title: Community involvement froma a comparative perspective: an evaluation and confrontation of governmentality and regulation approaches

author: Maarten Loopmans

date: 01.01.2004
number: 1/2004
series: research and training network urban europe

Research and Training Network Urban Europe

The Research and Training Network on Urban Europe

UrbEUROPE is a research and training network funded by the European Union (2002-2006) aimed at linking the outputs of recent and/or ongoing research in different disciplines involving the urban dimension of Europe.

The flourishing of research projects and networks carrying out empirical fieldwork on European cities signals the recognition of the crucial character of this dimension, even though little effort has been devoted in building a solid interdisciplinary knowledge basis integrated with a highly structured training programme. Filling this gap is our main objective.

The network provides at the premises of the partners (see below) 368 person/months fellowships (pre and post doc for candidates under 35 years old) for research in the following areas:

1. The analysis of how global changes and local impacts are conceptualised in theories and through which methods they are investigated;
2. The analysis of how changes impacted on the built environment (gentrification, sub-urbanization and segregation);
3. The analysis of how the changes impacted on the role of local social policies and governance.

The network provides also training to its fellows through:

1. International workshops;
2. Eurex International Online seminar ;
3. RTN Urbino-Summerschool.

The working paper series offers insights into empirical and theoretical research carried out by the RTN fellows or associated partners during their participation in the project. All papers are downloadable from the networks' webpage.
For further information please see www.urban-europe.net

The Partners

University of Milan-Bicocca (I)
Department of Sociology and Social Research
Prof. Enzo Mingione (International Coordinator)

University of Urbino (I)
Institute of Sociology
Prof. Yuri Kazepov

Sciences Po, Paris (F)
Cevipof and Osc
Prof. Patrick Le Galès, Prof. Marco Oberti, Prof. Edmond Préteceille

Humboldt Universität, Berlin (D)
Istitut für SozialwissenschaftenStadt - und Regionalsoziologie
Prof. Hartmut Häussermann, Prof. Susanne Franck

University of Amsterdam (NL)
AME - Amsterdam study centre for the metropolitan environment
Prof. Sako Musterd, Prof. Wim Ostendorf

London School of Economics, London (UK)
Cities Programme
Prof. Richard Sennett, Prof. Ian Gordon, Dr. Kathryn Firth

Helsinki University, (SF)
Department of Social Policy
Prof. Anne Haila, Dr. Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen

Contents

1. Introduction…… 05
2. Governmentality and the genealogy of ‘government through community…… 05
3. Community involvement under advanced liberalism…….06
4. Governmentality: a critique……..…… 07
5. British regulation approaches and the governance of societal relations……..08
5.1 The regulation approach to the study of neoliberal governance……..08
5.2 Regulation theory and community involvement…….10
5.3 Criticisms on a regulationary account of new policy development……..12
6. Synthesis and conclusion…… 13
References……..17

Abstract

Recently, community involvement and 'participation' have regained attention from urban policy makers throughout Western Europe. This evolution has drawn attention of scholars from a variety of theoretical backgrounds. In this paper, I evaluate and compare two competing 'critical' strands of theory that have payed considerable attention to the emergence of community involvement on the policy agenda in various countries. I confront British regulationists, who depart from a neo-marxist perspective and governmentality theorists, largely inspired by the writings of Michel Foucault, in order to develop an analytical framework for the comparative analysis of the re-emergence of community involvement on the policy agenda, that builds on both traditions of research.

Maarten Loopmans
Aspirant FWO-Vlaanderen
Institute for Social and Economic Geography
Catholic University of Leuven
W. De Croylaan 42
B-3001 Leuven
Belgium
Tel. 0032-(0)16 32 24 11
maarten.loopmans@geo.kuleuven.ac.be
Maarten Loopmans was hosted at the University of Urbino

1. Introduction

The last few decades, community involvement and 'participation' seems to have experienced a meteoric rise on the agenda of urban policies throughout Western Europe. Among the theories that try to account for this development, British regulationist writers and governmentality theorists stand out. Both theories stress the interconnectedness between the appearance of participation discourses and the general emergence of new forms of governance since the 1970s. This paper compares how both critical traditions of analysis deal with the recent upsurge of community involvement discourse in urban policies. The goal is to draw from both theories in order to develop a framework for a comparative analysis of the phenomenon. Both approaches lack such an explicit attempt to comparative analysis of this development in different countries. Both regulationist and governmentality accounts at least implicitly assume a policy convergence towards 'neoliberal' or 'advanced liberal' governance and, at least in practice, do not pay attention to international or interurban variability. Both governmentality and regulation approaches have remained too restricted first, to a very general analysis of emerging new policy 'regimes', and secondly, to analyses within the same –Anglo-Saxon- context to account for international variation.

Nonetheless, as I will argue at the end of this paper, a comparative analytical framework can be constructed from the confrontation of both strands of theory.

The paper is divided in three parts. In a first part, we will offer a review of governmentalists' account of the development of community involvement policies. Secondly, the regulationist approach receives attention. In a third section, we will attempt to synthesize both views and develop an explanatory framework that could be applied to a international comparison of the introduction of community involvement notions in urban policy.

2. Governmentality and the genealogy of 'government through community'. The problematics of government: the conduct of conduct.

The growing body of literature on 'governmentality', has been particularly sensitive to the rise of 'community involvement' on the policy agenda. Governmentality analysts take new technologies of government as their prime topic of research, and community involvement has recently been certainly one of the most generalised. The basis for the governmentality approach is formed by Foucault's 1970 writings on the nature of modern government, wherein he introduced the concept of governmentality.

This neologism is based on the semantic merger of government with 'mentality' or 'modes of thought'. Lemke (2001) points to two different theoretical innovations Foucault introduced with this notion.

First, the term govern-mentality indicates that it is not possible to study the *technologies* of government in absence of an analysis of the political *rationality* underpinning them. 'Governmentality' is defined as the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures but also the analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of power by government. It's the way and the means with which social interaction is conceptualised and organised (Uitermark, 2003a). On the one hand, governmentality refers to a specific form of *representation* which discursively delineates the problem to be solved, the field where intervention is 'thinkable' (Rose, 1990). On the other hand, political rationality simultaneously structures specific *forms of interventions*; the governmental issue and the technique to tackle it are mutually constituted.

Secondly, governmentality can also be read as pointing to the fact that Foucault uses 'government' in a broad sense that exceeds the *direct* exercise of power by governmental bodies or organisations. In doing so, Foucault defines government as a specific combination of governing techniques and rationalities, typi-

cal for the modern, liberal period and contrasts this in particular to the conduct of sovereign rule in feudal society. Whereas sovereignity is portrayed as a force exercised narrowly on the basis of consent or extensive repression, government permeates the conduct of individuals across a wide spectrum of activities and senses (Marinetto, 2003). It does so, because,

> in contrast to sovereignity, government has as its purpose not the act of government itself, but the welfare of the population, the improvement of its condition, the increase of its wealth, longevity, health, etc. (Foucault, 1991, p. 100; quoted in Allen, 2003).

For this, government needs to reach deep into the lives of a disparate population. When based upon direct intervention, the dominant technique in feudal society, this proves to be a time-consuming and cumbersome, if not a wholy unrealisable task. Government faces the paradoxical situation that it gains its legitimacy to act from the welfare it creates for the population, whereas doing so proves to be practically unfaisable, at least with the classical techniques of rule available. The key innovation of liberal rule that serves as a solution to this paradox is to construct a border between 'state' and a essentially self-regulating 'civil society'. This way, government –now interpreted broadly as the conduct of conduct- builds upon the freedom that people have to get things done or to make themselves up in certain ways. But to allow a degree of 'self-governance', to have people 'working' on their own conduct, free to fashion themselves, entails narrowing down the possibilities in line with acceptable behaviour.

These forces of indirect government operate through the constitution of various forms of immanent subjectivity that shape the possible ways of self-governance. As Allen puts it:

> the art of government rests upon the continuous and relatively stable presence of a series of ideals, expectations, received 'truths', standards and frameworks which provoke individuals to govern their lives in particular ways (Allen, 2003, p. 82).

Government bodies are not mere instruments of control, but actively engage in the diffusion of a certain 'mentality', of standards and ideals to be internalised by a self-governing population. Power works effectively at a distance on the condition that it is at least in part an immanent affair, it is capable of reaching into people's lives only because they bring them *selves* to order.

3. Community involvement under advanced liberalism

Apart from such broad historical analysis of new government rationalities such as liberalism, NeoFoucauldian literature and governmentality analysts have payed particular attention to the emergence (since the last 20 or 30 years) of new governmental practices where the boundary between state and civil society activities seems to be blurred. While there is no general agreement on the terminology, governmentality literature often uses the concept of 'advanced liberalism', emphasizing the continuity with modern liberalism, while at the same time acknowledging a major turn in governance (Dean, 1999).

Governmentality analysists have emphasized the increasing involvement of citizens, voluntary organisations, neighbourhoods and communities in the regulation of society, be it in policing and safety policies, service delivery, welfare and health policies or local economic development (Uitermark, 2003a; cfr. Cruikshank, 1999; Cohen, 1985; Rose, 1996, O'Malley and Palmer, 1996). Involvement, consultation and participation are pervasive notions that emerge as a new specialisation of government. Emerging from political theory and social critique, community has now become integrated into professional programmes and knowledge.

Significantly, governments preoccupation with active citizenship has been generated by distinct political calculations and by particular ideological predilections (Marinetto, 2003, p.

111). Community involvement indicates the emergence of new sectors for government, where conduct is only possible through existing or potential 'indigenous' mechanisms of government (O'Malley and Palmer, 1996) such as communities, neighbourhoods, social movements,… The rationality of government through community is centered around the potential of mutual self-regulation within a community, associated with spontaneous solidarity. The idea is that new policy programs can make use of the capabilities and resources of communities through placing the onus on responsible self-help. In Rose's words, what is created is 'government through community' (Rose, 1996, p. 332).

Community involvement rationalities specifically designate 'marginalized' communities as the target of this new governmental practice. Rose (1996) argues that the community is a new focus for dealing with established social problems. Community involvement is not merely seen as a practice of generalized 'deliberative democracy', but explicitly designates as objects of government those communities, groups, places where the liberal project is contested, where it runs the risks of loosing legitimacy or where its effectivity is challenged. As such, community involvement is not so much a matter of changing the ways in which and the origins wherefrom conduct is governed, but of enhancing its legitimation and effectiveness where this is contested. The notion of 'partnership' is crucial:

> Democratic legitimacy is to be achieved through shared responsibility and through building a consensus around policies. The joining-up of the citizen to government through the creation of 'participatory' spaces of local government is in theory supposed to be a process of convergence in which information is shared by participants in order to reach mutual understanding […] this 'community government scenario' can be described as a comprehensive programme of 'democratic renewal', involving strategies of interactive and participatory democracy that are designed to win back government credibility and effectiveness through turning citizens from 'objects of policy intervention' to sources of relevant knowledge (McGhee, 2003, p. 348-349).

Governmentality theorists are wary about the promises of liberation and inclusion attached to the alleged greater autonomy for communities to 'do-it-themselves'. In practice, engaging citizens in government not only entails the make-up of 'new technologies of performance' (Dean, 1999, p. 196) such as the extension of bidding procedures and monitoring of intergovernmental relations to the engagement of citizens in governing themselves (Loopmans, 2003a), but –and through them- also the design and promotion of new subjectivities, whereby citizens are transformed from 'policy object' with certain entitlements to care, to a 'democratic resource' that feels the responsibility to be 'active' and 'empowered'. Governments engage in community involvement because

> new modes of neighbourhood participation, local empowerment and engagement of residents in decisions over their own lives will, it is thought, reactivate selfmotivation, self-responsibility and self-reliance (Rose, 1996: 335).

Such 'technologies of subjectivity and citizenship' link personal goals and desires to social order and stability and power to subjectivity; the line between subjectivity and subjection is crossed (Cruikshank, 1999). The incorporation of citizens in networks of government is not merely a matter of empowerment, but tails the web of control and discipline that is woven around those deprived communities that are taken as a target of governmental action (Uitermark, 2003a, p. 158; Allen and Cars, 2000).

4. Governmentality: a critique

A often heard critique on governmentality analyses from the side of the critical left is that governmentality analyses fail to or do not wish to identify the actors and forces that are behind transformations of governing rationalities and techniques (e.g. Curtis, 1995), a critique he also addresses at Foucault's lectures on gov-

ernmentality themselves (Curtis, 2002, p. 523). Governmentality authors avoid human agency by focusing on 'mentalities' or 'rationalities' that guide policy development, thereby reifying and idealising what they identify as dimensions of liberal or neoliberal government. They make it seem as if real relations emerge from the needs of 'mentalities', while marginalizing the concrete activities of government (O'Malley et al., 1997, p. 504-505). Disregarding these leads to an overly-abstract view of the governing process. Martinotti (2003), from a more governmentality-friendly perspective, does identify relevant actors. Contrary to the idea of decentred government, he argues that in particular political institutions like central government continue to play a significant role in organising social life. Public authorities càn be identified as the gatekeepers to executive power and as the holders of significant resources and are significant actors in instigating new policy measures. Government has been deeply implicated in the expansion and growing significance of active citizenship.

Although these critiques are not always without reason, governmentality analysts would argue that, especially in those cases where power is not identifiably in the hands of one or two 'powerful' actors, but remains active in a dispersed, disguised form, the governmentality approach can provide a more subtle analysis that would still bring the relations of power to light which would go unremarked in classical critical analyses (Cruikshank, 1999).

Flint (2002) argues that in considering 'rationalities' and 'technologies' in pair, governmentality has overestimated efficacy of the regimes of authority, while in reality, governance is often characterised by contradictions, complexities and inconsistencies, a divergence between policy rhetoric, implementation and practices. The governmentality approach neglects struggles among identifiable groups over the production of these mentalities, over their validity and over the practices that emerge from them. As Larner and Walters (2000) argued, the concept of governmentality inadequately addresses the legitimacy of dominant ideologies and power structures, the resistance against them and the complex nature of agency and change. In a similar vein, Stenson and Watt (1999) call for a more place-sensitive approach, arguing that 'we need to go beyond general, abstract narratives of change, towards a focus on the unevenness and spatial variation in patterns of government in local, economic and social contexts' (Stenson and Watt, 1999, p. 189). Nonetheless, it can be argued that the idea of 'conduct of conduct', and the necessity to infuse a population with certain subjectivities of rule does allow for a more spatially diverse interpretation. As is proclaimed by Allen (2004), it is not at all certain that these ideas and meanings are accepted unproblematically in a widely dispersed and diverse population. The infusion of a population with a certain subjectivity entails the linking up of personal goals and ambitions to collective ones (Cruikshank, 1999), not the radical replacement of the former by the latter. Hence it can be inferred that in certain local settings, certain subjectivities will find a more fertile ground than in others, with a variety of policy schemes as a result (see Loopmans, 2004).

5. British regulation approaches and the governance of societal relations

5.1 The regulation approach to the study of neoliberal governance

The neo-Marxist regulationist approach provides a more structural perspective in the study of urban politics. The regulation approach originated in France in the wake of the 1970's economic crisis. A group of Marxist economists including Michel Aglietta, Robert Boyer and Alain Lipietz sought to move beyond classical as well as too narrowly economist Marxist interpretations of capitalism. They developed a theory of capitalist regulation, enriching economic theory with an analysis of the social and institutional conditions that help to secure the reproduction of capital and maintain social stability. (Boyer, 1990; Boyer & Sail-

lard, 2002). These conditions are decribed by the concept of 'regulation'. Regulationists seek a middle way between structure-oriented determinism and actor-oriented voluntarism. The regulation of the inherent contradictions of capitalism does not occur automatically (as is supposed in more structure-oriented approaches), nor does it occur by conscious and deliberate design (Painter, 1995). According to regulationist theorists, a regime of accumulation (describing the macro-economic relationship between investment, production and consumption) is always accompanied by a mode of regulation (specifying the political and sociocultural institutions and practices which secure that relationship). This mode of regulation ensures the unity, regularization and normalisation of the accumulation process. It consists of social and political institutions, cultural norms, moral codes that develop independently, but in mutual interaction with the regime of accumulation.

Regulation theory has found widespread recognition as a way out of the paralysing debate between structuralist and voluntarist approaches. Through the translation of the original French works on regulation, regulation approach has found international recognition and several 'Post-parisian' interpretations of regulation theory have developed worldwide (Jessop, 1990). The Parisian school retained a strongly economy-centred approach – despite their aim to 'embed' the economy in society and politics – but other schools outside France have developed a different focus (Macleod, 1997).

For our purpose, the approach that is most interesting is the British one, driven forward by the persistent theorizing of Bob Jessop on the capitalist state[1]. Jessop's interest for the State signified an important step forward in the regulation approach; theorising the state and state form was a 'missing link' in the early French regulation school (Tickel and Peck, 1992).

But Jessop's approach also entailed distancing oneself from the original approach by French regulationist economists, characterized by an attempt to broadenthe scope of traditional economic research to the societal embeddedness of the economy. Jessop and others draw both on regulation theory and recent institutionalist work on governance in discussing changes in societal regulation, while caring less for an analysis of macro-economic relations of accumulation. As social scientists from a variety of orientations beyond economic studies, they have turned to regulation approach mainly for the innovative tools it provides for social and political inquiry, thereby broadening the original research concern with economic crisis and the labour process to encompass new objects of inquiry such as social politics and the welfare state. Jessop (1997) speaks of *governance* 'in the broad sense', referring to any form of coordination of interdependent social relations. He defines three basic types of coordination, being the anarchy of exchange, the hierarchy of command and the heterarchy of self-organisation. Governance in the narrow sense as used in many institutionalist analyses (see for instance Rhodes, 1997) refers to the last, specific type of coordination which is typified by horizontal networked collaboration.

Jessop has sought to identify changes in the form and functions of state governance (in the broad sense) which would contribute to the regulation of an emergent 'post-Fordist' accumulation regime. He asserts that a new state form is developing that is to replace the 'Keynesian Welfare National State' of Atlantic Fordism. Jessop (1993; 1999) defines four criteria that can differentiate such forms of state governance.

First, there is the state's role in securing conditions for profitable private businesses: the broad field of economic policy. Second, there is the approach to the broad field of social policy, responsible for reproducing labour power. The third criterium refers to the main scale on which these economic and social policies are decided, the fourth refers to the relative weight of the mechanisms deployed in these policies, to the balance between states (hierarchy),

markets (anarchy) and civil society (heterarchy) in governance.

The KWNS is defined by its Keynesian tactics in promoting the conditions for capital profitability, its distinctive welfare orientation in its social policy role and in its national scale state-centered deployment of social and economic regulation. While Jessop asserts that there has never been a pure form of KWNS, he does identify a general shift from this model towards a new one, defined as the Schumpeterian Workfare Postnationalist Regime (SWPR). Schumpeterian economic management has replaced Keynesian aims and modes of interventions, promoting permanent innovation and flexibility and strengthening structural and systemic competitiveness. Social policy has shifted from Welfare to Workfare, prioritizing business needs over individual needs. The national scale has also lost primacy and sub- as well as supranational scales are now given greater responsibilities in both economic and social policies. Finally, the mode of delivery of social and economic coordination has changed from a hierarchic statist model to one where non-state mechanisms are increasingly important, working together in a more 'heterarchical' way, signifying a shift from government to governance.

5.2 Regulation theory and community involvement

Regulation theory, with its emphasis on trying to pin-point and explain the development of a new stabilizing couple of a (macro-economic) 'regime of accumulation' and (socio-political) 'regulation mode', has not payed much attention to issues as seemingly far-off from economic concerns as community involvement (unlike urban development policies, who have from the outset been central to many of their analyses). Yet interest for it has been stirred by the strong relationship between community involvement and the move from state government to governance beyond the state. Overall, this interconnection is presented to develop from two separate considerations. One is the analysis that in new forms of local governance communities are increasingly seen as 'resourceful' partners for specific tasks, especially in the field of social reproduction of labour power; the other stresses the problem of legitimation and new forms of political regulation of contestation and conflict in cities.

Painter and Goodwin (2000) derive from Jessop's general description of the SWPR the roles that might be fulfilled by local institutions. Under Fordism, the provision of social welfare was functional for economic growth and development, and also brought a degree of social cohesion and stability. In this regulatory process, local governance played a central role in many western european countries, as a provider and manager of key elements of the social wage, as the key site where consensual social-democratic politics could be constructed and experienced and through infrastructural provision and planning of local economic development. Local state played a key role in the wage relation, enterprise system and welfare state arrangements.

Post-Fordism however is marked by increasing global interplace economic competition, a subordination of social policy (no longer necessary to economic development) to supply-side requirements and new forms of coordination between public and private sectors would be required both to maintain the subordination of social need to economic competitiveness politically and to ensure that supply-side provision was tailored to the needs of the private sector. Welfare policy becomes decoupled from economic development and increasingly a mechanism for mitigating the social consequences of the search for competitive advantage. As it is no longer central to the mode of growth, welfare need no longer be provided or underwritten by the State, and new forms of coordination (again 'governance') can be introduced here too. This may also allow the costs of provision to be limited, especially where family members, voluntary agencies or 'the community' are the main providers. In other words, the local governance contribution

to the stabilization of a new, succesful mode of regulation becomes vital most explicitly in the regulation of the tensions arising from uneven development that potentially would undermine the emergence of the new Mode of Regulation.

'Governance' in the narrow sense, or the expansion of the sphere of local political action to involve a range of private and semi-public actors becomes the carrier of local community involvement: communities might be resourceful policymakers in some fields. Mayer (2003) argues that the concept of social capital is playing a powerful and effective role in framing these reconfigurations in local state-society relations, impacting especially on the trajectory of third or voluntary sector development. For her as well, participation or community involvement is a (partially ideological) resource for policy making; more specifically, employing the concept of 'social capital' entails the promise of self-organisation and self-reliance of deprived 'communities'. Participation in this sense is a way to manage the social costs of neoliberalism (to extend neoliberal control to neighbourhoods where the classical partners have little or no 'feet on the ground') and to impress market rationality in the minds of those living in areas hard to reach by other agents of global capital (Mayer and Rankin, 2002). 'Community' is promoted as a flanking, compensatory mechanism for the inadequacies of the market mechanism as experienced under the 'hard' neoliberalism of Thatcher and Reagan.

For Jessop (2002), 'neocommunautarianism' is 'one possible route' of adaptation towards the Schumpeterian workfare regime. He argues that neoliberalism has never been applicated in its full sense, but that neoliberal policy adaptations have taken place alongside other measures. All in all, policy adaptations can be classified among four different 'ideal typical strategies': neoliberalism, neocorporatism, neostatism and neocommunautarianism. Of this foursome, neocommunautarianism emphasizes the involvement of third sector and social economy agents (next to market and state) in economic development and social cohesion policies, as well as the role of grassroots economic and social mobilisation in developing and implementing economic strategies. It also involves empowering citizens and community groups in (community) economic development, promoting self-sufficiency in linking marginal economies to the wider economy and the opening up of partnerships between state and business interest to the community. It focuses on the local community empowerment of less competitive economic spaces (such as inner cities, deindustrialising cities or cities at the bottom of the urban hierarchy) with the greatest risk of losing from the zero-sum competition for external resources (Jessop, 2002, p. 463).

With his fourfold typology, Jessop stresses the relevance of synchronic, but spatially differentiated modes of regulation that can underpin actual existing neoliberalisation. Peck and Tickel (2002) on the other hand, writing from a singular Anglo-saxon perspective, situate the interest for community involvement (among other govermental techniques in social policies) in an evolutionary perspective; After a period of roll-back neoliberalism in the 1980's (epitomised most explicitly in the Thatcher/Reagan attack on the 'anti-competitive' institutes of the welfare state), we have now, since the beginning of the 1990's entered into a period of 'roll-out neoliberalism' where new state functions and institutional forms are being developed that can regulate/flank neoliberal development. At that time, the 'shallow neoliberalisms' of the Reagan/Thatcher era reached their institutional and political limits as the perverse economic consequences and social externalities became evident. While Peck and Tickel in earlier writings (1994, 1995) believed that a neoliberalism of this short was essentially unsustainable, they now have to admit that they underestimated the adaptive capacity of the project. As a reaction to the manifest contradictions, the neoliberal project gradually metamorphosized into more socially interventionist and ameliorative forms, such as in the Third Way projects of western post-welfare states. Since the 1990s,

> a deeply interventionist agenda is emerging around 'social' issues like crime, immigration, policing, welfare reform, urban order and surveillance, and community regeneration. In these latter areas in particular, new technologies of government are being designed and rolled out, new discourses of 'reform' are being constructed (often around new policy objectives such as 'welfare dependency'), new institutions and modes of delivery are being fashioned, and new social subjectivities are being fostered' (Peck and Tickel, 2002).

There seems to be a second connection between the appearance of 'governance' on the urban scene and the growing interest for community involvement in urban policies, one that tries to circumvent counterdiscourses to neoliberalism by integrating them. Governance as it emerged under roll-back neoliberalism has posed the particular problem of democratic accountability (Elander and Blanc, 2001). The fact that the traditional mechanisms of accountability in representative democracy were never designed to cope with the multi-organisational, fragmented policy systems that emerged has unclear normative consequences (Rhodes, 1997: 21). While traditional government, at least in theory, contained a chain of accountability ultimately leading to some kind of elected body like a parliament or a municipal council, governance largely leaves the question of accountability wide open. A number of critical studies have put the question of democratic accountability on the governance agenda. Tickel and Peck (1996) stress that the transition from local 'government' to local governance 'combines an anti-democratic centralism with a strongly politicised form of privatism'. Keating (1991) claims that new governance techniques seek to close off debate and streamline procedures.

A renewed interest for community participation seems to have emerged at least partly in response to these criticisms. Brownill et al. (2000) show how in the UK, quangos have gained interest in public involvement and community participation to achieve legitimation and to promote a positive public image. Equally, national governments have become aware of this legitimation issue. In several countries, urban development strategies of central government involve the promotion of local citizen participation (Vranken e.a., 2003). Mayer warns for a too overtly benevolent interpretation of this development. She argues that 'what might appear as the fulfilment of earlier grassroots empowerment claims is actually part of a new mode of governance that has emerged in and for neglected and disadvantaged areas and communities'(Mayer, 2003, p. 125). Instead of increasing democratic accountability of the programs, it serves to shut up adversarial or protest movements initiated by such excluded groups; The call to mobilise and activate local self-organisation has involved local movement organisations, who, while gaining more voice and representation in the new structures of governance, they simultaneously find their input restricted to local capacity building and productivity competition. The design of the programs and governance networks –most of the time established prior to the 'participation moment'- within which they now function makes it their task to identify and mobilize resources within 'problem neighbourhoods', not to analyze or resist the structural causes of new forms of exclusion. Their *embeddedness* and *legitimacy* in local communities is what makes them valuable for other partners in the network.

5.3 Criticisms on a regulationary account of new policy development

Regulation theory, and structural analyses of urban governance in general, have been reproached by those reasoning from a more voluntarist stance for their inability to account fully for variations among nations and cities. Regulation theorists, instead of looking for spatial differences, concentrate on general shifts in the modes of regulation, such as the rise of neoliberalism (Di Gaetano and Strom, 2003).

Jessop (1990, p. 318) himself admits that regulation theory overemphasised structural

relations between the state and economic categories at the expense of understanding the ways in which these are mediated through the strategic conduct and routine activity of social forces, thus offering room for recriminations of functionality and structuralism. Stronger formulated even, it has been stated that developments within political and social spheres of regulation are merely 'read off' from changes in the economy (Jones, 1998; Jones and Ward, 2002), resulting in a stereotypical Fordist/postFordist template that ignores the mediating influence of (locally variable) agency (Friedmann, 2000). Jones (1998) attributes this weakness most explicitly to those writings concerned with the emergence of post-Fordist institutions (e.g. Stoker, 1989, 1990; Mayer, 1994, 1999 to some extent also Painter and Goodwin, 2000). In sum, the picture does not look much brighter than for the governmentality approach. But while it must indeed be acknowledged for most of the empirical regulationist work that international or interurban differences are not the main interest (much of the work has been done within the proper national context, and is rather bluntly extrapolated to the rest of the (western) world), at least theoretically, regulationists, especially the 'British school' do emphasize local path-dependent interaction of neoliberal programmes with historically developed institutional and social landscapes (MacLeod, 1997; Brenner and Theodore, 2002a). Brenner and Theodore (2002b) have started to emphasize the contextual embeddedness of neoliberalisation insofar as this has been produced within national, regional and local contexts defined by 'the legacies of inherited institutional frameworks, policy regimes, regulatory practices, and political struggles'. Jessop (1999) develops a rather subtle theorizing that identifies as diversifying factors *institutional legacies*, the balance of *political forces*, and the changing *economic and political conjunctures* in which different strategies are pursued. He stresses that subtypes of modes of governance (see above) are developed in national and regional contexts during more or less extended periods of conflict and experimentation.

Moreover, as above discussed contributions by Jessop (2002) and Peck and Tickel (2002) demonstrate, recent empirical studies inspired by regulation theory have been sensitive not only to local variation (see also Raco, 1998), but also to the essential evolutionary character of regulation (Jones, 1998).

However, the development of specific governmental technologies that constitute policy regimes such as community involvement has, from a regulationist perspective, so far been touched upon only from a very broad perspective (see Peck and Tickel, 2002; Jessop, 2002) and has never been a specific object of study.

6. Synthesis and conclusion

In this final paragraph, I will draw elements from both theories in order to develop a framework for a comparative analysis of the development of community involvement in urban policy. Both approaches lack such an explicit attempt to comparative analysis of this development in different countries. Both regulationist and governmentality accounts at least implicitly assume a policy convergence towards 'neoliberal' or 'advanced liberal' governance and, at least in practice, do not pay attention to international or interurban variability. Both governmentality and regulation approaches have remained too restricted first, to a very general analysis of emerging new policy 'regimes', and secondly, to analyses within the same –Anglo-Saxon- context to account for international variation.

Nonetheless, a comparative analytical framework can be constructed from the confrontation of both strands of theory. To begin with, regulation theory and the governmentality approach share some common grounds. First of all, both approaches originated in Paris in the 1970s (Michel Aglietta, one of the protagonists of the French regulation school, once admitted to have been inspired –among others- by Michel Foucault) and were subsequently exported and further developed in a

predominantly Anglo-Saxon context. They also share as one of their main topics of interest recent evolutions in governance -what governmentality authors have called 'Advanced liberalism', but what regulationist writers prefer to name 'Neoliberalism'. Both approaches seem to admit for a transition from one more or less 'stabilized' system of government (Fordism, social governance) to another one. Both also approach this transitions as a dialectic between strategies and structures, although with a different emphasis on either of them. While governmentality analysts focus more on specific strategies of government, regulation theorists focus more starkly on established structure in the form of a –national- institutional framework. Hence they have developed more or less complementary tools for analysis. Not unsurprisingly, recent years have witnessed attempts to integrate both approaches in practical applications (MacLeod et al., 2003; Uitermark, 2003a; Uitermark, 2004), but none with the explicit aim of a comparative analysis of policy development.

What can be distilled then, from a confrontation of both theoretical approaches to provide us with guidelines for empirical comparative analysis?

What I appreciate in both approaches' theoretical writings, is the attempt to overcome the discussion between voluntarist and functionalist/structuralist points of view. But despite theoretical warnings, in practical analyses, they both have difficulties in sustaining this position. I will claim that drawing elements of analysis from both approaches will enable us to avoid tipping over to either one side.

In their theoretical writings, regulationists provide us with an established framework for explaining spatially divergent outcomes of similar underlying global economic and social pressures, or what Brenner and Theodore (2002b) have called 'actual existing neoliberalism'. The emphasis lies on the inertia of overarching institutional structures that variantly shape the direction of change in different (national) settings. The notions of both path dependency and path shaping are crucial in this respect, and three important interrelating factors are mentioned to determine national state contextual factors for the development of new ways of policy making: different, historically built-up organisational features of social and economic regulation, different intergovernmental relationships within countries and variable 'path-shaping occasions' and actors engaged in the development of new policy complexes.

Regulation theorists however do not in any way make clear how the determinating structures of institutions and the activities of a variety of actors operating around specific topics within this institutional framework are mediated to bring about specific forms of social and political activity. In fact, they do not adequately explain the development of *specific* policy measures as such, let alone the contributions made by the governmental activities of specific actors but can only make sense of spatial variations of more encompassing 'modes of governance'. Nonetheless, I think that exactly the specific formulation and working of policy measures can signalise –to my opinion- significant differences in political approach that can qualify an often too generic description of a international shift to 'neoliberalism'.

Governmentality theorists on the contrary, do pay more attention to the localized development of specific policy measures. They analyse in more detail the specific combination of rationalities and technologies that develop in localized institutional settings (see Uitermark, 2004). Governmentality analysts provide the tools for a convincing, and very detailed description of the trial-and-error process of the emergence of specific policy measures such as community involvement in contemporary urban policies. It is crucial for a critical and detailed understanding of this phenomenon to see the development of community involvement as a specifique government technique which has its own rationale and creates its own objects of policy and subjectivities.

But the rationality-centered analysis of many governmentality studies has a serious flaw: new governement rationalities and techniques are, contrary to what governmentality

theorists claim to look for, 'too easily read of from the stage of "mentality". It also implicitly understands the development of new government rationalities as part of a linear development towards 'better/more effective conduct of conduct'. Hence the concept of ' advanced liberalism'in governmentality theory becomes too easily an explanation for, rather than a generic descriptor of the emergence of new government technologies, while the actual practices, actors and struggles of change are underexposed. Together with the fact that governmentality studies are still predominantly produced in a narrow anglo-saxon context, this leads to a erroneous prioritisation of time over space.

Nonetheless, an assesment of the problematic distribution of policies over space, and hence the spatial diversity of 'actual existing policy measures', can be drawn from theoretical writings. This diversity does not stem from (national state) institutional structures, but derives from the practices of government themselves. According to governmentality analyses, government entails the development of specific subjectivities that are to be infused in the population, but these subjectivities do not fall in fertile ground per se; they have to be can run counter with localized counter-ideas and conceptions, with local culture. The dissection of such localized policy practices themselves, allows for greater methodological sensitivity for local possibilities of contestation or resistance to policy measures (and their consequential spatial diversity) than does the institutional approach of regulation theory.

This paper has been written in order to establish an analytical framework for the comparative analysis of the development of community involvement in the context of urban policy. While the concrete studies of Foucaultian and regulationist writers alike do provide a first insight into the question, methodologically rigid comparative analysis is lacking. Hence both theories are used to provide complementary elements to construct a framework that can guide the future analysis of this problem by the author. Regulationist writings unravel the elements of the (national) institutional context that shapes policy regimes; the policy complex is interactively shaped in a locally specific, *path-dependent* process. In the context of a national-level discourse around community involvement in local urban policies, the historical development and institutionalisation of urban policies will be important, but also the historically built-up relationship between local and national policies. This forms the historical place-specific background for the development of new policy complexes.

Governmentality theory approaches the question of specific policy measures from a more local angle and has provided us with the tools for analysing specific policy techniques and the way they interact with and are framed by (localized) subjects through the production of subjectivities.

Policy measures can be described as a three-fold complex of *rationalities*, *technologies* and *subjectifications*. Specific rationalities of government (the delineation of policy problems, potential solutions and policy objects) are developed locally and will shape the development of governmental technologies and the way new subjectivities are introduced and infused into the governed population, whereas subjectivities are always formed in interaction with the subject involved. Finally, the development of a new policy complex is *contingent*, and does not derive as a necessity from external factors. Rather, it relies upon emerging occasions for new policies and actors that develop it or contest it. Rationalities, technologies, and subjectivities can find a fertile ground, or they cannot, in the minds of the people to be governed, or in the minds of governors. Hence it becomes essential to analyse who does support the development of these rationalities at what occasion, or who does not and on what grounds.

Acknowledgements

The research undertaken for this paper has been made possible by a 4 month RTN fellowship grant from the University of Urbino, Italy. I would like to thank Yuri Kazepov for making this possible, and Justus Uitermark and Christian Kesteloot for providing valuable comments on an earlier version of this working paper.

Endnotes

1. See for instance Jessop 1995, 1997, 1999; MacLeod 1997; Peck & Tickel 1994; Moulaert and Swyngedouw 1989; compare Le Galès 1998 and Uitermark 2002a and 2002b as two scholars that are critical of regulation theory in itself, but remain to a large extent inspired by Jessop's regulation approach to State theory.

References

Allen, J. and Cars, G. (2000) *The tangled web: neighbourhood governance in a post-fordist era.* Paper for the European network for housing research (ENHR 2000) housing in the 21th century: fragmentation and reorientation, the institute for housing research. Uppsala University, Gävle.

Allen, J. (2003) *Lost geographies of power*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Allen, J. (2004) The whereabouts of power: politics, government and space. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86 B (1): 19-32.

Boyer, R. and Saillard, Y. (eds.) (2002) *Regulation Theory: the state of the art*. Routledge, New York.

Boyer, R. (1990) *The Regulation School: a critical introduction*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002a) Preface : from the 'new localism' to the spaces of neoliberalism. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 341-347.

Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002b) Cities and the geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism". *Antipode*, 34 (3): 349-79.

Brownill, S., Razzaque, K., Stirling, T. and Thomas, H. (2000) Patterns of inclusion and exclusion: ethnic minorities and urban development corporations. In: Stoker, G. (ed.) *The new politics of British local governance*. Macmillan, London.

Colenutt, R. and Cutten, A. (1994) Community empowerment in vogue or in vain? *Local economy*, 9: 236-250.

Cruikshank, B. (1996) Revolutions within: self-government and self-esteem. In: Barry, A., Osborne, T. and Rose, N. (eds.) *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism, and rationalities of government*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Cruikshank, B. (1999) *The Will to Empower*. Cornell University Press, New York.
Curtis, B. (1995) Taking the state back out: Rose and Miller on political power. *British Journal of Sociology*, 46: 575-597.

Curtis, B. (2002) Foucault on governmentality and population: the impossible discovery. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, x: 505-533.

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: power and rule in modern society*. Sage, London.

DiGaetano, A. and Strom, E. (2003) Comparative urban governance: an inegrated approach. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38 (3): 356-395.

Foucault, M. (1991) Governmentality. In: Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hampstead.

Friedmann, A. (2000) Microregulation and Post-Fordism: critique and development of regulation theory. *New Political Economy*, 5 (1): 59-76.

Gough, J. (2002) Neoliberalism and socialisation in the contemporary city: opposites, complements and instabilities. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 405-26.

Jessop, B. (1990) Regulation theories in retrospect and prospect. *Economy and Society*, 19 (2): 153-213.

Jessop, B. (1993) Towards a Schumpeterian workfare state? Preliminary remarks on Post-Fordist political economy. *Studies in Political Economy*, 40: 7-39.

Jessop, B. (1995) The regulation approach, governance and post-Fordism: Alternative per-

spectives on economic and political change? *Economy and Society*, 24: 307-333.

Jessop, B. (1997) Twenty years of the (Parisian) regulation approach: the paradox of succes and failure at home and abroad. *New Political Economy*, 2 (3): 503-527.

Jessop, B. (1999) The changing government of Welfare: Recent trends in its primary functions, scale and modes of coordination. *Social Policy & Administration*, 33 (4): 348-359.

Jessop, B. (2002) Liberalism, Neoliberalism and urban governance: a state-theoretical perspective. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 452-472.

Jones M. (1998) Restructuring the local state: economic governance or social regulation? *Political Geography*, 17 (8): 959-988.

Jones, M. and Ward, K. (2002) Excavating the logic of British Urban Policy: Neoliberalism as the 'Crisis of Crisis-Management'. *Antipode*, x (x): 473-494.

Judge, D., Stoker, G. and Wolman, H. (eds.) (1995) *Theories of Urban Politics*. Sage, London.

Larner, W. and Walters, W. (2000) Privatisation, governance and identity: the United Kingdom and New Zealand compared. *Policy and Politics*, 28 (3): 361-377.

Latour, B. (1987) *Science in Action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge (MA).

Lemke, T. (2001) 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society*, 30 (2): 190-207.

Loopmans M. (2003) 'Opsinjoren' in Antwerpen: een geavanceerde vorm van governance. *AGORA*, 19 (5): 17-20.

Loopmans M. (2004) *The strange appearance of the neighbourhood inhabitant, a governmentality perspective on 'Opsinjoren'*. Paper for the conference 'Professionals between people and policy', Amsterdam/Utrecht, 7-8 october.

MacLeod, G. (1997) Globalizing Parisian thought-waves: recent advances in the study of social regulation, politics, discourse and space. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21 (4): 530-553.

MacLeod, G., Raco, M. and Ward, K. (2003) Negociating the contemporary city: Introduction. *Urban Studies*, 40 (9): 1665-1671.

Marinetto M. (2003) Who wants to be an active citizen? The politics and practice of community involvement. *Sociology*, 37 (1): 103-120.

Mayer, M. and Rankin, K. (2002) Social Capital and (Community) Development: A North/south perspective. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 10-23.

Mayer, M. (1994) Post-fordist city politics. In: Amin, A. (ed.) *Post-Fordism: a reader*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Mayer, M. (2003) The onward sweep of social capital: causes and consequences for understanding cities, communities and urban movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27 (1): 110-132.

McGhee, D. (2003) Joined-up government, 'community safety' and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender 'active citizens'. *Critical Social Policy*, 23 (3): 345-374.

Moulaert, F. and Swyngedouw, E. (1989) A regulation approach to the geography of flexible production systems. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 7: 327-345.

O'Malley, P. and Palmer, D. (1996) Post-Keynesian policing. *Economy and Society*, 25 (2): 137-155.

O'Malley, P., Weir, L. and Shearing, C. (1997) Governmentality, criticism, politics. *Economy and Society*, 26 (4): 501-517.

Osborne, T. and Rose, N. (1999) Governing cities: notes on the spatialisation of virtue. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17: 737-760.

Painter, J. and Goodwin, M. (2000) Local governance after Fordism: a regulationist perspective. In: Stoker, G. (ed.) The new politics of British local governance. Macmillan: London.

Painter, J. (1995) Regulation Theory, Post-Fordism and Urban Politics. In: Judge, D., Stoker, G. and Wolman, H. (eds.) *Theories of Urban Politics*. Sage, London.

Peck, J. and Tickel, A. (1994a) Searching for a new institutional fix: the after-Fordist crisis and global-local disorder. In: Amin, A. (ed.) *Post-Fordism: a reader*. Blackwell, Oxford: 280-315.

Peck, J. and Tickel, A. (1994b) Jungle law breaks out: neoliberalism and global-local disorder. *Area*, 26: 317-326.

Peck, J. and Tickel, A. (1995a) The social regulation of uneven development: 'regulatory deficit', England's South East and the collapse of Thatcherism. *Environment and Planning A*, 27: 15-40.

Peck, J. and Tickel, A. (1995b) Business goes local: Dissecting the business agenda in Manchester. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 19: 55-78.

Peck, J. and Tickel, A. (2002) Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, 34 (3): 380-404.

Raco, M. (2000) Assessing community participation in local economic development – lessons for the new urban policy. *Political geography*, 19: 573-600.

Rhodes, R. (1997) Understanding Governance. Open University Press: Buckingham.

Rose, N. and Miller, P. (1992) Power beyond the state: problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43 (2): 173-205.

Rose, N. (1991) Governing by numbers: figuring out democracy. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 16 (7): 673-693.

Rose, N. (1996) The death of the social? Refiguring the territory of government. *Economy and Society*, 25 (3): 327-356.

Rose, N. (1999a) Inventiveness in politics. *Economy and Society*, 28 (3): 467-493.

Rose, N. (1999b) *Powers of freedom: reframing political thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stenson, K. and Watt, P. (1999) Governmentality and 'the death of the social'? A discourse analysis of local government texts in South-east England. *Urban Studies*, 36 (1): 189-201.

Stenson, K. (1998) Beyond histories of the present. *Economy and Society*, 27 (4): 333-352.

Stoker, G. (1989) Creating a local government for a post-Fordist society. In Stewart, J. and Stoker, G. (eds.) *The future of local government*. Macmillan, Basingstoke: 141-170.

Stoker, G. (1990) Regulation theory, local government and transition from Fordism. In: King, D. and Pierre, J. (eds.) *Challenges to local government*. Sage, London.

Tickel, A. and Peck, J. (1992) Accumulation, regulation, and the geographies of post-Fordism: missing links in regulationist research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 16: 190-218.

Tickel, A. and Peck, J. (1996) The return of the Manchester men: men's words and men's deeds in the remaking of the local state. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 21 (4): 595-626.

Uitermark, J. (2002a) Re-scaling, 'scale fragmentation' and the regulation of antagonistic relationships. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26: 743-765.

Uitermark, J. (2002b) Spatial policy in the United Kingdom: Regulatory experimentation in the after-Fordist era. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 17: 385-407.

Uitermark, J. (2003a) De sociale controle van achterstandswijken: een beleidsgenetisch perspectief. *Nederlandse Geografische Studies*, 322. Utrecht/Amsterdam: Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap.

Uitermark, J. (2003b) Social mixing and the management of disadvantaged neighbourhoods: the Dutch policy of urban restructuring revisited. *Urban Studies*, 40 (3): 531-549.

Uitermark, J. (2004) The genesis and evolution of urban policy: a confrontation of regulationist and governmentality approaches. *Political Geography* (forthcoming).