970s, but a relatively low tax one by the 1990s.⁷

Table 1 Government and welfare spending as share of national income 1948/9-1979/80⁸

	<u>Government (total)</u>	<u>Social security</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Health-care</u>
1948/49	36.9	4.1	--	--
1951/52	39.1	4.4	--	--
1955/56	35.7	5.0	3.0	--
1961/62	38.8	5.8	4.0	3.8
1964/65	38.2	5.9	4.4	3.9
1969/70	42.6	7.3	4.8	4.1
1974/75	48.6	7.8	5.8	4.8
1979/80	44.6	9.0	5.2	4.9
1988/89	38.7	9.7	4.7	5.4
1996/97	39.0	11.5	4.7	6.3

Table 2 shows how public rented housing – Lydon’s ‘another council tenancy’ – increased markedly in importance over the post-war period up to 1979 from 12% to almost a third of all households. One should also note, however, how owner occupation increased over the period from about a quarter to over a half of all housing. Both increased at the expense of the private rented sector. By 1994 the impact of Thatcherism is evident. Public rented housing fell to 20% of households, owner occupation increased to just over two thirds of the total.

Table 2 Housing Tenure in the UK 1945-79 (percentage of households)⁹

	<u>Public rented</u>	<u>Owner occupied</u>	<u>Private rented</u>
1914	0	10	90
1945	12	26	62
1951	18	29	53
1961	27	43	31
1969	30	49	21
1971	31	53	17
1979	32	55	14
1994	20	67	14

These tables obviously only pick out a few details of developments, but they indicate the direction of change in the UK in the years of post-war social democracy, and subsequently under the Thatcher and Major Conservative governments, so far as the size and significance of the welfare state is concerned. In the 1970s, as the post-war economic boom came to an end and distributional conflict between labour and capital intensified, the cost of the welfare state became a major issue. As indicated above, more families than ever were paying income tax by this time and this most probably contributed to the context in which Thatcherism arose.

Also important, however, were concerns about the structure and terms of welfare state provision. In the following discussion, I will focus on how a selection of left thinkers and activists addressed this structural concern. This does not mean that the thinkers under consideration were (or are) oblivious to the issue of cost and its tax implications. They did see the structure question as an important issue in its own right, however, and it might be argued that answering it persuasively is a precondition for making the case for a more generous welfare state and the higher taxation needed to fund it.

Colin Ward: anarchy within social democracy?

Let us begin with Colin Ward. An anarchist associated with the *Freedom* newspaper, Ward edited the monthly journal *Anarchy* from 1961-70 and wrote a number of books in the 1970s and after, exploring social problems from an anarchist perspective.¹⁰ As I have discussed elsewhere, Ward's anarchism was nested within a pluralist conception of social organization.¹¹ Societies solve problems and meet needs using a range of mechanisms which include markets, the state, and anarchist techniques of mutual aid and collective self-help. The anarchist, in Ward's sense, has a normative preference for the anarchist techniques. The aim of anarchism, for Ward, is to try to shift the balance of social organization away from state – and market – towards these anarchist techniques. This implies a recognition of the extent to which such techniques are already present in our society and doing real work ('anarchy in action'). It also entails a highly pragmatic turn towards a consideration of how these anarchist techniques might be more widely used to address social needs. This perspective informed Ward's editorship of *Anarchy* in the 1960s, and found definitive expression in his 1973 book, *Anarchy in Action*.¹²

Against the backdrop of the shifts in housing tenure noted above, and related, ambitious projects of reconstruction in many UK cities in the post-war period, Ward's work as a practical anarchist had a particular focus on housing. Here is Ward, writing an open letter to Tony Crosland, the new Labour Minister for Housing, in 1974: 'You ... see the homeless, the ill-housed and overcrowded and the newly-weds just coming up for membership of the Housing Shortage Club, as the inert objects, the raw material of policy, waiting to be processed by the Housing Problems Industry.'¹³ This comment anticipated, and perhaps helps us understand, Lydon's snarl about council tenancy. What Ward was protesting here was the paternalism of the post-war welfare state. The social democratic settlement after 1945 certainly did embody solidarity. But it often did so in ways that inscribed hierarchy into

welfare provision. Politicians, planners, administrators, and bureaucrats stood on one side of this hierarchy and welfare recipients on the other. Ward's anarchism opposed this hierarchy and aimed to find ways of opening up space and opportunity for more self-determining agency by those in need.¹⁴

One expression of agency was squatting. Some of Ward's earliest journalism for *Freedom* focused on the squatters' movement which emerged shortly after the Second World War. Against the background of an acute housing shortage, the squatters took over disused military bases and converted them into family accommodation. Here were people engaged in cooperative self-help to meet an urgent human need.¹⁵ Ward was also a strong advocate of the tenant co-operative.¹⁶ Co-ops would give people more control over their housing, making for greater self-determination and in the process better housing. Following *Anarchy in Action*, Ward worked up his ideas on this into *Tenants Take Over*, a book that helped stimulate wider interest in housing cooperatives and community control over housing design in British cities such as in the case of the Weller Street Housing Co-op in Liverpool.¹⁷ The model suggested here was one in which the state made resources for housing available, but in which the design of the housing was delegated to groups of citizens who stood to live in the houses themselves - a marked contrast to the way most new housing developments in the post-war years were designed by planners and then imposed on a hopefully grateful community.

In a fascinating extension of this idea, Ward also proposed the 'Do-It-Yourself New Town'.¹⁸ The creation of New Towns was a key commitment of post-war urban planning, and Ward, as someone enthusiastic for the original garden city ideas of Ebenezer Howard,¹⁹ was broadly sympathetic. But why not, he suggested, let the housing emerge in New Towns in a more autonomous way? Let the planners set down some utilities and basic parameters, let the state

make some resources available, and then let the people come and build for themselves.

As the cases of tenant co-ops and ‘DIY New Towns’ show, Ward’s interventions in discussion of housing policy were arguably pragmatic in *two* senses. Not only were they pragmatic in terms of addressing concrete social issues. They were also pragmatic in working to an extent with the resources of the background social democracy of the time. Implicitly or explicitly, the welfare state remained in place as a pooler and provider of resources.²⁰ The immediate aim was not to remove this state but to anarchise the way it worked by enhancing opportunities for individuals and groups to define the content of goods and services. To some degree Ward pointed towards a creative synthesis of anarchy and social democracy. As we shall see, this synthesis emerged a central theme of the left critique of the welfare state and effort to imagine an alternative.

Sheila Rowbotham: feminism, nurseries and the state

Let us now turn to our second thinker and activist, Sheila Rowbotham. Rowbotham was a major figure in the emergence of second-wave and socialist feminism in the UK in the late 1960s and 1970s. With Lynne Segal and Hilary Wainwright, she also pioneered an important attempt at rethinking the way the left should organize to ‘make socialism’ in the early 1980s through the *Beyond the Fragments* initiative.²¹ Here, I focus on her writing about child-care provision. A key article is ‘Mother, Child and State’, originally published in *New Society* in 1981.²² Rowbotham began by admitting her ambivalence about ‘the state’. On the one hand, she wrote, ‘I am firmly convinced that demands must be made upon the state. Clearly welfare resources of cash and labour have to be divided more equitably. To force the issue on to voluntary effort intensifies inequality.’ On the other hand:

... in my everyday life, if the state comes anywhere near me, I feel very uncomfortable indeed. If it appears in the shape of a form, I bury it and hope superstitiously that by hiding it from view I have removed myself from the eye of the state. If the state arrives in the shape of a person, I leap towards the teapot with a gripped enthusiasm to dissolve the state back into a human being who drinks tea rather than an official wielding a file.²³

The welfare state stood at the very centre of this ambivalence. The ambivalence made sense because the welfare state was at once a provider of goods and services which people genuinely need and, at the same time, frequently involved real subordination to the power of those who designed and implemented welfare services. In language similar to that of Ward in his 1974 open letter to Tony Crosland, she wrote that: ‘The problem which has dogged the whole development of welfare services is the power to decide what is *someone else’s welfare*.’²⁴ While planning is essential, it also ‘requires careful political scrutiny. For planners of all persuasions there is a danger that individual faces, names and actions dissolve into masses to be pummelled or steered.’²⁵

This tension or ambivalence applied in the area of child-care. Indeed, in this case there were a series of possible tensions: between the interests of workers and children; the interests of workers and parents; and the interests of parents and children. So, how to address these dilemmas in a way that was consistent with feminist and socialist concerns? In another, earlier article, ‘Storefront Day Care Centres, the Radical Berlin Experiment’, originally published in the UK in 1974, Rowbotham reported on the creation of day care centres for children in the West German student movement and on similar initiatives in the UK.²⁶

Students in West Berlin found that shops were cheap to rent, and so they set up their own child-care centres there. Those setting up the centres did so to create nursery environments that would foster what they saw as the right kind of values. However, the emphasis on self-

resourcing also came to be seen as problematic. Participants, Rowbotham explained, saw that day care centres posed no challenge to the wider educational system and ‘feared they were becoming incorporated within an umbrella of liberal middle-class self-help.’²⁷ Rowbotham reported that the ‘same dilemma’ emerged in the UK case. On the one hand, feminists were concerned that state-provided nursery care would be ‘unlikely to educate children in a radical way.’ But ‘on the other hand a refusal to campaign for nurseries which were financed out of rates and taxes meant you were letting the state and local authority ‘off the economic hook’’.²⁸ A way forward in the face of the dilemma, Rowbotham argued, is illustrated by the North London Children’s Centre. Set up by members of Women’s Liberation, it was a nursery ‘paid for by the council but controlled by parents.’

In the later article, Rowbotham returned to this idea. Rejecting the adequacy of ‘workers’ control’ as a demand adequate to the case, Rowbotham reported that the National Child Care Campaign had instead adopted the proposal for ‘community control’ of nurseries.²⁹ While this demand initially led to the direct ‘creation of community nurseries’ as a form of collective self-help drawing on the participants’ own resources, Rowbotham commented that the groups involved had moved away from simple self-resourcing. They ‘have also bargained for resources from the state, and they are now run with various combinations of money from local authorities and the labour of parents and supporters.’³⁰

The socialist feminist response to the problem of child-care, then, was to try to draw on the state without becoming subordinated to it. The state had the job of helping to mobilise resources, e.g., in the form of suitable buildings and paying for (some) labour. But the service itself was subject to control by parents and workers. As in some of Ward’s pragmatic anarchist proposals, the state provided resources, but what was done with these resources was, to some significant degree, a matter for the service users to decide. This retained the role

of the welfare state as an agency and expression of solidarity, one might argue, while also mitigating the hierarchy involved in service provision.

It is important to see the full significance of the anarchist element in this synthesis for Rowbotham. A key theme of her essay in *Beyond the Fragments* was the need for socialism to be understood not as an institutional set-up placed on society from above (whether by revolution or reform), but as something that grew out of people's daily lived experience. This led her directly to the importance of 'collective self-help' – similar to Ward's 'anarchy in action' – as a way for people to live solidarity directly, to make socialism at an everyday level as a base for a wider socialist transformation.

Nevertheless, it was also crucial in Rowbotham's view that there was a synthesis between the principle of collective self-help and the principle of state responsibility:

With the active support of working-class people in a community, mutual self-help forms provide a potential means of distinguishing between the coercive aspects of the state machinery and those activities of the state which are necessary to people in their everyday life. They raise the possibility of welfare control. Self-help community activity is not a substitute for the equally important radical struggles within the welfare state sector. But they can indicate ways of questioning the role of professionals and the means of creating more direct forms of control over welfare resources.³¹

Stuart Hall: Thatcherism and the need for a left anti-statism

Let us now turn to the work of Stuart Hall. Hall was a leading figure in the UK's first New Left, editing *New Left Review* in its early years. A pioneer of Cultural Studies, in the late 1970s and 1980s he worked closely with the group of Gramsci-influenced ('Eurocommunist') activists and thinkers around *Marxism Today*.³² Much of Ward's and Rowbotham's work, at

least that discussed above, was written at a time when social democracy was coming under greater political pressure. Hall's attention, in his period of close collaboration with *Marxism Today*, focused more directly on the nature of the emerging crisis of social democracy. Hall connected the crisis itself back to the character of the social democratic state. In doing so he connected to and generalized some of the ideas we see in Ward and Rowbotham, ideas that were at this point starting to influence the way some left local authorities, such as the Greater London Council (GLC), were operating.

A key first contribution here was Hall's 1979 essay, 'The Great Moving Right Show', which opened up the analysis of Thatcherism as a new and challenging form of right-wing politics.³³ Drawing on Gramsci, Hall understood Thatcherism as a response to the crisis of British capitalism in the 1970s. It was a creative response which aimed to put together a new coalition of social groups in support of the interests of capital. It was, in this sense, a hegemonic project. Central to its hegemonic ambition was the articulation of an ideology that helped to build and to hold a new social coalition, or 'historic bloc', together. This ideology could not simply assert the priority of ruling class interests but had to connect with and mobilise elements of the 'common sense' of wider social groups and give voice to their real grievances. It also had to seek to transform society's 'common sense'.³⁴

What did this ideology look like? In some respects, Hall argued, it echoed the 'resonant themes of organic Toryism – nation, family, duty, authority, standards, traditionalism ...'³⁵ Along this dimension, Thatcherism was itself statist in that it reasserted the authority of the state, e.g., via a discourse about 'law and order'.³⁶ However, Hall argued, Thatcherism combined this authoritarianism 'with the aggressive themes of a revived neo-liberalism – self-interest, competitive individualism, anti-statism.'³⁷ This anti-statist aspect was, moreover, a key aspect of Thatcherism's appeal to working-class people. It built on genuinely negative experiences of the state in its welfare-providing capacity:

Whether in the growing dole queues or in the waiting-rooms of an overburdened National Health Service, or suffering the indignities of the Social Security, the corporatist state is increasingly experienced by [working people] not as a benefice but as a powerful bureaucratic imposition *on* “the people”.³⁸

An important and persistent feature of Hall’s analysis was his insistence – against some on the left – that Thatcherism was addressing real concerns and grievances: it was not ‘mere ideology.’³⁹ As Hall put it in a later, 1984 essay, ‘The State – Socialism’s Old Caretaker’: ‘The problem for the left is that the dissatisfactions with the state are real and authentic enough – even if Thatcherism misdescribes and misexplains them. Thatcherism did not invent them – even if its remedies for the problem are fictitious.’⁴⁰ An adequate left response, Hall argued, could not dismiss these concerns and trust to a swing of the political cycle, or assume the ultimate discovery of some true proletarian consciousness amidst growing economic crisis, as a way forward.⁴¹ Rather, it had to find a better way to respond to the concerns. This would require the left to confront the weaknesses in its own approach to government and social change. In ‘The State – Socialism’s Old Caretaker’, Hall identified this weakness with the way twentieth century Labourism became one vehicle or expression of a ‘collectivism’ which shaped thinking across the UK’s political elite. The victory of collectivism marginalised anti-statist currents on the left and created a form of socialism vulnerable to the New Right’s critique: ‘... it [Thatcherism] exposed a weakness, a critique of the existing system which the left made too little of: the deeply undemocratic character of state-administered socialism. Most disconcerting of all, this revealed that the left and the new right share, on this question, some of the same ground!’⁴²

At the same time, Hall argued, much of what was creative and vibrant on the left was self-organised activity outside of the state:

Culturally, where would the left be today without initiatives like City Limits or a thousand other small, ‘independent’ publications; or Gay Sweatshop and hundreds of other little theatre groups; or Virago and History Workshop and Readers and Writers Cooperative and Compendium and Centreprise and Comedia and – you name it?⁴³

The problem, of course, was to identify the terms on which one could imagine an anti-statist project which did not simply mimic the neo-liberal, pro-market agenda.

In Hall’s view it was necessary first to recognise that the state did have a crucial role in creating distinctively public spaces that were independent of the rules of capital and the market: ‘... I feel sure that socialism cannot exist without a conception of *the public*. It would be right to regard the ‘public sector’, however little it represented a transfer of power to the powerless, as an arena constructed against the logic of capital.’⁴⁴ A public health-service distributed health-care on a different basis to ability to pay. Public transport embodied a non-market conception of the right to mobility. Yet, though the state was necessary to create public space, Hall added that ‘the public’ cannot be identical with the state.’⁴⁵ Having used its power to wall off a certain social space from the market and capital, the state would then itself have to cede power to society: ‘Once the logic of capital, property and the market are broken, it is the diversity of social forms, the taking of popular initiatives, the recovery of popular control, *the passage of power from the state into society*, which marks out the advance towards socialism.’⁴⁶ The crucial idea is a ‘partnership’ between state and society ‘so long as the initiative is always passing to society ...’⁴⁷

Hall’s argument here involved a generalization of the idea we saw in Rowbotham’s writing on nursery provision and in at least some of Ward’s writing on housing. The state would create and resource a social space in which a particular good or service could be created and

distributed, but crucial decisions about provision belonged to organizations within society and/or were negotiated by the state and these organizations.

Were there any examples of this kind of anti-statist left practice? Hall saw some promise in the municipal socialist experiments of the 1980s, notably that of the GLC.⁴⁸ To some degree, Hall argued, the GLC had tried to apply the partnership principle. As Hall elaborated in another 1984 essay, 'Face the Future', the GLC allowed social movements into the local state, to shape decisions. This was a terrain of political struggle – a terrain, that is, on which to affirm the idea of 'the public' not necessarily harmonious: 'The ding-dong, complaint, pressure, pushing-and-response, the negotiation in public forums between the movements and the politicians is the positive sound of a real, as opposed to a phoney and pacified, democracy at work.'⁴⁹ In addition, Hall was impressed by the way the GLC sought to make the city itself against that of the market and capital.

A major early policy in this respect which we may note was 'Fares Fair', an attempt to increase public subsidy to the London transport system so as to keep fares low and thereby enable London residents to travel more easily throughout the metropolis.⁵⁰ One way of interpreting the significance of Fares Fair – and the political opposition it provoked – is through the idea of what we might term 'sectoral communism'. Sectoral communism involves taking a specific good or service out of the market and offering it to all as of right. The NHS is sectoral communism where the 'sector' is health-care. The imaginative horizon implicit in Fares Fair was sectoral communism in relation to transport: a situation in which all would be able to get on a bus or use the underground system as they wished without paying for the service at the point of use. Of course, the method of provision in sectoral communisms can be hierarchical. It was precisely this that animated the struggles to anarchise or democratize public housing (Ward) and child-care provision (Rowbotham). So there is an argument for complementing sectoral communisms with the democratic state-

society partnership principle. But reflecting on the public transport case one can also see, perhaps, how a sectoral communism can fit into a distinctively left vision of a freer society, a politics of emancipation. For to be able to get on the tube and move from A to B to C as one wishes, what is this if not a freedom of access to city life? The state here is pooling resources in a way that creates an infrastructure for people to do their own thing. In Hall's words, initiative passes from state to society.

Paul Hirst and Hilary Wainwright: association and participation

Although Margaret Thatcher left office in 1990, Thatcherism was by then the new orthodoxy and, as Hall had warned, had begun to shift UK society's 'common sense'. Nevertheless, the effort to think through an alternative to Thatcherism – an alternative that would have credibility precisely because it did not amount simply to a restoration of post-war social democracy – continued. Here I want to note briefly the contributions of two thinkers and activists of the left who can be seen as building on the insights we have found in the thinkers discussed above: Paul Hirst and Hilary Wainwright.⁵¹

Initially a revolutionary Marxist keenly engaged with the work of Louis Althusser, in the 1980s and into the following decade, Hirst developed a distinctive conception of 'associative democracy'. This was set out most fully in his 1994 book of the same name.⁵²

The welfare state featured centrally in the book, with two ideas standing out. The first was that public services such as health-care and education should be provided not directly by the state but under the auspices of non-profit associations.⁵³ Under associative democracy, organizations such as trade unions and faith groups would be free to offer services.

Individuals would elect to get services from a specific association which would then receive

corresponding public funds. This model of ‘associational welfare’ had a clear echo of the idea we find in Ward, Rowbotham and Hall, of services becoming the site of a partnership between state and society in which the state provides resources while civil society groups determine what is done with these resources.

A second idea in Hirst’s discussion of the welfare state was unconditional basic income: every citizen was to receive an income grant from the state with no test of means or willingness to take employment.⁵⁴ Hirst viewed this as an important source of individual empowerment. Again, however, Hirst was here connecting to a wider stream of thinking on the left (and not just on the left). As Toru Yamamori has shown, basic income was a key demand of the Claimants’ Unions which emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s to help welfare recipients assert their rights, and of some sections of the Women’s Liberation Movement.⁵⁵ Basic income was seen as a non-judgmental form of income support which would emancipate welfare recipients from the intrusive and demeaning task of proving their eligibility for cash payments. It could be seen as another expression of what I referred to above as sectoral communism: in this case, the proposal was to take the income necessary to meet (some set of) basic material needs out of the domain of the market and make it available to all without condition. Although harnessing state power, the policy would create a platform for individuals to pursue their own objectives: it would build an infrastructure of personal freedom. The proposal gained a new lease of life in the 1980s in response to mass unemployment.⁵⁶

Hirst’s model of associational welfare also pointed, however, to a challenge in trying to formulate a left alternative to post-war social democracy in the 1990s and after as the assumptions surrounding political discussion became increasingly Thatcherite or neo-liberal

ones. Although Hirst emphasized the associational character of the proposal, he was in effect proposing that all public services become ‘quasi-markets’ in which providers would compete for customers who would choose between them with assistance from a state-funded voucher.⁵⁷ The proposal was non- or anti-neo-liberal insofar as it excluded commercial providers from the quasi-market. But it worked with the grain of neo-liberalism insofar as it would have created a kind of market and emphasized the power of service users to exit. This might or might not have been a good idea. The point here is simply to note how Hirst did seem to be getting drawn onto some common ground with neo-liberal thinking.

Hall was very aware of this challenge: ‘... if we go too far down that particular [anti-statist] road, whom do we discover keeping us company but – of course – the Thatcherites, the new right, the free market ‘hot gospellers’, who seem (whisper it not too loud) to be saying rather similar things about the state.’⁵⁸ Another thinker and activist who had been particularly conscious of this issue, and who engaged with it directly, was Hilary Wainwright.

Wainwright was active in the 1970s as a socialist feminist, contributing with Rowbotham and Segal to *Beyond the Fragments*, and in the emerging movement around ‘alternative plans’ in industry.⁵⁹ In the 1980s she headed the Popular Planning Unit at the GLC, helping to build some of the democratic partnerships between state and society which Hall saw as a positive aspect of the GLC model.

Wainwright responded directly to the theoretical perspective of the New Right in her 1994 book, *Arguments for a New Left*.⁶⁰ This laid the groundwork on which she built in her later work, *Reclaim the State: Experiments in Popular Democracy*, first published in 2003 with a revised edition in 2009.⁶¹ *Arguments* is structured around a direct engagement with the work of Friedrich Hayek, a major thinker of the New Right.⁶² Social democracy, neo-liberalism

and participatory democracy each rests, Wainwright argued, on a distinct theory of knowledge. Post-war social democracy rested on a theory of centralised expert knowledge, the knowledge of the post-war planner (of whom Ward and Rowbotham were so sceptical). Against this, and against the fuller notion of central planning in state socialism of the Soviet type, Hayek asserted the importance of localised and tacit knowledge that could be absorbed and digested by a central planner. Wainwright retained Hayek's emphasis on dispersed knowledge, but also argued that Hayek developed this idea in a reductively individualistic way. Relevant, local knowledge is something that can be generated and shared in groups, e.g., in the local meetings and networks of social movement activists.

Thus, while the Hayekian would see the alternative to the social-democratic welfare state as requiring the rolling back of the state in favour of the market, or the introduction of market mechanisms into the state, Wainwright argued that there was an alternative based on a participatory democratic restructuring of the welfare state. A given service could become the site of democratic discussion between providers and organised groups of service users, generating new knowledge that could be brought to bear in policy design and implementation, thereby improving the outcomes of collective action.

Wainwright illustrated this argument with a discussion of how the Swedish women's movement had helped establish new educational institutions for women using a mix of public funding and civil society design and control.⁶³ This was just one example of the way the women's movement had sought to build a distinctive welfare state based on the model of public funding and civil society input and control.⁶⁴ In the GLC context, women's, ethnic minority and other civil society groups similarly helped to shape local welfare provision.⁶⁵ Wainwright also discussed how networks of civil society groups could coordinate to help

regulate economic activity in the market. Such networks could strengthen workers' bargaining position in relation to wages and working conditions. They could help develop ideas for new productive strategies. They would not necessarily displace the market so much as, in Diane Elson's phrase, 'socialise' it.⁶⁶ There would, again, be a role for the state as a provider of resources to help support these civil society networks. Referencing Elson's model, Wainwright also argued for an unconditional basic income as part of the institutional framework for a new economy.⁶⁷

The idea of democratic state-society partnerships is clearly central here and remained so in Wainwright's later book, *Reclaim the State*. Here the context was the comprehensive shift to outsourcing and privatisation of public services under a now thoroughly hegemonic neo-liberalism. Wainwright understood the neo-liberal restructuring of the welfare state as a response to real problems of paternalism within post-war social democracy. Nevertheless, she argued, the neo-liberal response, in the form of outsourcing and privatisation, was deeply flawed. Particular problems included the impossibility of specifying in contractual terms many of the qualities of service provision which make for a good service; the way commercial confidentiality worked as a barrier to the democratic accountability of companies providing public services; and the lack of effective competition between providers.⁶⁸ The implication, Wainwright argued, was not a return to the methods of post-war social democracy, but, as argued in the earlier book, an agenda that involved democratizing public services and wider state structures: 'The other option for reform is one based on processes of participatory democratic decision-making, complementing and strengthening representative democracy'.⁶⁹

Reclaim the State looked at a variety of real-world experiments which indicate how this might be done. One very influential real-world case was that of Participatory Budgeting (PB) initially developed and applied in the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre. PB was introduced by Brazil's Workers' Party (PT) to give neighbourhoods more control over public investments. Wainwright explained:

The PT did not simply seek to get into office and drive the machinery of state towards the poor. Rather, it aimed to open up the state machinery in the municipalities and involve all citizens - the poor especially - in deciding how it should work, a collaborative process that is both personally and socially transformative.⁷⁰

Concretely, PB involved neighbourhood assemblies discussing and voting on local spending priorities. These were then considered further across neighbourhoods using a democratic delegate system, leading to the agreement of a comprehensive city budget. Implementation of this budget was then monitored through the same system.⁷¹

Reclaim the State also discussed real-world experiments in the UK, including in-depth discussions of two attempts to assert popular control over the development and implementation of public policy through New Labour's New Deal for Communities (NDC). Announced in 1998, NDC provided 39 of England's poorest estates with £50m each for 10 year regeneration programmes. These programmes were to be 'community-led'.⁷²

Wainwright looked closely at the Marsh Farm NDC in Luton and at a NDC in East Manchester. These cases were instructive about the challenges involved in applying the democratic partnership principle between state and society. Local officials and politicians did not always trust community groups (and vice versa). The extent of community control was something that was continually negotiated between a large array of actors at the local level. A related worry was that notions of community action and control could themselves become

delimited in ways that worked with the grain of neo-liberalism. It could actually fit well with a neo-liberal agenda to remove the state from provision and give resources to local communities to provide goods and services at low cost, supplemented by their own time and energy. The problem lay in a higher authority defining participation as applying to a prescribed set of resources and within limits defined through structures that excluded or marginalised the affected community. To correct this, participants would have to be willing to contest resource settlements and their exclusion from wider decision-making structures. As Wainwright put it:

An important point here for the debate about democracy is that participation is not used to discipline people at a micro level simply to 'make do' with a budget set at a higher level of decision-making by a process over which they have no significant control. This would be what I would call the 'institutionalization of small expectations' participatory democracy is not only a means of generating creative improvements at a micro level but it is potentially also a mechanism for ensuring a pressure upwards for wider change.⁷³

Wainwright also made the point that the success of democratic approaches to welfare state restructuring could not be divorced from wider trends in social and economic policy. Deregulated labour markets, for example, characterized by insecurity, temporary contracts, low pay and long hours work would not provide the context for all citizens – and, in particular, poorer citizens – to become engaged in participatory democracy.⁷⁴ Thus, the practice of democratic state-society partnerships would have to be complemented by measures to help ensure people have the time and energy to participate in them.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have explored how five significant activists and thinkers on the left responded to the perceived paternalism of the post-war welfare state and how they helped to develop an alternative approach to the welfare state, doing so increasingly against the background of a new, Thatcherite ‘common sense’. Let us briefly review some of the elements of this emerging, radical democratic alternative.

Perhaps the most prominent idea, developed in various ways by all of the five thinkers we have briefly considered, is that of the democratic *state-society partnership*. The idea is to distinguish between the state as a collector and provider of resources and the state as designer of the goods and services supplied with these resources. Against the grain of neo-liberalism, the principle of the state as a major pooler of resources is affirmed. Against the grain of post-war social democracy, the role of groups within society using participatory democratic processes to control exactly what is done with these resources is also affirmed. Within the partnership model broadly construed we can see differences of emphasis between more individualistic and more collective approaches to how citizens exert their control over the exact use of resources. An important theme also is the role of social movements in supporting the ‘societal’ input into participatory democratic processes. It should also be noted that even where approaches have a strong collective element, there is generally a recognition – indeed, arguably a celebration – of the diversity of groups and perspectives that properly come into play in these processes.

Another idea we see in the above discussion is what I have termed *sectoral communism*: take a particular, generally needed good or service and use the state to marshal resources so that the relevant good or service is available to all as of right. The GLC’s ‘Fares Fair’ policy can

be seen as aiming in this direction, as a step towards a situation where public transportation across London would be free at the point of use. The policy can be seen as creating a supportive infrastructure for the pursuit of personal projects. Of course, the provision of a good or service as of right always raises issues of power in the process of provision. This is precisely the issue that, for example, Ward was focusing on in housing and Rowbotham in relation to nursery care. So sectoral communism has to operate in conjunction with democratic state-society partnerships.

A related idea, explicitly proposed by Hirst and Wainwright, is that of *unconditional basic income*: an income grant paid to every citizen as of right with no test of means or willingness to take a job. As indicated very briefly above, this idea was developed by some in the Claimants' Union movement in the 1970s as a liberating alternative to conventional cash welfare. In this respect, it is a proposal which, again, affirms the role of the state as pooler and provider of resources while also seeking to limit the state's role as a prescriptive, overseeing force. Basic income is itself an application of sectoral communism, attempting to take a certain set of basic material needs out of the sphere of market dependency. At the same time, one might argue that it is complementary to democratic state-society partnerships. By providing a degree of income security independent of the labour market it may free up time and energy for involvement in a participatory democratic welfare state.

As the discussion above suggests, these ideas are perhaps best seen as working in conjunction, as a potentially mutually reinforcing combination.⁷⁵ Of course, we must recall that showing how welfare provision can be less hierarchical does not necessarily mean that citizens will be willing to carry the tax implications of a more generous welfare state. As also suggested above, however, making the case that the welfare state can be less hierarchical and more empowering is arguably a crucial step in building public support for it. Lydon's snarl is something the left ignores at its peril.

¹ N. Seth-Smith, 'The left and the Big Society VII: Hilary Wainwright of Red Pepper', *OurKingdom*, December 1 2010, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/niki-seth-smith/left-and-big-society-vii-hilary-wainwright-of-red-pepper>

² The references here are to the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola ('MPLA'), the Ulster Defence Association ('UDA') and Irish Republican Army ('IRA').

³ For a short essay which interestingly covers punk and the welfare state, see O. Hatherley, 'England's Dreaming introduced me to the power of urban, sprawling London', *The Guardian*, August 5, 2014, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/aug/05/englands-dreaming-jon-savage-book-that-changed-me>

Hatherley discusses here J. Savage, *England's Dreaming: Sex Pistols and Punk Rock* (London, 1991). On the political and cultural context of punk rock in the UK, see also D. Simonelli, 'Anarchy, Pop and Violence: Punk Rock Subculture and the Rhetoric of Class, 1976-78', *Contemporary British History* 16 (2), 2002, pp.121-144, and K. Gildart, 'The Antithesis of Humankind': Exploring Responses to the Sex Pistols' Anarchy Tour 1976', *Cultural and Social History* 10 (1), 2013, pp.129-148. For a discussion of the specific moment of 1976 in the UK, see also Joe Moran, '"Stand Up and Be Counted': Hughie Green, the 1970s and Popular Memory', *History Workshop Journal* 70, 2010, pp.173-198. Although Moran emphasises the way some actors sought to talk up the idea of a 'crisis' for their own political ends, and argues that such talk was at some remove from the lived experience of many people in the UK at the time, he acknowledges that there were very real economic

problems; and Gildart argues in response to Moran that reactions to punk outside of the elite indicated a wider sense of ‘moral malaise’.

⁴ One initiative which also needs to be considered, but which I do not address in this paper, is the ‘In and Against the State’ project from a Working Group of the Conference of Socialist Economists. See London Edinburgh Return Group, *In and Against the State* (London, 1980 [1979]). A fuller discussion might also look at how some of Raymond Williams’ thinking on public broadcasting also expressed the idea of a democratic state-society partnership. On the continuing relevance of Williams’ ideas, and those of the wider New Left, see Mark Fisher and Jeremy Gilbert, *Reclaim Modernity: Beyond Markets, Beyond Machines* (London, Compass, 2014). I do not use the concept of the ‘New Left’ much in this discussion for two reasons. First, because the New Left itself is internally diverse and use of the term immediately calls for further clarification in terms of which generation of the New Left one is talking about. Second, because not all of the thinkers – notably Colin Ward – can be straightforwardly categorised as such. I think we can get at the central institutional or policy ideas that are the concern of this paper without the need to employ this at once complex and (for present purposes) somewhat restricting category. Fisher and Gilbert are clearly correct, however, in signalling this deep connection.

⁵ See T. Clark and A. Dilnot, *Long-Term Trends in British Taxation and Spending* (London, Institute for Fiscal Studies, Briefing Paper No.25, 2002), pp.1-3.

⁶ Indeed, Table 1 suggests that as a share of national income spending across social security, education and health-care together was higher at the end of the Thatcher-Major governments

than it was in the mid-1970s. Of course, this does not necessarily mean the welfare state was ‘more generous’ as the underlying needs it addressed might have increased by even more, e.g., due to demographic change, higher unemployment and increased inequality and poverty.

⁷ Clark and Dilnot, *Long-Term Trends*, pp.1-5.

⁸ The figures for total public spending and social security spending are calculated from a data series provided by the Institute for Fiscal Studies and available at <http://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/1791>. The figure for government spending is total managed government expenditure as a proportion of GDP. The second figure is social security spending as a proportion of GDP. The figures for education spending are calculated from the same IFS data series. The figures for health-care spending are taken from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/data/oecd-health-statistics/system-of-health-accounts-health-expenditure-by-function_data-00349-en (The OECD series is apparently for calendar years rather than financial years and, for example, I have entered the figure for 1961 in place of that for 1961/62.)

⁹ This is taken from Table 1 in A. Murie, ‘The social rented sector, housing and the welfare state in the UK’, *Housing Studies* 12 (4), 1997, pp.437-461, specifically p.444.

¹⁰ For overviews of Ward’s life and work see D. Goodway, ‘Colin Ward’, in D. Goodway, *Anarchist Seeds Beneath the Snow. Left-Libertarian Thought and British Writers from William Morris to Colin Ward*, Second Edition (Oakland, 2012), pp.309-325; C. Wilbert and

D. F. White, 'Introduction: autonomy, solidarity and possibility: the worlds of Colin Ward's anarchism' in C. Wilbert and D. F. White, eds., *Autonomy, Solidarity, Possibility. The Colin Ward Reader* (Oakland, 2011), pp.vii-xxx; C. Honeywell, *A British Anarchist Tradition. Herbert Read, Alex Comfort and Colin Ward* (London, 2011), pp.133-182; C. Levy, ed., *Colin Ward* (London, 2014); S. White, 'Making anarchism respectable? The social philosophy of Colin Ward', *Journal of Political Ideologies* 12 (1), 2007, pp.11-28. The best introduction, however, is C. Ward and D. Goodway, *Talking Anarchy* (Nottingham, 2003).

¹¹ See White, 'Making anarchism respectable'. See also Wilbert and White, 'Introduction', pp.viii-ix.

¹² C Ward, *Anarchy in Action* Second Edition (London, 1996 [1973]).

¹³ C. Ward, 'Dear Mr. Crosland...', in C. Ward, *Housing. An Anarchist Approach* (London, 1976), pp.93-98, specifically p.94.

¹⁴ See also C. Honeywell, 'Colin Ward: anarchism and social policy', in Levy, ed., *Colin Ward*, pp.88-105, and Honeywell, *British Anarchist Tradition*, pp.162-169.

¹⁵ C. Ward, 'The people act: the postwar squatters' movement', in Wilbert and White, eds., *Autonomy, Solidarity, Possibility*, pp.63-69.

¹⁶ Ward, *Anarchy in Action*, pp.72-73.

¹⁷ See Ward and Goodway, *Talking Anarchy*, pp.74-75, and C. Ward, *Tenants Take Over* (London, 1974).

¹⁸ C. Ward, 'The do-it-yourself New Town', in C. Ward, *Talking Houses* (London, 1990), pp.15-35, reprinted in Wilbert and White, eds., *Autonomy, Solidarity, Possibility*, pp.71-84.

¹⁹ See Ward and Goodway, *Talking Anarchy*, pp.70-73.

²⁰ On this point, see also Wilbert and White, 2011, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

²¹ S. Rowbotham, L. Segal and H. Wainwright, *Beyond the Fragments. Feminism and the Making of Socialism* (London, 1979).

²² S. Rowbotham, 'Mother, child, state', in S. Rowbotham, *Dreams and Dilemmas* (London, 1983), pp.130-135. The article was originally published, in a shorter version, in *New Society*, October 1, 1980.

²³ Rowbotham, 'Mother, child, state', p.130.

²⁴ Rowbotham, 'Mother, child, state', p.133.

²⁵ Rowbotham, 'Mother, child, state', p.132.

²⁶ S. Rowbotham, 'Storefront day care centres, the radical Berlin experiment', in S. Rowbotham, *Dreams and Dilemmas* (London, 1983), pp.94-98. The article was first published in the UK in 1974 in *Women Speaking*.

²⁷ Rowbotham, 'Storefront day care centres', p.97.

²⁸ Rowbotham, 'Storefront day care centres', p.97. Rowbotham references, in making these points, an article by V. Charlton, 'The patter of tiny contradictions', *Red Rag* 5.

²⁹ Rowbotham, 'Mother, child, state', p.133.

³⁰ Rowbotham, 'Mother, child, state', p.133.

³¹ S. Rowbotham, 'The Women's Movement and organizing for socialism', in Rowbotham, Segal and Wainwright, *Beyond the Fragments*, pp.21-155, specifically p.137.

³² On Hall's involvement with the first New Left, see M. Kenny, *The First New Left. British Intellectuals After Stalin* (London, 1995), pp.10-68. On the context of the Gramscian left and *Marxism Today*, see G. Andrews, *Endgames and New Times. The Final Years of British Communism 1964-1991* (London, 2004), pp.140-246. *Marxism Today* was the 'theoretical and discussion journal' of the Communist Party of Great Britain, but under the editorship of Martin Jacques it achieved a much wider circulation.

³³ S. Hall, 'The Great Moving Right Show', in S. Hall and M. Jacques, eds., *The Politics of Thatcherism* (London, 1983), pp.19-39. This is a revised version of the article originally published in the journal *Marxism Today* in January 1979.

³⁴ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', p.23.

³⁵ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', p.29.

³⁶ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', pp.37-38. See also S. Hall, C. Critcher, T. Jefferson, J. N. Clarke, and B. Roberts, *Policing the Crisis. Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*, Second Edition (Basingstoke, 2013 [1978]), especially pp.268-317.

³⁷ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', p.29.

³⁸ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', p.33.

³⁹ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', p.20.

⁴⁰ S. Hall, 'The state – socialism's old caretaker', in S. Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal* (London, 1988), pp.220-232, specifically p.227. This essay was first published as S. Hall, 'The state – socialism's old caretaker', *Marxism Today*, November 1984, pp.24-29, www.amielandmelburn.org.uk/collections/authorsandtitles/mt/84_11_24.htm

⁴¹ Hall, 'Great Moving Right Show', pp.20-23.

⁴² Hall, 'The state', p.227.

⁴³ Hall, 'The state', p.229.

⁴⁴ Hall, 'The state', p.230.

⁴⁵ Hall, 'The state', p.231.

⁴⁶ Hall, 'The state', p.231.

⁴⁷ Hall, 'The state', p.231.

⁴⁸ The Greater London Council was run by a Labour administration, under the leadership of Ken Livingstone, from 1981 until it was abolished by the Thatcher government in 1986. It was one of the major focal points of 'municipal socialism' in the 1980s and perhaps the example of municipal socialism that was most strongly influenced by socialist feminist, anti-racist and other radical democratic currents.

⁴⁹ S. Hall, 'Face the future', in Hall, *Hard Road to Renewal*, pp.233-238, specifically p.235. Other essays which explore the problem of statism include S. Hall, 'The battle for socialist ideas in the 1980s', *Hard Road to Renewal*, pp.177-195 (originally published in 1981 in *The Socialist Register* 1982); 'The crisis of Labourism', *Hard Road to Renewal*, pp.196-210 (originally published in J. Curran, ed., *The Future of the Left*, New Socialist and Polity, 1984), and 'Realignment – for what?', *Hard Road to Renewal*, pp.239-250 (originally

published in *Marxism Today*, December 1985,

www.amielandmelburn.org.uk/collections/authorsandtitles/mt/85_12_12.htm).

⁵⁰ 'Fares Fair' was introduced in 1981 but had to be abandoned after a (highly questionable) court ruling that the GLC did not have the power in law to subsidise the London transport system to the extent of the policy. For helpful discussion, see J. Carvell, *Citizen Ken* (London, 1984), pp.128-152.

⁵¹ The affinity in the work of Hirst and Wainwright from the 1990s is helpfully noted and discussed by S. Griffiths in 'Pluralism, neo-liberalism and the "all-knowing" state', *Journal of Political Ideologies* 16 (3), 2011, pp.295-311, specifically pp.304, 306-307. Griffiths sees Hirst and Wainwright as major figures in a revival of pluralist political thought in the UK since the 1990s.

⁵² P. Hirst, *Associative Democracy. New Forms of Economic and Social Governance* (Cambridge, 1993).

⁵³ Hirst, *Associative Democracy*, pp.165-173, 184-189.

⁵⁴ Hirst, *Associative Democracy*, pp.179-184.

⁵⁵ See T. Yamamori, 'A feminist way to unconditional basic income: Claimants' Unions and Women's Liberation movements in 1970s Britain', *Basic Income Studies* 9 (1-2), 2014, pp.1-24. See also H. Rose, 'Up against the Welfare State: the Claimant Unions', *Socialist Register*

10, 1973, pp.179-202, and B. Jordan, *Paupers. The Making of a New Claiming Class* (London, 1973). Jordan became a leading advocate of basic income.

⁵⁶ See B. Jordan, *Mass Unemployment and the Future of Britain* (Oxford, 1982), and *Rethinking Welfare* (Oxford, 1987).

⁵⁷ For a sympathetic discussion of quasi-markets, see J. Le Grand, *The Other Invisible Hand. Delivering Public Services through Choice and Competition* (Princeton, 2007).

⁵⁸ Hall, 'The state', pp.221-222.

⁵⁹ See H. Wainwright and D. Elliot, *The Lucas Plan. A New Trade Unionism in the Making?* (London, 1982).

⁶⁰ H. Wainwright, *Arguments for a New Left. Answering the Free-Market Right* (Oxford, 1994).

⁶¹ H. Wainwright, *Reclaim the State. Experiments in Popular Democracy* (Calcutta, 2009 [2003]).

⁶² Wainwright's response to Hayek's work is discussed in depth in Griffiths, 'Pluralism, neo-liberalism and the "all knowing" state'.

⁶³ Wainwright, *Arguments*, pp.115-142.

⁶⁴ Wainwright, *Arguments*, pp.139-140.

⁶⁵ Wainwright, *Arguments*, pp.178-182.

⁶⁶ Wainwright, *Arguments*, pp.153-182. See D. Elson, 'Market socialism or socialization of the market?', *New Left Review* I/172, 1988, pp.3-44.

⁶⁷ Wainwright, *Arguments*, p.170. See Elson, 'Market socialism or socialization of the market?'

⁶⁸ Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, pp.36-42.

⁶⁹ Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, p.42.

⁷⁰ Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, p.120.

⁷¹ Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, pp.50-51, 121-139.

⁷² Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, p.56. Wainwright reported that input into the design of the NDC came from the Development Trust Association 'which had its origins in community initiatives supported by the GLC such as Coin Street Community Trust'. See Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, p.69, note 5.

⁷³ Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, pp.42-43.

⁷⁴ Wainwright, *Reclaim the State*, p.39.

⁷⁵ Three helpful discussions in this respect are Elson, ‘Market socialism or socialization of the market?’, E. O. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias* (London, 2010), especially chapter 5, and Fisher and Gilbert, *Reclaim Modernity*. There is much in common in these discussions with Hall’s argument that socialism requires that initiative is always passing from the state to society.