

A black and white photograph showing a dead animal, possibly a dog or cat, lying on a pile of rubble and debris in the foreground. In the background, there is a large, multi-story apartment building with many windows. A large, dark, irregular shape, resembling a torn piece of paper or a shadow, is overlaid on the right side of the image, containing the text.

# Community Challenge

A conference report



# **Community Challenge**

Report of a conference held at  
Liverpool University 16th-19th September 1981  
organised and sponsored by *The Guardian* and  
the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation

Published by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation  
UK Branch, London, 1983.

**Further copies of this report  
are available from the  
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation**

**© 1983 Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation  
98 Portland Place  
London W1N 4ET  
Telephone 01-636 5313/7**

**ISBN 0 903319 35 7**

**Produced by PPR Printing London W1**

# Photographs

Cover photo and caption by SHANKHILL PHOTOGRAPHY WORKSHOP: *'Belfast has probably got the worst bloody housing in Europe, these 'weetabix' flats were built as a noise barrier to the proposed motorway. The motorway has become a dual carriageway and the flats have been demolished (Lovely ain't it).'*

Inside front cover—top—photo by ART IN ACTION: 'Dodge City' Estate, Bootle.

Inside front cover—bottom—photo by EASTERHOUSE FESTIVAL SOCIETY in Glasgow.

Inside back cover—top—photo and caption by SHANKHILL PHOTOGRAPHY WORKSHOP: *'During the re-development programme in the Shankhill area, play facilities for kids were very limited, so jumping off district heating towers became a form of diversion. The wee lad in the picture died later on trying the same stunt.'*

Inside back cover—bottom—photo by ART IN ACTION: 'Dodge City' Estate, Bootle.

Back cover photo by EASTERHOUSE FESTIVAL SOCIETY in Glasgow.

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>History, planning and objectives</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>An overview</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Summaries of discussion groups:</b>	
<b>a Employment</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>b Education</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>c Health</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Summary of area group discussions</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Summary of concluding plenary session</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Three additional papers: a submission by the Black Caucus, a statement of disassociation and a reply</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Conference organisation</b>	<b>59</b>

**The following people were invited to contribute to the  
preparation of this report:**

<b>Peter Beresford</b>	<b>Nigel Lee</b>
<b>Richard Bourne</b>	<b>Nigel Mellor</b>
<b>Peter Brinson</b>	<b>Rab Murray</b>
<b>Sebastian Charles</b>	<b>Jane Overton</b>
<b>Charles Clarke</b>	<b>Jill Sharratt</b>
<b>Malcolm Dean</b>	<b>Sonia Ward</b>
<b>Monica Elliot</b>	<b>Jon Webber</b>
<b>Hugh Frazer</b>	

## Introduction

So what came out of the Community Challenge conference in Liverpool in September 1981? All those words, the photographs and pictures round the rooms, the confrontations, meetings, talks in the bars, preparatory work and aftermath? The essential message was simple—that community initiatives have far more to contribute to the renaissance of decaying inner cities than official policy recognises, but that central and local government must do more to help community groups help themselves. What is needed is a strategy, and a plan for immediate action.

The main purpose of the Liverpool conference therefore was to re-assess what was happening in the inner cities. Four years had passed since the Save Our Cities conference in Bristol—the conference at which Peter Shore first outlined his partnership policy. Yet on many fronts the urban crisis had become even more urgent. Unemployment was much higher. Rehabilitation was much lower and set to drop even more sharply with the switch of government subsidies from the cities to the shires. Community projects, however, had mushroomed. One aim of the Gulbenkian Foundation and *The Guardian* was to identify successful local strategies in the hope of promoting them elsewhere. This was why so much emphasis at this conference was placed on bringing together community and voluntary workers who had initiated successful local experiments so that they would learn from each other. The focus this time was at the local rather than national level. The emphasis was on the practical rather than the theoretical.

We hoped the conference discussions could provide guidelines for different groups in different places. That was how things turned out. To review the progress of community groups over the past few years was to discover how far they can get when their confidence and support has grown. From various beginnings—as tenants' groups concerned with one estate, or a neighbourhood suddenly threatened by a plant closure—they can branch into planning their own renovation projects, starting their own employment programmes, and nurturing alternative arts. What is more, they can employ community workers and other professionals on their terms, and force local authorities to respect their views.

But in spite of the progress made we have also seen how fragile and vulnerable many community initiatives are. They have always had to fight against the decay and demoralisation of the inner city and the handicaps of few qualified personnel and frequent government policy switches. The recession and cuts to local services have made it even harder for community groups to succeed in their aims. For the last two years they have been desperately trying to hang on to whatever they can, as real resources in the inner city have floated away like an ebb tide.

This conference, then, was decided upon in 1979 because the organisers were concerned about the increasing desperation of those living and working in deprived communities. They believed community-based initiatives could ease inner city problems. They wanted to give the exponents of community action a chance to exchange experiences and ideas about worthwhile practices and policies. What the conference organisers could not foresee was that the date they had booked so far in advance—September 1981—would turn out to be scarcely two months after inner city rioting of a kind no-one alive had seen before in Britain, and that the venue they had chosen—Liverpool—would prove to be the worst afflicted. The conference was caught up in the backwash of Toxteth. As a consequence, a practitioners' conference, which no-one had even planned to report, suddenly became the natural place for the dramatic expression of minority feeling, notably about race and racism by the Black Caucus and the Liverpool 8 Committee, and a conference report was demanded as one means of reflecting it. These two elements in the conference—one intended, one unintended, sometimes consonant, sometimes oblique to each other—come through the report, as does the turmoil of the times. The differing preoccupations of those responsible subsequently confounded the attempt to put a report together in a form which finally approached (without entirely achieving) the status of an accepted, agreed version.

The initial decision not to publish a report had been taken because the sponsors had not intended a conference addressing national issues, but rather a workshop and exchange. The focus was to be on a few geographical areas, each of which would be able to express its particular local needs and responses.

A cross-section of people concerned with work in the community



from each area was invited. (The organisation of the conference is described in the report.) The aim was—realistically—a limited one: to ensure local community groups become more aware of their potential so that the power, influence and resources at local level would be increased. It was not expected therefore that there would be a final session at which the conference would attempt to put forward a collective view on any matter, though there was no unwillingness for that to happen if it was desired. In fact, it did happen. As no final report was planned, no arrangements were made to have notes taken, or to tape the proceedings, nor was there, of course, any allocation in the budget for writing, editing or publishing such a report or for meetings of any editing group. However, Peter Brinson readily agreed to support a proposal to the Foundation for the production of a conference report when it arose from the conference floor and accepted the idea of an editorial group.

Given that there were nearly 300 participants, with widely different geographical backgrounds, ideologies and experiences, no report can do more than attempt to reflect some of the main themes and arguments, and to offer a flavour of the proceedings. Nevertheless it is our feeling that the result reflects a valid view of the conference, its strengths and weaknesses, its difficulties, and its mixture of pessimism and optimism. The optimism was particularly significant. The Hackney Tenants' presentation and the community actions of many kinds portrayed around the conference room in photographs and prints, provided only a few examples from many kinds of evidence that things can be changed at local level. Not all change has to start at the top. It is crucial that all possible help should be given to local community organisations—particularly to strengthen local links between voluntary bodies and the voluntary and statutory sectors. If this can be done, the conference demonstrated how much there is that people can do, and are doing, at grassroots level.

So much for our general approach. Now for practical policies. Here 'community' is the key. Strengthen the community movement, the community spirit, community organisation and the will and ability of people to help themselves, then new hope and a new life could develop in our inner cities. This is why we called the conference 'Community Challenge'. The first element in a strategy to this end in sustaining and strengthening community groups must be financial.

The need is for a secure source of funds, access to which should be based on the viability of the project, the benefit to the public and on the representativeness of the group making the application. Those to whom they apply should not only have the budget and the will to make grants and loans to community groups, they should also develop an expertise in dealing with community groups. The funds concerned should be both central and local, general and specific, public and private. For example, central government should increase its urban programme and partnership budget and, in re-organising local government finance, it could examine ways of how particular levies (like a sales tax or local income tax) could be allocated to community services not provided by the local authority itself.

Some monies should be available for specific purposes, like housing or employment. Here, for instance, there might be scope for private as well as public funds. Local enterprise boards or community banks could be a means for recycling pension funds into employment-creating investments in the inner city. Building societies could, by agreement with local authorities, make resources available to tenants' groups to refurbish their estates. In terms of public money, however, it is important that the greater part is made available via local government which is nearer to the community groups. It is difficult to imagine an effective financial strategy for local communities which starts by removing the resources and discretionary power of the local authorities which are closest to them.

The second element in a strategy for sustaining community groups should be human—concerned with advice, educational entitlement, and supporting the strongest possible local participation. There is room for argument as to whether more community workers or more advice centres are likely to be most effective in a particular area, but the fact has to be faced that community initiatives do not spring into existence spontaneously in a grievously depressed neighbourhood. Nor, even if local citizens are aware of a need, is there always the staying power to win through.

It was apparent from the discussions at Liverpool that most local authorities tend to see their community groups in separate compartments: tenants' and amenity bodies are looked after by housing and planning; many of the voluntary service groups have a good

relationship with social services; while the education department on the whole is more insulated. But if community initiative is to be a major element in regenerating the inner city, local authorities should review their response as a whole, should make all their departments community-minded, should recognise their duty to bring into being and underpin the growth of representative community organisations.

This is especially important for ethnic communities, for women, and all those marginal groups whose wants now lie at the bottom of the inner city heap. Partly because of the urban riots and partly because of powerful presentation by the Liverpool 8 Defence Committee, the Community Challenge conference became especially concerned that justice should be done for black Britons. A whole range of steps from employing more blacks in local government to altering methods of policing were suggested. Essentially the need is for proper consultation, representation and control. Why not apply the resource centre idea to black needs? The staff should be the best that can be obtained, but the controlling management board should be black. The involvement of the black community would be a condition of local authority finance. Black participation should be monitored and weekend schools and other courses established to provide management training. Above all, everyone concerned with race relations should keep in the front of their thinking the needs and situation of young black people. For black groups, then, as for others which still need to be helped into existence, local authority recognition and encouragement is an essential preliminary to the removal of grievances. In negotiating with its local groups, and modifying its practices accordingly, a local authority itself becomes more representative.

Against this background we welcomed the forcefulness of the black contribution. This corrected to some extent a failure to include the black community adequately in conference planning—an object lesson in an essential element, at all levels of action, if black people are to feel fully involved. But we do not agree with the Black Caucus that the failure to consult meant that ‘the whole purpose of the conference’ was defeated. The report indicates its many positive features. Among outcomes was a pledge, since fulfilled, by the Gulbenkian Foundation to consult with other foundations to see how funding might be more effectively directed towards issues of racial

justice and equality of opportunity. Of course, much has already been given and much done, but there is need of more, in the context of a coherent strategy to alleviate the effects of racial discrimination and to combat racism in British society. Such a strategy was missing in Community Challenge and we regret it as much as did the Black Caucus.

Support can be non-financial as well as financial. A support strategy which includes non-financial measures is valuable because much of what community groups do is about self-development and local democracy. Planning, thinking, discussing and getting together can be as liberating as the final achievement of a new project. A characteristic of many community groups is their attitude to finance. They do not start, in general, from a position of demanding finance before action; they start by asking 'what do we need in our community?' If they can provide it themselves, they do. But a lot of what needs doing needs the commitment which can come only from paid workers and access to other sources. The groups normally ask for finance when, and only when, it becomes obvious finance is necessary to solve their problems. Even then most groups underestimate what they need.

The third element for reviving our inner city communities lies in looking at all those services which already have, or could have a stronger, community flavour, and seeing what more needs to be done: community health councils, community schools, community policing, community arts and community care. In many of these fields the community element is still only an aspiration or low budget experiment at the margin. Although the label may look fashionable, it is not always clear how much accountability, control or activity is permitted to the community which opens the wrapping. In other cases the problem is that 'the community' remains an abstraction, so that specific individuals and organisations benefit from services intended for all. A few examples will illustrate this point.

Although the community health councils have a statutory basis within the National Health Service, the Liverpool conference felt they were under-budgeted and peripheral to raising general health levels in the inner city. In order to achieve such an objective it is necessary to open up the NHS bureaucracy and family practitioner committees to

community opinion, to persuade the medical establishment to do more about structural and social problems, and to switch money into preventive initiatives such as 'well woman clinics'.

In education there will never be a real growth in community schools and open colleges until financial aid is skewed in favour of schools and colleges which can demonstrate a community use. In policing, the community police councils proposed by Chief Constable John Alderson in his evidence to the Scarman inquiry—which was distributed as a background paper for Community Challenge—would be one way of increasing community influence. But to succeed, these bodies must have the support of the police. Too many community police initiatives were, as Wally Brown of the Merseyside Community Relations Council pointed out at Liverpool, lightly destroyed by hard 'law and order' policing in the summer of 1981. Police powers need to be reconsidered so that the police service becomes more accountable to the communities they serve. New conciliation and complaints procedures are also needed.

Community arts provide one of the best means of restoring the sense of imagination, esteem, fun and personal achievement to the inner city. They can also challenge conventional ideas and foster new approaches to old problems: for example, the status of women. The Gulbenkian Foundation has done what it can to help such arts groups. But the enormous fuss aroused when the Greater London Council sought to steer substantial funds away from London's established national arts companies, and into a programme for underwriting more local, community-based work, shows that public opinion is not yet convinced. But such redistribution has got to happen if any community arts activity is to belong to the mainstream rather than the fringe.

Community care of vulnerable people—mentally ill, physically disabled, the elderly and disadvantaged children—is now widely accepted. For both philosophic and financial reasons such vulnerable people should, where possible, be looked after in the community rather than in institutions.

So much for the outlines of a strategy which aims to build up community groups and initiatives in the inner city. The real results of

Community Challenge will only appear over time. Short and long term measures must include:

1. Setting up a risk fund for community projects in every city authority backed by a specific portion of the rate and central government grant. Ideally some new source of income for local government is also needed—preferably some form of local income tax. By ‘community projects’ we mean projects which fulfil a social need in the community and projects which find gaps in the market and thus provide jobs. In practice, the working of the market (or free enterprise) sector often makes it nearly impossible to relate social need to the need to create jobs. This difficulty is re-inforced by recent re-interpretation of the rules and operation of the Community Enterprise Programme (CEP) to limit the scheme in such a way that it is not allowed to develop businesses which might one day become viable, ie it must not compete with private enterprise. This limits seriously much of the scheme’s potential and will deter initiative. The definition of ‘community benefit’ as qualifying for support from the scheme now means only goods which would not otherwise be produced for a group in society who would not otherwise be able to buy such goods. This is economic nonsense if the MSC (Manpower Services Commission) is really aiming to create jobs to revive disadvantaged areas.
2. Community police councils should be established by statute as proposed in the Scarman Report. Police powers need to be reconsidered and new conciliation and complaints procedures introduced to make the police service more accountable to the community.
3. Central government should recognise and stimulate the initiative of community groups as a major force for the rehabilitation of inner city areas. It should give financial and other inducements to local authorities to support community and voluntary action. It should take account of this strategy when reviewing the structure and finance of local government. It should publicise successful practice, irrespective of ideological considerations.

*Immediate action* within this framework needs to include:

4. Local authorities, in collaboration with central government and private finance, should allocate considerable funds to finance employment-creating community enterprises in the inner city.
5. Each inner city should set up priority teams on the Newcastle model, which brings together councillors, council officials and representatives from community groups at ward level with a small budget for financing community projects at the neighbourhood level.
6. Education funds need to be steered towards institutions which can demonstrate a high degree of community use and response. Collaboration between the MSC and education authorities needs to be developed so that MSC funding can be available to community organisations for education and training purposes. These purposes should include general job possibilities, leisure and cultural activities—recognising that such activities can lead to permanent employment for those in danger of being permanently unemployed in a society where the work/non-work balance is shifting towards non-work. Leisure and related activities, even when they are unlikely to lead to paid employment, are as important as vocational training in educational planning for inner city life today. Consequently they deserve corresponding support from MSC and other sources.
7. Resource centres, staffed by skilled workers committed to sharing their experience and knowledge with community groups, should be set up by city authorities.
8. Local authorities should conduct a cross-departmental review of their relations with community groups to check on the regularity and effectiveness of their contacts with them, and to see whether there are any geographical or ethnic gaps which new community groups might fill. Such reviews should be implemented with the fullest possible participation of community groups themselves.
9. Within their policies for creating employment, local authorities should join private employers in a drive to reduce unemployment among blacks, young people, the disabled, women, and other disadvantaged groups in the inner city.
10. Social service departments should do more to stimulate the energies of community groups. Individual social workers should

be more ready to recognise that complaints of individuals often affect a high proportion of other people in the same street—or estate—and can often be more effectively resolved by community action.

11. Local authorities should call on community groups to express views and to list their priorities on the full range of local authority provision, and discuss how community groups might be involved in all spheres.
12. Community health councils should, in concert with community groups, social workers and other interested parties, draw up and publicise plans to improve health standards in inner city areas. There should be an emphasis on the need for preventative campaigns or other measures, for example, to reduce infant mortality or deaths from smoking-related diseases.

Peter Brinson  
Malcolm Dean



## History, planning and objectives

The structure, setting and style of the Community Challenge conference were based upon one central premise: that change and improvement in those areas most devastated by economic blight, particularly inner cities, require—inescapably—the commitment and mobilisation of the people who live there. New resources, changes in central/local government relations and different governmental policy approaches are also needed, but none of these will succeed unless they are part of an overall approach which seeks to set community collective endeavour at the centre of any strategy for social and economic improvement.

Thus the conference was organised on the basis of twin principles: that effective inner city renewal rests on self-help initiatives, and on changing the organisation of local government services to allow the community to exercise real influence and control over them.

The organisation of the Community Challenge conference was designed to follow the principles outlined above. This represented a clear change of emphasis from the previous conference in Bristol in 1977 organised by the Gulbenkian Foundation and *The Sunday Times* with the theme of 'Save Our Cities'. That conference sought to bring together major national decision-makers and journalists in order to draw attention to inner city policy which events demanded. It concentrated, very successfully, on central government strategy, and on stimulating debate in the media. Peter Shore MP, then Secretary of State, spoke at the conference outlining the government strategy which was later to be formalised in the White Paper of that year.

In early 1980 an Advisory Committee, appointed by the Gulbenkian Foundation to help it to determine its own policies, suggested that the time was ripe for another conference. This was to become the Community Challenge conference. A Planning Committee under the chairmanship of Sebastian Charles, Canon of Westminster, was set up and the Gulbenkian Foundation made funds available both to organise the conference—a half-time conference organiser was

appointed—and, decisively, to subsidise conference participation by a large number of individuals and organisations so that the event should not be unduly dominated by those who could afford to pay.

In early 1981 *The Guardian* newspaper agreed to join with the Gulbenkian Foundation in sponsoring the conference which was a major assistance in terms of publicity and improving the quality of the debate. A series of articles around the themes of the conference was published in *The Guardian* in the months prior to the conference; and directly beforehand three successive days had a full page article upon the issues with which the conference was dealing.

The two most difficult questions which the Planning Committee had to deal with were the conference agenda and participation. Both were designed to reflect the principles behind the conference as outlined above. Four subjects were chosen for detailed discussion: Health, Housing, Education and Employment. The subjects were selected because they were issues of priority concern in deprived localities and offered opportunities for intervention by a wide range of community organisations. Additionally, and crucially, consideration of each topic would take account of each racial dimension. After the summer riots it was agreed, at a late stage, to include a plenary session upon policing. A working party was established for each topic. After some six to eight months, four working papers were produced with recommendations for conference participation. These were widely distributed beforehand and received considerable attention from the press. A number of reprints were made in response to demand and they were generally well received as discussion papers. Some are being used by teachers in higher education.

The second main organisational question, that of participation, was more difficult and controversial. From the outset the Planning Committee ruled out two obvious options which normally determine conference attendance where limited places are available: rationing through finance (the Gulbenkian Foundation made available a very substantial number of bursaries) and rationing by 'first come first served'. It was felt—correctly as it proved—that those who responded first to conference publicity were not always the community organisations and local policy-makers for whom the conference was designed. Later, a separate event (which took place on 22 January 1982) was organised for academics and planners.

In line with the conference's twin aims it was decided to concentrate on certain local authority areas from which a range of people, from local councillors and chief officers to community activists, would be invited. Nine cities were chosen, from each of which nine or ten people would come. A further 60 people were invited from about 20 cities. Thus, between two-thirds and three-quarters of the conference came from these local areas, the balance coming from central government departments and other national organisations concerned with the policy areas in question. This balance reflected the difference in aims between this and the 1977 conference. Following discussion with groups in Liverpool, where the conference booking had been made as far back as autumn 1979, a much larger number of participants from that city was invited to participate, though only a minority on a residential basis. The special efforts to encourage participation from ethnic minority groups and from women, on the basis of positive discrimination, were not as successful as the Planning Committee had hoped.

Suggestions of names of individuals and organisations were sought through the working parties, through press publicity which stimulated a large number of enquiries, and through the organisations with which the Gulbenkian Foundation was acquainted. The invitation list was revised to ensure balanced participation, though of course very many people were disappointed. In the event, some 280 people attended, though not all were present for the entire conference. The Planning Committee had aimed at 'grassroots' representation from community organisations. However, many organisations sent their full-time staff so that the 'community worker' influence in the final event was greater than it should have been.

The value of the conference, which took place at halls of residence of Liverpool University, was greatly enhanced by the displays of photographs by community photography organisations throughout the country (co-ordinated by Bootle Arts in Action) which expressed the actual experience of inner city life coherently and profoundly.

It is not the function of this description of the origins and organisation of the Community Challenge conference to attempt to weigh its successes and failures. But it may be useful to indicate

possible lines of development of the initiative which the conference represented. It has served to heighten debate at local level about ideas of community involvement which were considered at the conference. This requires a new willingness by community organisations and by local government—both councillors and staff members—to discuss openly the ways in which community initiative can be supported and local government services changed to allow greater community participation. There is some evidence that the conference has in fact stimulated such discussion in some parts of the country and this needs to be taken further. Advice and training systems for local government could make a big impact here.

More difficult is the necessary change in the relationship between local and central government which would allow much greater freedom for the local authority and much less subjection to the whimsical dictates of a central government machine—which has little sympathy with and less understanding of the real problems which the inner cities experience.

## An overview

The Liverpool conference set up considerable expectations among all those who were invited to attend by the Gulbenkian Foundation and *The Guardian*. The expectations were high because the recent city rioting, and the appointment of Michael Heseltine to re-examine and co-ordinate government policy for inner cities, made it clear that central government was giving new thought to these issues and might change an approach that dated from the 1979 general election. Virtually all those attending the conference blamed this approach for worsening the existing difficulties of inner cities by cutting public services and raising unemployment.

Because of the influential role of the Gulbenkian-*Sunday Times* 'Save Our Cities' conference in Bristol which occurred just before the Labour Government's white paper in 1977, many who came to Liverpool supposed that they could have an equally immediate impact. Yet this was a much larger conference, with very few civil servants or academics present, and the bulk of those attending were community workers and local authority councillors and employees. Such a body was well-briefed to compare local initiatives and generalise from such experience but, even if the Conservative Government had been prepared to listen, it was not so well-g geared for national policy-making. Nevertheless this sense of portentousness which had been built up by the strong publicity support provided by *The Guardian* in preceding weeks, helps to explain some of the tensions which ran through the sessions. This overview will go on to look at the main sessions, at the extra documents produced at the conference, at the 'fringe' events which took place on the evening of Thursday 17 September, and at some of the main ideas which emerged in the course of the four day event.

To begin with it is worth referring to some of the underlying concerns which appeared both in the plenary and the small group sessions. Among these were a worry that the conference members were unrepresentative of their communities, and therefore unsuitable to put forward initiatives on their behalf—specifically that they were too white, too male and too professional. Again and again it was suggested that the conference organisers had underplayed the

potential contribution of blacks and women as platform speakers and attenders, and that crèche facilities advertised in advance would have made it easier for mothers to have come. Black people who were there warned that they could not necessarily be regarded as the representatives of their communities, and many professional workers said they would have preferred it if ordinary members of their groups had come.

Undoubtedly this anxiety was heightened because the invited participants believed that their opinions could alter national policy and felt insecure in their status for doing so. Of course there were excellent reasons why the organisers had asked the participants they had. But the uncertainty of some participants was itself significant in that it reflected an uncertainty about the democratic credentials of community groups in British society. Are they pressure groups, or are they somehow more representative than the councillors and MPs elected by universal franchise? Community workers, whoever they were actually employed by, seemed unhappy either to be speaking for their communities or out of some objective professionalism.

A second worry that affected the conference was about the media and the use to which the discussions and conclusions might be put. Although one of the co-sponsors, *The Guardian*, is a media institution which had allocated a lot of editorial space and effort to the conference, it too was not immune from criticism from the floor. Among the incidents that illustrated this concern, particularly in plenary sessions on Friday 18 September and Saturday 19 September, were: complaints that *The Guardian* had been unable to cover late speeches at the conference; a suggestion, which was not pursued, that journalists covering the conference should be asked to say what they intended to write; a vote, which was passed, to permit an overseas TV team to cover the plenary session on policing; and a request, accepted by the sponsors, that an editorial committee should be elected to oversee a conference report.

Lying behind such incidents was perhaps rather more than just an awareness of the topicality of the conference, and the hopes of participants for sympathetic coverage for their personal views and prescriptions. There was also, seemingly, a frustration with the orthodox media for not noticing community groups and initiatives

more often and more favourably, and an irritation that the media were not more vigorous in combating racism, unemployment, and government policies bearing hardly on the inner city.

The third debate which surfaced in different guises was about the relative utility of a change in national strategy—especially economic strategy—as compared with a concentration on community initiatives at the local level. It was abundantly clear from the opening session on Wednesday 16 September onwards that a significant proportion of those present felt depressed about the plight of inner cities, bitter about Conservative Government policy, and severely limited in what they could do alone to better the lives of people in their own areas. From such critics there emerged calls for a national campaign to reverse government policy as the top priority, and complaints that too much talk of local initiatives meant harking back to the 1960s and defusing the outrage of inner citizens.

On the other hand, however, were possibly a larger number who felt that it is important to pioneer new approaches and services which can then, when a change in central government occurs, be introduced more widely on the basis of proven experience. Many also remarked that the needs of local communities are so clamant that it is unthinkable to ignore them, pending wholesale national change. By the end of the conference a sort of working compromise seemed to have developed. Final resolutions tended to call simultaneously for more government resources for areas of social and economic decline while pressing for new local and regional initiatives.

The conference was divided between full plenary sessions and small discussion groups (see the agenda on page 59). There were small discussion groups, ranging in numbers from around half a dozen to 20, on various aspects of employment, education and health. Furthermore the participants met twice by geographical areas; the 10 groups covered the Midlands, South Yorkshire, West Yorkshire, Tyne and Wear, Manchester, Merseyside, Wales and Northern Ireland, North London, South London and Scotland.

Two other discussion groups sprang up. The first, right from the beginning of the conference, was a Black Caucus which focused on issues of racism, the problems of black inner city dwellers, and the

role of black participants at the conference. It co-operated with members of the Liverpool 8 Defence Committee, who made their own powerful presentation on the evening of Thursday 18 September. The second extra group, which emerged later in the conference, was a women's health workshop which broadened into a general discussion of sexism and women's issues in the inner city. Although the organisers had thought that tenants' action groups might wish to get together in a similar way at the conference only one such meeting was organised.

The opening session, on Wednesday afternoon 16 September, illustrated some of the divergent emphases that would develop as the conference progressed. The formal opening was conducted by Lord Bellwin, a former Conservative leader of Leeds City Council and Parliamentary Under-Secretary at the Department of the Environment. He explained that his government wanted to find a solution to the 'deep-seated malaise of the inner city' but offered little guidance as to how it intended to do so. He indicated that there was little hope of fresh money from central funds, but that there was scope for local and voluntary initiative. His hearers felt that he was possibly inhibited from saying more—for example about the conclusions that Michael Heseltine had reached after his three week stay in Merseyside—because of a current reshuffle, and the fact that the cabinet had yet to approve the Heseltine proposals.

Lord Bellwin was followed by Canon Sebastian Charles, chairman of the conference planning committee. He argued that most of the solutions currently being advanced were rooted in the failures of the past rather than the imperatives of the future: IT WAS NOT ENOUGH, AS WITH Mr Heseltine, simply to hark back to the free spirits of private enterprise and private investment; nor was it enough, as the TUC proposed, merely to inject large quantities of public money. The crucial requirement was to have confidence in the people living in the hearts of the inner cities, and employers and government agencies must stop running away from these areas. The speaker saw the two chief objects of the conference as: one, to achieve a wider public discussion for a community-based approach; two, to encourage more local initiatives.

Archbishop Worlock, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool,



took up the argument about human resources in the inner city. He warned that there were 'no-go areas of the spirit', invisible divides within cities which had grown up over decades. He also urged a much sharper and more effective policy towards the promotion of black people into positions of responsibility; token appointments were insufficient.

This perspective was developed by the next introductory speaker, Yvonne Collymore, the education correspondent for West Indian World and a member of the Rampton Committee. She called also for a better liaison between black groups and grant-givers, a proper participation by blacks in the ethnic minority planning of organisations like the Department of Education and the Inner London Education Authority, and the appointment of some blacks to grant-awarding bodies. The effects of implicit racism were still subtle and widespread in Britain. Not only were far too few black youngsters getting qualifications but those who did could not obtain the sort of jobs they should expect. She quoted the case of a young black man of West Indian origin who had a PhD in linguistics but was only offered a manual job in the Post Office. He had gone to Nigeria to obtain a more worthwhile career.

David Blunkett, the Labour leader of Sheffield City Council, argued that both socialism and local government had more to offer inner cities than the sceptics and Conservative central government too readily assumed. He pointed out that city disturbances at a time of central government laissez-faire were nothing new: the same thing had occurred in the nineteenth century. He also foresaw scope for co-operative solutions to the employment crisis in inner cities. If the Mondragon enterprises in Spain's Basque country could flourish in General Franco's time, he joked, 'Lord Bellwin, that gives me some hope'.

From the general the conference moved to the rather more specific in the plenary session on employment on the evening of Wednesday 16 September. Here the introductory speaker was Professor David Donnison, professor of town and regional planning at Glasgow University. He warned that some of the basic realities of the disaster of nearly three million unemployed were in danger of being forgotten. Whatever economic or social policies were advocated

would take a long time to come into effect. Meantime large numbers of workers of all ages have no prospect of a job for the foreseeable future and all the assumptions—by teachers, social security, town planners and trade unions—that most people usually get jobs, are actually unjustified. Unemployment could and must eventually be brought down—a task that would call for national and international action. But meanwhile the local leaders of Merseyside, Tyneside, Clydeside and other disaster areas could not just sit and wait for the government to come to their rescue—not unless they were prepared to see cities burn and communities disintegrate. Professor Donnison proposed a strategy for such city leaders. First, every city needs a centre for economic initiatives which ensures that local enterprises can find cheap, small premises, risk capital and expert advice. Second, the public authorities own work should be organised whenever possible to promote and develop economic activities within their own area. Investment in local enterprises—whose job creating spin-offs should always be part of the evidence for decisions—should be coupled with the development of training and consultancy work through the Manpower Services Commission, the education authorities and universities or polytechnics. The funds should go to the enterprises, which would require the educational institutions to tender for a share of them.

Above all Professor Donnison appealed for more flexible thinking. The questions were how to create enterprise and skills from within the resources of the cities; how to develop part-time and quasi-professional models of public service; how to bring in the talents of the unemployed even where a full-time job in the formal economy was out of the question; how to break the barriers between commercial, charitable, and public service activities; and how to implant in big organisations some of the virtues of small ones. In a brief discussion at the end of Professor Donnison's talk it was clear that some members of the audience were a great deal more sceptical than he about the employment potential of community enterprises sponsored by local authorities.

The extensive documentation which all conference participants had received on the first day (the discussion documents presented at the conference following articles on related issues in *The Guardian* throughout the previous week) was supplemented at the start of

Community Challenge with three unofficial reports. Although none were debated as such—the first two were the subject of a fringe meeting—they added to the flow of ideas around the event. They were a Declaration, signed by John Benington and 41 other individuals and organisations; an alternative discussion paper entitled, *Challenge to Government: Stop Ripping off the Inner City*, presented by Suzy Croft of Battersea Redevelopment Action Group and Peter Beresford of Battersea Community Action (see page 70); and a paper on the Leisure/non-Work issue by Peter Brinson, Director of the UK Branch of the Gulbenkian Foundation.

The Declaration questioned whether there was a need for any further government investigations into the urban crisis, of the Heseltine variety, before action could be taken. The community activists who signed it called for reflation, expansion of the social and welfare services, more accountability to people who used such services and ‘substantial support for community-based initiatives involving urban groups in tackling local problems’. Among their proposals for the latter were the creation of resource centres for community-based groups tackling key issues in the inner city, and funding over a longer-term than the normal three to five years.

The paper from Battersea took a somewhat parallel view, stressing the importance of fresh state investment in inner cities, and criticising a theme in literature for the conference and in preceding *Guardian* articles that ‘even though times are bad, improvement in the inner city is possible and is taking place’. The authors warned against the belief that ‘a few marginal developments’ are ‘the harbingers of solution’. They placed the main blame for the cities’ plight on reactionary government policies but recognised that old inner city policy had failed and that there were difficulties involved in taking the idea of community participation beyond mere rhetoric.

Peter Brinson, by contrast, was anxious to complement the official conference papers by a fuller consideration of the changing balance between work and leisure. He pointed out that constructive use of leisure could create jobs, lead to better health and well-being, and required a different sort of educational preparation. Accepting that the old balance between the work and non-work periods of life had gone for ever meant ‘junking among other things the traditional work ethic in favour of an ethic embracing life needs as a whole—but

making sure that solutions are relevant to those most affected, usually the most disadvantaged sections of society’.

Following discussion of employment in smaller groups on the morning of Thursday 17 September (summarised in this report) the conference moved on to a plenary session on education. The discussion was launched by Chris Elphick of the College without Walls who pointed out that working class people had never really had much influence over the education provided by the state. ‘People are still being thrown out of education knowing more about the Battle of Hastings than they do about their own class and culture’ he claimed. He advocated a flexible system which would put working class people in charge of their own education, and would harness talents, that are running to waste, to their own needs for change. Arts in Action of Bootle—whose powerful photographs adorned the walls of the conference—was really an educational project for unemployed young people. There were other schemes such as the Mutual Aid Network of South Wales and the *Communiversality of Craigmillar*.

John Rudd, head of the Bellfield Community School, said that the School was set in a housing estate where 50% of the adults were unemployed, where half the families were one parent families, and one in three were living on supplementary benefit. Nevertheless, even though there was still no regular refuse collection and outsiders still thought the community was inadequate, ‘some of that vaguely hoped-for revitalisation has returned’. In his school an elected community council ran evening courses, funds and social groups. He argued that primary schools were the ideal community schools and base for community development: a recognisable community coincides with the normal catchment area of a primary school.

The third platform speaker was Liz Filkin of the Liverpool Adult Education Consortium who suggested that if Liverpool was the graveyard of British capitalism it was also the graveyard of inner city initiatives. The consortium was a co-operative venture by bodies providing adult education in the city who were anxious to get a real shift of resources to the have-nots. It had applied for urban programme and partnership funds and about seven projects had got some. Among recent developments were the setting up of a Women’s Education Centre, a £20,000 fund to send people to the Northern

College, Yorkshire, and the recruitment of detached adult education workers based at a further education college.

In the plenary discussion, Eric Robinson of Bradford College challenged the idea that 'post-school education is so bad that you have to work outside the system'. He wanted to see a bigger attack on the inequality in the post-school system which had grown up over the past 20 years; the huge resources of this system should be opened up to the people; all polytechnics and universities should be open on Saturdays and Sundays for a start. Albert Fontenot, of the Charles Wootton Centre, Liverpool, said that even though his was probably the oldest black community in Britain the response of the local authority was still pitifully small—only two or three teachers had come to a course for black studies at the centre.

Following discussion groups on education and by geographical areas (summarised in this report) the participants were free on Thursday evening 17 September to enjoy a variety of fringe events. Among these were slide shows on Newcastle and American Inner City experience, a session on housing and race, and a video show co-ordinated by Bootle Art in Action. In terms of its reverberation for the conference, the most important of these sessions was one laid on by the Black Caucus and the Liverpool 8 Defence Committee. The presentation began with a tape-slide sequence about institutional racism in the United States. Dorothy Kuya, of the London Borough of Haringey, followed this by saying, 'Institutional racism exists in the same form in this country, and is happening at this conference too'. She quoted as an instance that although 30% of the people of Haringey are black, only 10% of the Borough's employees were, and there was only one black councillor. No ethnic minority citizens were using sheltered housing. She argued that by tolerating such disproportions 'all whites in this society are racist by implication—including you community workers'. The conference should have had a stronger black voice at all levels.

This general challenge to the Gulbenkian participants to look to the motes in their own eyes was followed by some raw testimony of two or three members of the Liverpool 8 Defence Committee. They gave accounts, with all the strength of personal experience, of police harassment, local newspaper complacency, and of continuing

mini-riots after the major conflagration in Toxteth was over. All those who attended this meeting came away with the strong feeling that black rights in the inner city had been trampled on and must be fully won.

The first plenary session on Friday morning 18 September was on health, with Professor Gordon Stewart, the holder of the chair of community medicine at Glasgow University, as the opening platform speaker. He pointed out the striking inequalities in health, and that if only we could apply the standards of the suburbs to the inner cities there would be a huge improvement. Furthermore, the difference in smoking behaviour between the unskilled and the better off was the main explanation of differences in coronary, lung cancer and respiratory diseases. There was still too little emphasis on prevention, primary care and consultation with the communities in deprived areas.

Alex Scott-Samuel, a Liverpool community physician, argued that the medical model of health was still too individualist. Doctors were unwilling to take enough account of structural, social and environmental factors. Hence society ended up by blaming its victims, and GPs worried about heart disease tended to advocate jogging rather than getting rid of the EEC's butter mountain. He welcomed the aggressive approach of an Australian group called BUG-GAUP—Billboard Graffitiists Against Posters—who challenge misleading and anti-health advertising. He welcomed the setting up of an unemployment and health unit on Merseyside.

Jill Rakusen, co-editor of *Our Bodies Ourselves*, inspired the conference to lift its 'no smoking' and time limit rules in favour of a 'hassled' platform speaker. She urged every local health authority to have a budget responding to community needs as identified by community groups; this was being pioneered by Kensington and Chelsea. She quoted two other useful initiatives—a 'well woman' clinic in Manchester and a menopause group in the north. But she said that it was important to recognise that health workers are often surprisingly ignorant of women and black people, and that it was important to redress the bias in favour of drugs in medical research.

The final platform speaker on health, Mick Carpenter from Coventry

Trades Council, said that he wanted to encourage pessimism about the chances of improving health. 'This is far too optimistic a conference,' he averred, 'the forces against improvement in health are much stronger than those in the other direction.' Yet health was an issue because the unequal distribution of ill-health robbed poorer people of time. He quoted a National Government poster of 1931—'smokeless chimneys make anxious mothers'—to show how the urban working class couldn't win. When factories closed they were the first on the dole: when they were working they were the first in line for pollution and other agents of illness.

If there was some feeling that platform participation had been dominated by experts 'on' rather than representatives 'of' the inner city, this was offset in the housing plenary by the Weller Street Housing Co-operative from Liverpool and by a dozen representatives of the Lea View Tenants Association in Hackney whose council estate had been a model when it was built just before the second world war but by the late 1970s it was severely run down. The Mutual Aid Centre of Bethnal Green did a survey to see what support there would be for building up a tenants' association and pressing for refurbishing the estate. In 1980 the centre and the association applied jointly for partnership funds to pay for two community workers. The tenants' association took over the employment of the community workers and embarked on a policy of non co-operation with the borough architects until it was accepted that they would serve the local community. Finally, after attempted cuts and a sit-in at the Town Hall, Lea View had won a £6 million conversion scheme. This was tailored to the preferences of the community and included double-glazing and solar panels. As Jack Davidson, one of the leaders of the tenants' association put it, 'You name it, we'll fight for it'.

There was some anxiety on the floor of the conference that Lea View's success in up-ending the council's budget might have been at the expense of other estates, but this vigorous expression of the resourcefulness and determination of a local community brought the conference alight. However a participant from Newcastle pointed out that on the whole the government cuts had not strengthened the tenants' will to fight back. They knew that councils would act if they had the money, but they did not know how to fight against a

government. The speaker emphasised the very wide effects caused by the cuts in her city: a halt to modernisation and new building, a reduction in repairs, and the sale of the best council houses.

A Lambeth participant added that his borough had found ethnic records useful in ensuring that black families had their fair share of council housing: the aim was to allocate 30% of homes to black people, because 30% of households in need are black. However there was some difference of opinion on the floor about the merit of making problem council estates into special management areas. Speakers felt this only worked if a lot of money was spent on them. Nigel Lee, from Nottingham, said that in his city special management meant little more than doing repairs before people moved in, and the tenants' association was still fighting for a full improvement scheme.

Nigel Lee, and Chris Holmes from East London, both pointed out that public housing had been increasingly cut by both Labour and Conservative governments. Lee argued that the last Labour government had cut spending from £7 billion to £5 billion; the Conservatives were trying to get it down to not much above £2 billion, or about the same amount as was spent on tax relief for mortgage interest. He felt that much talk about housing finance was secondary—though the state made a profit on council housing and a loss on subsidising owner occupiers, and the economic difference between council and building society borrowing was almost non-existent. The main issue was how to find the political will to invest in public housing and use the massive resources now idle. After the lively housing discussion all were in the right mood for the last plenary on a single issue—policing. The organisers had been frustrated in their attempts to invite various policemen who had a particular interest in community policing although John Alderson's evidence to the Scarman inquiry had been circulated as a background paper, so the platform was left to Wally Brown of Merseyside Community Relations Council.

Wally Brown took up the story from the previous evening's meeting, arranged by the Black Caucus and Liverpool 8 Defence Committee. He explained that over the last 10 years the Merseyside police had changed their style of policing—moving from a small block foot patrol system to a large block car patrol system. At the same time



there had been increased use of stop-and-search powers against black males. 'We now have a situation where black men are guilty until proved innocent and while community policemen may be friendly, all their good work is vitiated by the action of thugs in uniform,' he said. In the process the Community Relations Council itself had lost credibility. 'How can I go and drink cocktails with police in the afternoon and then drag young people off the floor who have been beaten over the head by truncheons in the evening?'

Much of his address was taken up with a criticism of aspects of Chief Constable Kenneth Oxford's report on the Toxteth riots, with much of which he strongly disagreed.

The discussion on the floor concentrated on the need to improve police accountability to local communities and to remove the causes of the city riots before they should recur. There was criticism of the police for harassing young blacks in other communities apart from Toxteth, and also criticism of the media for not covering the oppressive use of police powers. Stuart Lansley, a Lambeth councillor, said that there was a lot of evidence that the Brixton black community had been systematically harassed by police.

Councillor Andy Hawkins, Labour leader of Lewisham council, said that it was possible to get a police force that was more responsive to the local community. He said that a few years ago in Lewisham there had been a police liaison group which had made little headway. However a year or so ago a local man, who had been to a local comprehensive school, had been appointed head of the Lewisham division of the Metropolitan Police. Since then relations with all the local communities had greatly improved.

The final plenary session, on Saturday morning 19 September, heard brief resolutions on each topic which had been the subject of separate discussion groups, plus reports from the area groups and a concluding statement from Peter Brinson from the Gulbenkian Foundation, in which he confirmed that the Gulbenkian Foundation would look particularly carefully and with favour at the funding of black groups, that it would sponsor local Community Challenge conferences, and that it would pay for a report of the Liverpool conference. A summary of the final plenary conclusions appears at the end of this report.

This was not an optimistic conference in the sense that it was vibrant with proposals which could be readily adopted in inner cities throughout the country. The morale of community workers and others intimately concerned with these areas had inevitably been hit hard by the slump and public service cuts which began in 1979. To that extent perhaps the most valuable fact about the conference was that it took place at all, heartening those who attended and making possible an informal as well as formal sharing of experience. The commitment by the Gulbenkian Foundation to support local Community Challenge conferences was widely welcomed for the opportunity these would provide to have the same inspiring effect at a local level, while enabling community representatives who might be more authentic than community workers to thrash out with councillors and others the problems they saw in their own city.

In several important areas the conference was not able to go significantly beyond saying that a problem existed, towards specifying possible solutions. This was even true of the 'three isms' which a participant in the final session described as having dogged the discussions—racism, sexism and professionalism. Although there was wide agreement that each represented a major obstacle in the inner city—and in the case of racism it was plain that more sympathetic policing and local authority and employment policies were essential—there were many awkward questions outstanding. Who speaks for black people in the inner city? Who speaks for women—and what are the priorities of inner city women themselves? How can community groups make use of professionals without being dominated by them?

Behind some of the anger at central and local government cutbacks there was also perhaps some confusion between the potential roles of human and material resources for the inner cities. In the absence of public funding, it was suggested, the main priority should be to campaign for more; yet an exclusive approach of this kind apparently undervalued the human resources and independence of spirit which the community groups symbolise. They are, and could be, more than just pressure groups for extracting money from the public purse. Hence perhaps one of the more interesting themes which emerged in the conference was a support for Mondragon-style initiatives in which the human and economic resources of a community are

mobilised to create jobs, wealth and economic activity; the ideas here encompassed people's banks, community enterprises and local enterprise boards. The objective was to strengthen the local money cycle and to use savings to support the local community.

In education too it was suggested that resources should be skewed in favour of the schools that made the most effort to serve the community. The example of the Liverpool Adult Education Collective was also held up to show the benefits of co-operation. Although this was to some extent a defensive exercise at a time of national cuts and fee rises in adult education, it also indicated the advantages of mutual support.

There was considerable feeling in the conference against the reduction of financial autonomy of local authorities—even where it was felt that these authorities were insufficiently responsive to their various communities. But there were some initiatives that could only be taken at a national level. The health discussion groups, for example, thought that it was essential that social policy should be considered across the board, as with the Joint Approach to Social Policy by central government in the early 1970s.

Consultation by local authorities and other bureaucratic bodies with community groups was a must, but for many this did not go far enough. The community groups themselves must be armed with more power and confidence. Above all the conference broadcast a message that the summer riots of 1981 showed that there was very little time left. There had to be some visible improvement in conditions if violence was not going to become endemic, thus speeding up the spirals of decline. In this respect perhaps the major governing idea that emerged was that the situation of black people had become the real litmus test of society's intentions for the inner city. Jobs, respect and participation in official decisions were the urgent right of the black communities: if these were achieved then similar benefits to the other inhabitants of inner cities could hardly be delayed.

# Summaries of discussion groups

## a. Employment

The eight discussion groups on employment were facing the toughest part of the inner city dilemma. The collapse of whole industries, the disappearance of skilled workers and the younger and more entrepreneurially minded, have defied all kinds of policy prescription for the past 20 years. The inner city has come to be seen as a problem precisely because its old economic functions have disappeared without being replaced by new ones.

Group A looked soberly at the barriers which hinder the growth of community business ventures. It felt that advance planning and adequate funds were crucial to success. Both a national Community Venture Capital Fund and local Community Banks should be created to provide the necessary capital. As things now stand, however, the need to make a conventional profit, and to advance at a pace that would satisfy statutory bodies, can too easily cut across the community development role of such ventures. Orthodox banks are slow to fund them, as a London Rasta group found when it wanted to manufacture dresses and sound systems. The group pointed out too that if these ventures were going to employ mothers and single parents it would be necessary for them to have crèches.

The group looking at the relationship between leisure and employment (B) found itself distinguishing between the voluntary leisure of the employed and the enforced leisure of the unemployed. Unemployed people have neither the money nor the psychological assumptions of enjoyment that go with paid leisure.

Participants in group C were optimistic that community issues and educational courses could provide fulfilment for the unemployed, and that such people could provide for themselves if they were encouraged to do so. But society still defines persons by the job they do, and the education system must prepare everyone for satisfied living, whatever their employment status might be.

Local authorities should play a leading role in a national policy for

equal opportunities and affirmative action in employment and promotion: this was the conclusion of the equal opportunities group (D). Local authorities should employ specialists—race relations or equal opportunities officers—to develop programmes for their own staff. Ethnic records should be kept in order to monitor the effectiveness of such programmes. The group recognised that special training and further education opportunities would be needed, as would the support and involvement of trade unions and local community groups.

Group E, which was considering local government strategies, felt that it was not necessarily desirable to establish ‘godfathers’ for individual cities—bringing together the resources of the Departments of Environment and Industry and the Manpower Services Commission (MSC). This approach had had some success in Belfast however. The group thought that certain states in the United States had set a legislative example that was useful in coping with firms’ closures. These state laws require up to two years’ notice of a firm’s intention to move, a public inquiry when a substantial change in the use of labour is intended, and a social audit on the likely results of a firm’s move. Further the group felt that other parties should have the opportunity to produce socially useful alternatives to a closure and, where there was to be a transition from an outwork industry to a new one, redundancy payments should be made to a community fund for training purposes.

How far could trade unions develop an economic strategy? Group F took it for granted that communities should exercise greater control over their economic, commercial and industrial destiny, and that there should be more industrial democracy. At a national level more public sector investment and a reduction in arms spending were seen as essential. At a local level no firm should move without attempting to raise productivity on its existing site. However the trade unions themselves must change. The group thought that the differentials between staff and manual workers should be removed and that, as present trade union structures do not correspond to the current situation, they should be critically examined and re-organised.

In education and training (G) it was felt that the process should be as fruitful as possible for an individual’s personal development.

Academic debates are sterile. The group felt that more effort should be put into opening up the professions to new sources of entry: it commended the successful Turning Point project at New Cross, London, which enables black people to enter the caring professions. Both initial and in-service teacher training should encourage teachers to get closer to their local communities.

As in the education working group discussions, the employment group (H), looking at local community groups and the Manpower Services Commission, made a number of criticisms of the MSC. Regional officials were too cautious, projects were scrutinised in excessive detail, and community groups could not tell what was needed to make their applications successful. The group concluded that an intermediary agency, such as the Action Resource Centre on Merseyside, was extremely helpful in advising groups and selling projects to the MSC. The MSC should be required to explain how it distributed its money, should increase the training element in projects, and should lengthen the one year duration for an individual participant to three or even five years.

Group I, which was considering the local money cycle, discussed how a given circulation of finance could be tapped and controlled by the community. It agreed that local groups did not need such a high profit margin as straight commerce. It saw a need for alternative banking systems, for community links with organised labour, and for more effective use of the spending power of local authorities and the urban programme to circulate money locally. However it also decided that more work had to be done to identify the levels at which action is necessary, and the most suitable strategies.

## b. Education

The need to make better use of human resources, and to increase the scope for real participation, were themes that ran through the eight discussion groups on education. But there was also a strong feeling that existing educational funds could be used differently to provide much greater benefits for local communities.

The group looking at trade unions, basic and continuing education in

the inner city (A) was struck by the insecure funding for this kind of work, even from trusts, and by the limitations on the statutory services. Women's education deserved a special Gulbenkian-type workshop at which crèches should be provided. Education should be both free and informal: at present there was discrimination against both women and black students in the award of grants.

The curriculum group (B) felt that parents and others in the community should be able to change a school curriculum which seems designed to fail the majority of pupils. Teachers, the community and young people themselves should be involved in its design. More emphasis, the group felt, should be placed on continuous assessment. Where there were tests they should be more like the driving test, a mark of attainment which nearly everyone could manage with practice, not a device to ration a scarce good by failing the majority.

There was sharp criticism of the Manpower Services Commission in group E where it was felt that area managers were inconsistent in the kind of community education initiatives that could or could not be funded. The group thought too that the area managers were too unaccountable, and too pre-occupied with short-term unemployment to take a longer view of work, training and education; they also had little understanding of community education and issues.

Voluntary groups should, group E considered, retain control over their further education. In this way they could influence formal educational institutions, stimulate change in them, and inspire a more participatory content. This feeling overlapped with the approach of group F, which was concerned with opening up schools to their local communities. This group considered that community and parental participation was actually more important than the physical use of school premises. Resources should be biased in favour of schools used by the community, and there should be changes in initial and in-service education to prepare teachers to co-operate with local people. Selected teachers should also make contact with parents and pupils at home. There were also practical matters of caretaking and cost to be examined before greater use of school buildings could be achieved: caretakers' conditions of service should be reviewed, and a closer investigation of the additional cost of using buildings out of school hours may reveal that such costs could be met by users.

Group G, focusing on resources, re-iterated that people are a more important resource than either buildings or money. By using parents as a resource, for example, the Newham Parents' Centre had raised morale and enabled teachers to draw on parents' expertise in developing community projects. The worst outcome was where an expert adviser became a leader. In Nottingham, however, the tenants' federation had kept a firm control on its experts in preparing an educational pack on housing finance. This group also made a series of positive suggestions. It wanted to rationalise the finance for adult education and a campaign in favour of community education. It also requested that the Gulbenkian Foundation should fund a National Continuing Education Consortium based on consortia like the Liverpool Adult Education Consortium.

How could the government of schools be made more effective and accountable? This was the question occupying group H. Among its proposals were that parent governors should serve for three years, compared with one in Newcastle on Tyne and two in Lancashire, and that parent governors from different schools should meet, as they do in Inner London. Governing bodies should meet more than once a term, and should get out into the community. At the same time governing bodies, like council committees, should hold their meetings in public. Both teacher and pupil representatives should be delegates who could report back.

The community arts group (I) was concerned that the cultural dimension had been largely overlooked in the conference. This was odd as community arts work had developed a body of practice which had much to offer for inner city renewal, and community workers had come to respect it as a weapon in education, community action and social change. Gulbenkian was an important funding agency in this field at a time when cuts in other finance were severe. The group felt that Gulbenkian should now hold a national meeting of those practising community arts in order to review its finance, structure, practice and philosophy. It was concerned at the absence of any representative of ethnic minorities in its own discussion, at the growth of a new 'profession' of community artist, and at inconsistencies in what was supported as a community art. In one area, it was said, a juvenile jazz band was supported as a community art, but a rock band wasn't.



The group considering ideas for an Open College (J) was divided as to its most useful incarnation. It could involve opening existing colleges and universities as community resources. It could be a place where structured adult education is provided, at a step below the Open University. It could be a new resource—a purpose-built place run by the community, using alternative educational strategies. This group felt that TV and video courses had a useful role to play in promoting unconventional education in the inner city. But overall the group felt that little progress had been made in community education over the past decade. Like group G it urged the need for an effective political campaign for community education.

### c. Health

More prevention of illness, more accountability and more respect for the patient as a consumer with rights—these were themes that ran through several of the health discussion groups.

Group A, looking at inequalities in health, criticised as excessive the resources being channelled into teaching hospitals compared with those going into the community. There was still too much emphasis on hospitals rather than on primary care. Further, social initiatives are as important as NHS ones in improving health standards. Community groups should collect information in this field, the participants thought, and the Community Health Councils (CHCs) should have wider powers to investigate. There is still a shortage of community health workers and health visitors prepared to go out to the people: health information should be more widely disseminated to ordinary citizens.

A strong recommendation that CHCs should be represented on all health care planning teams, their successors and other NHS working parties, emerged from the group looking at the accountability of the NHS to its clients (C). Consumers should have the right to form patients' associations and to have a say in the delivery of GPs' services. The group thought that all adults should have a statutory right to read their own medical files, and there should be an improvement in the present complaints system. In addition, the public should have right of access to named persons on the Area

Health Authority, the Community Health Council and the Family Practitioner Committee.

The professionalism discussion group (D) thought the training of health workers should be looked at in order to make them more responsive to communities and aware of the barriers that exist for patients. Demarcation lines between different health professionals are too rigid. At the same time it should be possible to integrate what is now called 'alternative treatment' into the health service. Patients should be regarded as consumers to whom doctors are accountable. The development of private medicine should be opposed.

A community development approach to health, the subject of group E, was felt to have had a number of successes to its credit even though the first wave of these projects had often collapsed because they had been imposed by an authority. In Birmingham now, for instance, multi-disciplinary teams including environmental health officers had regular contact with community groups. Housing problems were often the main factors in community health. In Craigmillar it was the discussions of public service workers which had led to setting up a club for the mentally handicapped which has now developed into a day centre. Community health can also extend far beyond the direct provision of health care. The Ruchhill Community Health Project, for instance, also gives advice on food.

The health and safety at work group (G) felt Britain has a lot to learn from Sweden in placing a greater emphasis on the safe design of jobs to create a better working environment. Too often now the role of doctors is to identify people at risk from particular processes and exclude them from those jobs, rather than to make the processes safe first. More effort now should be put into improving mental health at work. The threat of redundancy was a considerable stress factor for workers. A number of the workers who were active in the Shotton Steel campaign, for example, had died prematurely as a result of the strain.

The primary health care group (H) believed that prevention and treatment should go together, and that prevention meant looking at the state of housing, employment and the availability of child care. As a result the health professionals had to join in the political arena.

At present, health authorities are the most secretive, unaccountable and bureaucratic part of the welfare state which most working class people encounter. The GP too is unaccountable to the community. Only radical change, therefore, would open up health authorities, family practitioner committees and the like to real community participation. There should be local teams which include GPs, health visitors, and social and community workers.

There was also a need to find extra money for health education initiatives based in the community: this was the view of group I. It saw valuable scope for 'switchboards' which could transmit information between community groups, and between the groups and health professionals. In general, people in the NHS should consult local groups more and there should be less compartmentalism and more openness in health institutions.

Finally the women's health workshop (J), which broadened its discussions to cover women's issues generally, felt that Gulbenkian should fund a special conference just on health and a research programme on the health implications of life skills programmes in schools, further education and Youth Opportunities courses. Community theatre groups, it was pointed out, could be very helpful in changing women's self images in a positive way, and in offering information on women's matters. The Community Theatre Company, Newcastle, had had considerable success in this direction, on one occasion it had substituted for the life skills session of a YOPS course.

## Summary of area group discussions

A significant part of the work of the conference took place in small groups divided on the basis of geographical interest. These met twice and were asked to make recommendations for the final plenary session on Saturday 19 September. The numbers who met varied considerably and, although the geographical area to be covered might be large, the real locus of interest inevitably depended on where the bulk of participants came from. For this reason the Scottish group was principally concerned with Strathclyde and Glasgow, the North London group was dominated by Hackney.

The groups set their own agenda. Hence some spent quite a lot of time discussing the structuring of the conference, or the meaning of community initiatives, while others concentrated on the situation of their own localities or attempts to change government policy. This section of the report seeks to highlight some of the points emerging from the area groups as their own rapporteurs summarised them.

In the Midlands group (A) there was considerable heart-searching about the objects of the conference. While many participants assumed that more community initiatives were needed, the Midlands group felt there were plenty around to which the authorities were making little response. There was also some discussion and disagreement as to whether community workers have any expertise which sets them apart from the community. It was felt that in Birmingham the decisions about allocating inner city money were not made fairly, but as part of a patronage system. The local authority would not support projects it did not like. The group felt that local authorities should take trouble to meet residents' groups who were applying for support so that their proposals could be seen in perspective. It was recognised that if inner city money was allocated directly to neighbourhoods the people in them would have more power; on the other hand their decisions on distributing money might not be any fairer than the local authorities.

The South Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire group (B) was more concerned with national issues. It condemned the Secretary of State for the Environment's policy of 'punishing' local authorities which

overspent his guidelines; this had had particularly ruinous consequences for community services and aid to voluntary groups in Sheffield. It suggested that the Gulbenkian Foundation was a powerful capitalist, racist and sexist organisation which should devote some resources to changing its own processes, publishing an account which could influence other bodies. It was important that the Foundation continued to devote funds to 'high risk' projects for social change. Discussion covered the need for an alternative national economic strategy to have local connotations and the fact that effective community projects invariably come from the community rather than from professional staff sitting in central locations. Community groups needed to have money and professional advice which could not be suddenly cut off at the decree of local authorities. The role of external funders, like Gulbenkian, could help redress the balance of power in favour of needy communities.

The Leeds/Bradford group (C) pointed out that a lack of community workers could actually lead to flexibility and a speedy response to initiatives. There were fewer than 10 neighbourhood community workers in Leeds compared with around 200 in Liverpool. Most of the Leeds groups were issue-based and the people of Chapeltown had a considerable resentment of outsiders who imposed new activists on top of existing ones rather than channelling resources to existing groups. It was felt that there was a real lack of communication between the local authority and people on the ground; too much rivalry between the education, housing and social services departments; and an opportunity had been lost when inner city money had been given to local authority departments rather than to community groups. There was concern that the community education department in Leeds might have the effect of stifling community initiatives, and an urgent feeling that policing should be reformed and made more responsive to community groups.

The Manchester group (E) was also concerned with the attitudes of local authorities. The problem was not only one of financial cutbacks but of the paternalistic attitude of the local authority departments. However as the cuts bit, inner city money was being used to support mainline services which should have been paid for by the basic local authority budget. It was doubtful, in Manchester, whether even if there were more community initiatives they would be able to

influence these mainline programmes. The group also considered some of the obstacles to greater community control in the inner city. Other bodies were unwilling to give up their power; the limited number of votes in inner city areas were reflected in the level of resources applied to them; community groups were divided in the competition for funds and there was still no real debate between the local authority and the voluntary sector. There were also other difficulties: many councillors felt they had little participation in decisions and therefore it was difficult to make them more accountable; again certain groups, among them black people, were totally alienated from the political system.

Merseyside (F) argued that community initiatives need a realistic long-term commitment to funding that is not subject to local or central changes of policy. The group asked whether there was a need for co-ordinating groups at the grassroot level, and indeed whether the voluntary sector was particularly representative. The group did consider that there was a case for some public forum which could give people an alternative to rioting as a means of drawing attention to their views. Such forums could make coherent submissions to local and central government and could obtain information which would become the property of the community and lead to action.

The South London group (I) discussed housing issues, and felt it was important that more resources, over longer than one year ahead, should be allocated to local authority housing. It felt that the housing plenary at the conference had been seriously wanting in not considering the needs of single people and single homeless people. There was a need to see how tenants, trade unionists and others could unite to get things done by local authorities. More generally the group felt that more money should be devolved to the local community level. Some also thought that the conference should have spent more time discussing structural issues, rather than local initiatives; it was felt that thinking had not moved on significantly from the 1960s, and that there had been insufficient exchange of knowledge and experience at the conference. The group wondered how best information networks could be strengthened locally, how government could best support community banks, and how community workers could become more attuned to racist issues.

The Scottish or Strathclyde group (J) felt there should be a

Community Challenge conference in Strathclyde. There was some consideration as to how best to sustain community initiatives; starting them was much easier than keeping them going, and it was important that local authorities and professionals should assist them. It was suggested in this group that local authority architects should work with community groups as a matter of course, and that councillors should try and find out which other departments the community groups need help from. There was some discussion of the weakness of tenants' organisations in Glasgow. Although the Festival Society in Easterhouse was doing a lot, it had kept out of political issues. Other tenants' organisations were jealous of their resources but conditions in Easterhouse were still terrible. At Craigmillar there were area meetings where officials came to discuss policy with local people. The trouble there was that the officials often did not have authority delegated to them, and there was a danger that just a few, 'acceptable' local people had access to power.

## Summary of concluding plenary session

The concluding plenary session on Saturday 19 September was important because it gave an opportunity for all the groups into which the conference had broken up for detailed discussion to express their views concisely. These were endorsed without debate. At the same time it gave Peter Brinson from the Gulbenkian Foundation a chance to explain how the Foundation's own policy might develop in the light of Community Challenge.

On housing the conference endorsed a statement that a campaign should be launched to ensure that the government should commit substantially greater funds for the inner city on a three year basis; that people living in these areas, especially black people, should be able to shape this programme; that forms of housing tenure other than owner occupation should be developed; and that tax concessions for owner occupiers should be removed in order to create funds for rented housing.

On education the conference endorsed a statement that new MSC funds should be used to support training for community leaders and volunteers and that area follow-ups to Community Challenge should seek the direct participation of non-professionals, especially non-waged people. The statement included concern that the conference reflected the domination of local community activity by professional workers.

On health the conference acknowledged the absolute mutual interdependence of health with other aspects of social conditions, particularly income, race, employment, housing and education. It called for de-professionalisation, accountability to patients and the community, and a recognition that racial issues in health were not simply class issues. More appropriate ways of meeting ethnic group health needs should be considered, as should the institutional aspects of racism within the NHS.

The Black Caucus, in their concluding statement which like all the others presented was endorsed by the whole conference, said that they were encouraged by the specific references to ethnic minority



needs in the final plenary, but they still felt that the conference had not properly accommodated the race issue. There should have been a black platform speaker on health, for instance, and a greater black input in the planning of Community Challenge. 'We say that the organisers decided to sidestep the issues they said they wanted to highlight,' Dorothy Kuya claimed on behalf of the Caucus.

The women's health workshop also complained at the small participation by women in the conference, pointing out in its statement that in no way could women be described as a minority group. The Gulbenkian Foundation should arrange a special conference on health issues.

A group which got together at the concluding stage of the conference, on community arts and the media, stated that this topic had received insufficient attention in the agenda. Community arts provide a liberating experience and deserved continued encouragement.

In addition to the statements of issues, the area groups also made a succession of points. The Midlands group (A) said that they saw no case for a local Community Challenge conference, but they would like to see a risk fund for community projects. South Yorkshire (B) saw the need for an advertising campaign to promote a People First approach, and wanted Gulbenkian to reorganise its own structure to eliminate sexism and racism.

West Yorkshire (C) had three points: that time is running out and there is an urgent need for action in the inner city; that community groups must form alliances; and that there should be more accountability by official bodies, particularly the police. The North East group (D) urged both a massive programme of public investment in inner cities, plus genuine community control over services, resources and forms of economic production.

Manchester group (E) felt that its city was a good example of a local authority which had made a lot of gestures to participation but no structural changes. It still paid too little attention to the issues which matter for community groups. Merseyside (F) stated that resources must be found to make the voice of black inner city Liverpool more independent and articulate. This was a case of giving fundamental

rights to the powerless. Specifically the group endorsed the comments of Wally Brown, the chairman of Merseyside Community Relations Council, on local policing and the Oxford report on the Toxteth riots.

The Wales and Northern Ireland group (G) stated that inner cities as a whole should be regarded as minorities within the nation which deserved positive discrimination. It was concerned with linking people within the inner city, both with each other and the sources of power in local authorities. The North London group (H) concluded that a Community Challenge conference should be held in Hackney and that it was important that ordinary people in the community groups should be involved in the planning.

The South London group (I) did not think it would be sensible for Gulbenkian to support a local conference in its area, however. It was not surprised that the Liverpool conference was dominated by paid workers because it was easier to get grants for them. It was important that Gulbenkian monies should get through to the groups themselves. There was a crisis of confidence locally in the role of local authorities.

The Scottish and Strathclyde group (J) emphasised that Glasgow would like to have its own Community Challenge conference, and that discussion would continue on seconding local authority officers to help community groups.

There was not a great deal of discussion in the final plenary, although Suzy Croft and Peter Beresford from Battersea restated their belief that 'the major need now in this sphere is to encourage community initiatives which develop and sustain a broad based challenge to the present destructive and anti-social economic and social policies of this government and the private sector, by developing collective action and the expression of inner city people's own ideas and desires'. Their statement, and another from Wandsworth Youth Event about Young People in Crisis, were also endorsed by the conference. However one person from the floor explained that he was under increasing pressure from the government and Charity Commissioners not to undertake anything that could be described as political activity. Another added that the urban programme directives made plain that that money could not be used for such purposes.

It was left to Peter Brinson from the Gulbenkian Foundation to wind up the conference and stress the lessons that had been learnt. He pointed out that the views of the Foundation were not necessarily in agreement with those of the independent organisers of the conference, and that its principal aim had been to consider strategies for change in the inner cities. The intention was to review the community and self-help movement in Britain in order to explore what lessons there were for national and local policy. Referring to the conflict between optimists and pessimists at Community Challenge he argued that if enough was changed at local level changes nationally must follow. 'This conference has demonstrated how much there is that people can do, and are doing, at grassroots level. Therefore we do *not* accept that change cannot be achieved, or that the future is hopeless,' he said. For this reason the Foundation believed it could contribute significantly by supporting local self-help organisations, by strengthening local links between voluntary bodies and the voluntary and statutory sectors.

He then spelled out specific undertakings by Gulbenkian in the light of the conference:

1. That there should be a conference report, supervised by an editorial board elected from the conference.
2. That he acknowledged the recommendations for area conferences, discussions and other activities arising from Community Challenge. The Gulbenkian officers would ask the Board of Trustees—and the decision was theirs—to set aside monies for such purposes.
3. That a high priority must be given to the issue of race. 'This means support for measures to fight institutional and personal racism at every level, and the formation of alliances to achieve this objective. The Gulbenkian Foundation, for example, will invite other foundations, national organisations and related bodies to join with us in formulating action to fight racism. We shall combine this, as recommended by conference, with an examination of our own attitudes, policies and practices in racism and sexism.'

4. That there should be more research in the inner city, but it should be commissioned in the light of the needs and ideology of local communities themselves, and not from traditional academic ideology.
5. That there should be help for training courses of various kinds, primarily for non-professional people seeking to develop management skills in the self-help field.
6. That there is a strong case, so far as resources would allow, for the continuing development of community communications of all kinds.
7. That the conference has underpinned Gulbenkian's existing commitment to encourage community-based activities, co-operative businesses and so on which create jobs. It was re-affirmed the present Gulbenkian priority to help young unemployed people, especially young black people, to benefit from the actions which follow the conference.

Peter Brinson expressed the hope that the local discussion and community action to which this conference would lead would stimulate so strong a movement for regeneration that change becomes irresistible.

## Three additional papers

### Submission by the Black Caucus

We, the black caucus, understand that the organisers of this conference were of the view that there should not be a specific session on race and that race issues should be discussed in all the sessions. This objective, in our view, was not realised and in this respect the conference was a failure.

We would have liked the issues of race and racism not only to be an integral part of the conference but to be a major part of it. Since racism permeates all facets of this society it is absolutely necessary that it is specifically explored and understood.

We believe the organisers failed to face this challenge because of their inability and reluctance to recognise that community challenge is not merely about social change but also about racial justice and equality of opportunity.

In side-stepping that challenge they not only diffused the issue but also failed to confront the main question of direct/indirect discrimination and institutionalised racism. Moreover, they fell into the same pitfalls which the government policies have fallen into; that is, failing to see the link between race issues and social/political/economic issues in the inner cities. The majority of the residents in many of our inner cities are black; they are often made to feel that they are not a legitimate part of this society. Implications of this were not fully explored. It was evident that no in-depth thought was given to some of these fundamental issues and how these should be reflected in all the sessions. Consequently the issue of race was dealt with superficially and in a cursory fashion.

It was in response to this major weakness in the whole structure of the conference that the black participants decided to get together and make a presentation on racism. The way racism manifested itself right through the conference is illustrated below:

1. To our knowledge hardly any blacks were involved in the planning stages. It is evident from the format of the conference that no in-depth consideration was given to race issues. A pious hope that all sessions should reflect race issues is not enough. Black people should have been involved in the early planning stages and some serious consideration should have been given to the link between race and other issues in the inner cities. Black groups who approached the organisers were either ignored or their suggestions were not accepted. Exclusion of blacks from the planning committee meant that the perceptions, assumptions and analysis of the organisers of the conference were not challenged and these in turn manifested themselves in the whole structure of the conference. This defeated the whole purpose of the conference.
2. Because an early opportunity to involve black people was missed, the analysis of the issues involved were essentially by a predominantly white conference committee. Consequently the majority of the speakers in the main plenary sessions were white who made only a superficial attempt to raise the race issue. This was so in all the sessions but particularly true of the health and the education sessions. The agenda for these sessions was set by those who had very little understanding of the real issues facing the black communities and the fundamental importance of race and racism in all the issues discussed. Instead the question of race was marginalised. There was only but a token mention of the issues involved.
3. Some of the terminology used by the main speakers indicated their lack of understanding. On Wednesday evening one of the main speakers used the term 'newcomers to the country'. This totally ignored the fact that communities in Liverpool 8 have been here for centuries. It also implies that problems facing the blacks are due to newness. There were a number of other examples which illustrated lack of understanding and awareness.

## Statement of disassociation

In the Battersea Community Action/B.R.A.G. alternative discussion paper prepared for the Community Challenge Conference, concern was raised that community and workplace organisations and delegates seemed to have been allowed little if any substantial say in the form the Conference took. This concern was strongly expressed at the Conference itself by the Black Caucus, Women's Health Workshop and other participants.

The point which we want to make in this statement as members of the editorial group, is that effectively the same lack of say for participants of the Conference seems to have been true of the production of this report as of the Conference itself. It was agreed at the Conference that an editorial group should be elected to produce and have control over any report of or from the Conference. This was democratically elected from the local groups established during the course of the Conference. We were elected to that group.

There was a very long delay, despite an attempt to urge an early meeting, before Gulbenkian arranged a meeting of the editorial group. Instead of the group having the chance to decide what kind of report it might like to produce, lines were set and discussion pre-empted by a draft being provided by the Conference organisers. In the event this meeting was abortive because bad weather prevented a majority of the editorial group coming. Charles Clarke, who had been employed as an organiser of the Conference, played a major part in the discussion although he was not a member of the editorial group.

It was agreed at that meeting that a complete version of the initial write-up incorporating modifications should be circulated as a prelude to the group meeting again to discuss it. It was not until 16th March, six months after the Conference took place that another draft was sent out. At this stage some of us argued strongly that the editorial group should meet as a group to discuss collectively the report that would appear.

On the 20th May, Gulbenkian wrote to members of the editorial group saying that four members wanted a further meeting, four were

against and the opinions of three were still not known. It hardly seems surprising that the group was less than unanimously enthusiastic about having a further meeting since by now nearly eight months had passed since the Conference took place. Replying to that letter, one of the editorial group argued:

‘The conference established the editorial board to be responsible for producing a report of the conference. I take the view that we have editorial responsibility for that report. I am quite happy for someone else to do the work of writing it. But the final decision on what appears in the report must be a collective decision of the editorial board. I therefore suggest that as soon as your final draft is complete an editorial board meeting should be called and *all material for inclusion in the report* including photographs and graphics should be circulated to us beforehand. I do not accept that individual editorial board members acting alone without the benefit of collective discussion have the right to vote against an editorial board meeting. They may have the right not to turn up to such a meeting, but they have the responsibility vested in them by the conference to ensure that a report is produced and that the editorial board has the opportunity to ensure that the report reflects the views of those people at the conference. That cannot be done without a meeting to discuss all the material to go into the report.’

But no further meeting was ever held. The final report has not therefore been approved by the editorial group acting as a collective body on behalf of the conference as was originally intended. So the report cannot be considered as a valid record of the conference.

Finally on 31st August 1982, almost a year after the Conference was held, a draft report was sent to the editorial group for their individual ‘comments’. The introduction included discussion of ‘practical policies’. These proposals did not emerge from and were not mandated by the Conference. Nor were they proposed by the editorial group. Instead they first appeared in a previous draft as ‘a personal view’ by Peter Brinson of Gulbenkian and Malcolm Dean of the Guardian. Thus while there was supposed to be ‘so much emphasis’ at the Conference ‘on bringing together community and



voluntary workers', it was on the opinions and values of two of the Conference organisers that proposals were made. There were changes between these two draft introductions admittedly; for example, the earlier one 'regret(ted) the rather negative contribution of the Black Caucus in the report'. Now its 'forcefulness' was 'welcomed'.

Peter Brinson of Gulbenkian in a letter to editorial group members of 16th March 1982 said that 'it was thought doubtful whether the conference had given the group the mandate' to put forward some positive proposals. Having questioned the right of the elected editorial group to offer proposals, Peter Brinson then went on to provide 'suggestions'—which appear indistinguishable from proposals—instead. Using the implied limitations of the competence or terms of reference of the editorial group as a reason to allow two individuals, albeit representatives of the sponsoring organisations, to draw up proposals or 'suggestions' instead, seems unsatisfactory and questionable. The report and any proposals were to follow from what participants—and the editorial group was elected by participants—felt and wanted rather than specifically what the sponsors wanted.

As one of the editorial group argued in a letter of 20th April 1982:

'... in terms of what notice people may take of the report, the foreword (introduction) could be the most important part of the report, and particularly the itemised suggestions at the end of it because these can immediately be taken up as concrete proposals ... I think it is our responsibility to ensure that what appears is broadly representative of the views of the conference ... If there is to be a foreword (introduction) making suggestions, I would like to see a whole range of suggestions being made, broadly in line with different strands within the conference.'

Significantly, although it was a major issue raised by many people at the Conference, nowhere in the introduction is mention made of the need for large scale increases in financial resources from central government for housing, services, environment, employment etc despite the evident catastrophic run-down of these in the inner city.

In a letter of 14th June 1982 from Peter Brinson to a member of the

editorial group, the status of the group was questioned and it was now suggested that it constituted an *advisory* body. Peter Brinson wrote:

‘It seems that some members of the group ... regard those put forward by the regional groups ... as an editorial board with the final say in the editing and production of the report ... The Foundation’s view is that those nominated members ... constitute a group to offer advice and guidance to the Foundation in the preparation of the report. It could not be other ... since as a Branch of a Lisbon-based Foundation, we do not have the authority to establish any other kind of body.’

This was certainly not the situation presented initially at the Conference, nor indeed in the recorded discussion which took place at the one partial meeting of the editorial group. Nor were statements of members which offered another interpretation ever questioned or challenged until this date.

Just as the Community Challenge Conference despite its emphasis on participation and community involvement allowed participants, particularly black people and women, little say in its organisation and form, so participants have had relatively little say in the production of the report of it. In many ways, sadly, the process of the production of this report has echoed other experiences of official ‘consultation’ and ‘participation’—

1. the organising body defines the terms of reference, produces the initial document/report/recommendations etc for ‘comments’ rather than enabling people to initiate and participate from the start;
2. no guarantees are available to people involved in consultation that what they might want to say will be acted on or included;
3. long delays occur without clear explanation at the organising body’s end;
4. sudden rushes and deadlines are imposed—in this case to get to print—which means that discussion is either perfunctory or doesn’t take place and comments have to be rushed;
5. obstacles appear in the way of collective discussion and the role of a delegate group is redefined by the organising body from an executive to an advisory one.

Sadly the production of the report in microcosm reflects many of the

problems affecting the inner city, which the Community Challenge Conference was intended to address: of people not being afforded an adequate say, particularly women and black people, and their energies and efforts being dissipated and sidetracked.

We feel as members of the elected editorial group that we would wish to disassociate ourselves from the report, not because of anything we may disagree with in the report, but because of our disagreement over the process by which the report was produced.

Peter Beresford, Battersea  
Community Action  
Monica Elliott, Newcastle  
Tenants Federation  
Nigel Lee, Nottingham  
Federation of Tenants and  
Residents Associations

5th October 1982

## Reply by the sponsors

The conference sponsors greatly regret that three members of the editorial group have considered it necessary to submit the foregoing Statement of Disassociation. While respecting their right to express their views, the interpretation of events in the Statement is not accurate, and we respond reluctantly to set the record straight.

*Organisation of the conference* This matter is dealt with in some detail on pages 11–14. It was the intention of the conference planners so to organise the event that participants reflecting a wide range of community interests from a limited number of geographical areas in the UK would be able to come together with two aims: first, to share their experience of aspects of participation in policy formulation and decision making with those from other areas; and second, to meet according to geographical areas in a neutral setting to discuss plans for further activity within their particular localities.

The framework provided for plenary sessions, interest groups and geographical area discussions. The programme left time for additional group discussions, and opportunities were given for changes in the overall timetable—and this indeed occurred as a result of requests from participants. Community groups from around the country accepted invitations to set up exhibitions or presentations of their work (bursaries were available for this) and to organise additional seminars.

Background papers on the central themes of participation in health, housing, employment and education were prepared by small study groups made up of members with particular knowledge and experience in each of the issues under consideration, and these members subsequently attended the conference. Each group was asked to give particular attention to the needs of minority ethnic groups in the area being considered.

*Participation* Participants to the conference were invited either because they were known to have relevant experience within the localities selected, or because their organisations (eg CRCs, Tenants Associations, Trades Councils, etc) nominated them. The Planning Committee was particularly concerned that local community

activists, women and members of minority ethnic groups should be invited. (The Chairman of the Planning Committee, and of the conference, was Sebastian Charles, himself a member of a minority ethnic community.)

An experienced community worker, Charles Clarke, was appointed in the Autumn of 1980 to plan and organise the conference. During the year he visited many of the areas selected (eg Merseyside, Newcastle, North London) to discuss with local organisations and groups both the form and content of the conference, as well as to seek suggestions for people who might attend. Apart from these consultations, well over 70 of those who ultimately attended the conference were consulted in one way or another.

While the organisers were disappointed that efforts to achieve fair representation of all groups was not wholly successful, they were satisfied that organisations and individuals in local areas, as well as the actual participants, were consulted to a remarkable degree for such an event.

*Conference Report and Editorial Group* In view of the focus and structure of the conference it was thought that such 'success' that could result would be in increased awareness and activity in each of the areas represented to bring about a devolution of power, influence and resources to local community groups. As the Introduction states: 'It was not expected therefore that there would be a final session at which the conference would put forward a collective view on any matter, though there was no unwillingness for that to happen if it was desired.' In fact, it did happen. As no formal report was planned, no arrangements were made to have notes taken, or to tape the proceedings, nor was there, of course, any allocation in the budget for writing, editing or publishing such a report or for meetings of any editorial group. However, Peter Brinson readily agreed to support a proposal to the Foundation for the production of a conference report when the request arose from the floor. He also warmly welcomed the appointment of a small group, with a member nominated from each of the geographical areas represented, to help with the task.

Given the wide-ranging debate, the different backgrounds of participants, the diversity of interests and ideologies, few people

present could have expected the report to do more than reflect some of the main themes and arguments, and to offer a flavour of the proceedings. The three people present who had any official responsibility for keeping some track of the conference were the Chairman, Sebastian Charles, the Organiser, Charles Clarke, and the Press Officer, Richard Bourne. In view of the difficult task of preparing the report, since no arrangements had been made to record events, the small group nominated at the conference was seen by the sponsors as aiding their efforts and those of the officers in ensuring that the report reflected a valid view of the conference, and to act as a sounding board (not to mention making sure that criticisms of the Foundation voiced at the conference did not go unreported!).

In an attempt to enable the initial meeting of the editorial group to be as productive as possible, Richard Bourne agreed to proceed with a draft on an informal basis pending agreement to fund the report by the Foundation. The draft was based on his notes, and on the papers prepared as a result of group discussions at the conference.

A decision to fund and publish the report was taken by the Foundation in early November 1981, and the initial draft together with other relevant papers were circulated later that month for a meeting of the editorial group on December 10th. It was made clear to the meeting that the layout and content of the draft was seen only as an aid to discussion, and that changes could be made. Although bad weather prevented all those who had hoped to attend from coming, seven members of the group were present. As a result of the discussion substantial changes were made to the organisation and content of the report. The second draft, together with a contribution which had been sought from the Black Caucus, was circulated for comment in March. It was further amended in the light of comments received.

*Status of the editorial group* Following circulation of the second draft, it became clear that there was a misunderstanding about the standing of the editorial group. In June, Peter Brinson wrote to members of the group: 'It seems that some members of the group (it is not clear how many, but the correspondence suggests it is a minority) regard those put forward by the regional groups—ie all those who were not involved in sponsoring, planning or servicing the

conference—as an Editorial Board with the final say in the editing and production of the report. In view of the confused way in which this matter was discussed at the conference, it is not surprising that there should be different interpretations of its role.

‘The Foundation’s view is that those nominated members, together with representatives of the co-sponsor (*The Guardian*), the conference Chairman and Organiser, and the Press Officer, together constitute a group to offer advice and guidance to the Foundation in the preparation of the report. It could not be other than an advisory group since, as a Branch of a Lisbon-based Foundation, we do not have the authority to establish any other kind of body. There is no way, without a decision from our Lisbon Board, that we could offer an external group the right to determine what the Foundation publishes. That is not to ignore the crucial importance placed by the Foundation on the work of advisory and consultative groups, as is testified by our long list of publications, most of them the work of such groups. I also believe that our serious attempt to respond with respect and integrity to the suggestions and recommendations of the editorial group is a further indication of the importance we attach to its work.’

*Introduction* At the December meeting some members of the group suggested that the publication of the report presented the group with an opportunity to offer pointers for future developments in social policy, funding and other matters, drawing on the conference discussion. However, other members did not think that the group had the mandate to undertake such a task, quite apart from the difficulty in obtaining agreement on such a statement. As a result, when circulating the second draft in March, Peter Brinson wrote: ‘On listening to the tape of the discussion it seemed to us that there was a wish on the part of members that the report should put forward some positive proposals for future action, but at the same time it was thought doubtful whether the conference had given the group the mandate to do so. Accordingly Malcolm Dean and I, as representatives of the two sponsoring organisations, drafted a Foreword to the report which incorporates suggestions made both at the conference itself and at the meeting of the group. We hope that this meets the mood of the editorial group without causing difficulties about the role it was given.’

'We would welcome your comments on the Foreword and on the rest of the draft as it now stands. If it is broadly acceptable to most members of the group, having amended it in the light of comments and suggestions received, we will proceed to publish it as soon as possible.'

The Foreword/Introduction was substantially amended as a result of comments received. Most members of the group were happy for it to be included as a statement by representatives of the two sponsoring organisations.

*Further Meeting of the Group* The second draft was circulated on 16th March, and comments were asked for by 6th April 'by telephone if it's easier' in order to set the publication process in operation before Easter. However, two members of the editorial group requested a further meeting. Their letters were circulated to all members of the group, together with a letter from Paul Curno saying that 'the request for a further meeting was totally acceptable to us, and we would be happy to arrange it if most members considered it desirable'. Of the 12 members who responded, four indicated that they thought that another meeting was necessary, and eight members thought that another meeting was unnecessary.

*Delays* It will be evident that there has been considerable correspondence over the production of the report. At each stage we have wished to confirm whether the views of one or two members were representative of the group as a whole. This has necessitated circulation of the correspondence with a request for a reply, frequently followed up by telephone calls to elicit a view. The process has been slow, but given the difficult circumstances under which a report of a conference, which included some controversial elements, had to be reconstructed, and the reconstruction subjected to many advisory and editorial comments, it may seem less surprising that the report was delayed than that it was eventually published.



# Conference organisation

## Conference agenda

Wednesday 16 September, 1981

14.00-17.00 Registration at entrance to Dale Halls of Residence

16.30-18.00 OPENING PLENARY SESSION  
(Chair: *The Reverend Sebastian Charles*  
Canon of Westminster)

*Lord Bellwin*

Parliamentary Under Secretary at the  
Department

of the Environment will open the conference

*The Reverend Sebastian Charles*

Chairman of the conference Planning Committee  
will welcome participants

Introductory talks will be given by:

*Archbishop Worlock*

Archbishop of Liverpool

*Yvonne Collymore*

Education Correspondent: *West Indian World*  
Member: Rampton Committee

*David Blunkett*

Leader: Sheffield City Council

18.30 Dinner

20.00-21.30 PLENARY SESSION ON EMPLOYMENT  
(Chair: *Councillor Andy Hawkins*  
Leader: Lewisham Council)

To be introduced by:

*Professor David Donnison*

Professor of Town and Regional Planning

University of Glasgow

Thursday 17 September

09.00-10.30 DISCUSSION GROUPS ON EMPLOYMENT

- A Community Business Ventures, and how to overcome barriers to local economic activity
- B Using buildings to create employment
- C Leisure and employment
- D Equal opportunities in employment
- E Developing a local government economic strategy
- F The role of trades unions in developing economic strategies
- G Education and training
- H The Manpower Services Commission and community initiative
- I The local money cycle

10.30 Coffee

11.00-12.30 PLENARY SESSION ON EDUCATION  
(Chair: *Peter Brinson*  
Director: Calouste Gulbenkian  
Foundation)

*Chris Elphick*  
CETU Community Development  
'College without Walls'

*John Rudd*  
Head: Bellfield Community School

*Liverpool Adult Education Consortium*

13.00 Lunch

14.30-16.00 DISCUSSION GROUPS ON EDUCATION

- A Trade Union and basic education
- B Power in the school curriculum

- C The development of supplementary schools
- D Education with the unemployed
- E The Manpower Services Commission in community education
- F Opening up schools to their local community
- G Resources for community educational initiatives
- H Changing the government of schools
- I Developing community arts
- J The Open College

16.00 Tea

16.30-18.00 **AREA DISCUSSION GROUPS**  
stimulating community initiative

In the Area discussion groups, the participants in the conference will be divided into groups on the basis of geography, and it is hoped that each discussion group will consider the practical steps which can be taken in particular areas to achieve the goals of the conference

18.30 Dinner

20.00 onwards **VARIED ACTIVITIES**

No conference session is scheduled during this period, but participants, and local Merseyside groups are encouraged to use this time for any events which they would like to put on. A number of events have already been planned and a full list will be available at the conference.

Friday 18 September

09.00-10.30 **PLENARY SESSION ON HEALTH**  
(Chair: *Malcolm Dean of The Guardian*)

*Gordon Stewart*

Professor of Community Medicine at Glasgow University

*Alex Scott-Samuel*  
Liverpool GP  
'Community-based initiatives in inner city health'

*Jill Rakusen*  
Co-editor of *Our Bodies Ourselves*

*Mick Carpenter*  
Secretary: Coventry Trades Council  
'Environmental Health'

10.30 Coffee

11.00-12.30 DISCUSSION GROUPS ON HEALTH

- A Inequalities in the health services
- B The role of the Community Health Council
- C Accountability of the National Health Service to its clients
- D Professionalism
- E The community development approach to health
- F Ethnic minorities and health
- G Health and safety at work
- H A framework for primary health care
- I Health education
- J Cuts in health finance

13.00 Lunch

14.30-16.00 PLENARY SESSION ON HOUSING  
(Chair: *Peter McClachlan*  
Belfast Voluntary Welfare Society)

Weller Street Housing Cooperative, Liverpool

Lea View Tenants Association, Hackney

Sheffield Tenants Federation

16.00 Tea

16.30-18.00      DISCUSSION GROUPS ON HOUSING  
The previously circulated discussion paper will form the basis of discussion in each of the discussion groups, which will be divided on the same basis as the Area Discussions

18.30-19.30      PLENARY SESSION ON POLICING  
(Chair: *Trevor Phillips* of Skin Programme  
London Weekend Television)

*Wally Brown*

Chairman: Merseyside CRC

*Police representative:* to be confirmed

20.30              Buffet Dinner

Saturday 19 September

09.00-10.30      AREA DISCUSSION GROUPS  
Devolution of power and accountability

10.30              Coffee

11.00-12.30      CLOSING PLENARY SESSION  
(Chair: *The Reverend Sebastian Charles*)

13.00              Lunch

## People invited to the conference

**ABBOTT Marie**  
Community Information Service  
'SCOPE', Belfast

**ABBOTT Roslyn**  
Scottish Special Housing Association,  
Glasgow

**AJEEB Cllr Mohammed**  
Bradford City Council

**ALLEN Graham**  
Labour Party

**ALVIS Sue**  
Youth Action, Hull

**ANDERSON Bryce**  
Social Services Department, Strathclyde  
Regional Council

**APPLEBY Eric**  
National Federation of Voluntary  
Literacy Schemes

**ARMSTRONG Hilary**  
Sunderland Polytechnic

**ASHTON Muriel**  
Merseyside Probation Service

**ATHERTON Cllr Sally**  
Conservative Member, City of Liverpool

**ATKINS Sue**  
Hub Workshop, Sheffield

**ATKINSON Dick**  
St Pauls Centre, Birmingham

**ATKINSON Joe**  
Community Support Programme

**BALL D R**  
Department of the Environment

**BARNES Don**  
Liverpool Action Resource Centre

**BARNETT Colin**  
TUC, North West Region

**BASSEY Soloman**  
Liverpool 8 Defence Committee

**BENINGTON John**  
The Network of Labour Community  
Research and Resources Centre

**BENNETT A J**  
St Christopher's Project, Dudley

**BENNETT Delroy**  
Hub Workshop, Sheffield

**BERESFORD Peter**  
Battersea Community Action

**BLACK Rev Neville**  
Liverpool

**BLUNKETT Cllr David**  
Sheffield City Council

**BOND John**  
National Federation of City Farms

**BOWEN Mr**  
Urban Renewal, City of Birmingham

**BOWERMAN Millicent**  
Gulbenkian Foundation

**BRANGWYN Mark**  
Lambeth Inner Cities Consultative Group

**BRADDOCK Bob**  
WEA, Liverpool

**BRIDLE Marjorie**  
AFFOR, Birmingham

**BRINSON Peter**  
Gulbenkian Foundation

**BROMFIELD Colin**  
Newark Tenants Federation

**BROWN Cllr Mrs P**  
London Borough of Islington

**BROWN Manneh**  
Liverpool 8 Defence Committee

**BROWN Wally**  
CRC, Merseyside

**BRYETT P A**  
Lancashire Education Committee

**BURKEMAN Steve**  
Central Birmingham CHC

**BURN Elizabeth**  
Newcastle Tenants Federation

**BELLWIN Lord**  
Parliamentary Under Secretary,  
Department of the Environment

**BOYD Frank**  
Freeform Arts Trust Ltd, Hackney

**CANTOR Mike**  
London Borough of Southwark

**CARPENTER Michael**  
Coventry Trades Council

CARTER Trevor  
Hackney Caribbean Teachers Association  
CEMLYN David  
Bristol Settlement  
CHARLES Frances  
CHARLES Rev Sebastian  
Community Support Programme  
CLARKE Charles  
Gulbenkian Foundation  
CLARKE Sue  
Bristol Folk House AE Centre  
CLARKESON Geoffrey  
Community Projects Foundation  
COLLINGE Chris  
Nottingham Community Project  
COLLYMORE Yvonne  
*West Indian World*  
CORBETT J  
Weller Street Housing Co-op, Liverpool  
COURTENEY Joy  
Family Start, Oldham  
CRAIG Gary  
West End Resource Centre, Newcastle  
upon Tyne  
CROFT Suzy  
Battersea Redevelopment Action Group  
CRUMMY Helen  
Craigmillar Festival Society, Edinburgh  
CURNO Paul  
Gulbenkian Foundation  
DALE Phillip  
Inner Cities Directorate, Department of  
the Environment  
DAVIES Bob  
Birmingham VSC  
DAVIES Robert  
NCVO  
DEAN Malcolm  
*The Guardian*  
DENT Hugh  
CRE, North West Region  
DOHERTY Paddy  
Londonderry YOP Workshop  
DONNISON Prof David  
University of Glasgow  
DOWLING Sue  
Bristol  
DOYLE O J  
Merseyside County Council

DUFFY Jim  
ARC, Liverpool  
EDGE Cllr Geoff  
West Midlands County Council  
EDGINTON Jon  
Voluntary Action  
EDWARDS Berry  
West Indian Centre, Manchester  
ELLIOTT Monica  
Newcastle Tenants Federation  
ELPHICK Chris  
CETU, Oldham  
FAIR Eileen  
Stanhope Street Area Action Centre,  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
FARRINGTON Cllr Josie  
Lancashire Education Committee  
FEELEY Jill  
Stoke School, Coventry  
FERREGRA Carlos  
Community Health Group for Ethnic  
Minorities  
FIELD Frank  
MP for Birkenhead  
FILKIN Liz  
Institute of Extension Studies, Liverpool  
FISHER Dr Brian  
GP in South London  
FITZMAURICE Jon  
HEO Housing Association  
FLOWER Fred  
ex Kingsway College, Princeton  
FLYNN Cllr Tony  
Moorside Priority Area Team, Newcastle  
upon Tyne  
FORSYTH Leslie  
COMTECHSA, Liverpool  
FRANKS Michael  
Clerkenwell Workshops, London  
FRATER M R  
Wrekin District Council  
FRAZER Hugh  
N Ireland Voluntary Trust  
FRAZER Ivan  
Lambeth Consortium of Ethnic  
Minorities  
FREEMAN Brenda  
CRC, Merseyside

**FRU Ferdi**  
 Alinsky Community Training Project,  
 Liverpool  
**GALLANT Victor**  
 Cleveland County Council  
**GARBETT Graham**  
 London Borough of Hackney  
**GILLEN Steve**  
 Town and Country Planning Association  
**GLENDINNING Cllr Will**  
 Belfast  
**GOLD Teddy**  
 PAD, Liverpool  
**GOLDMAN Helen**  
 Freeform Arts Trust Ltd, Hackney  
**GOSMAN Nora**  
 Stanhope Street Area Action Centre,  
 Newcastle upon Tyne  
**GRAHAM Don**  
 City of Liverpool  
**GRAHAM Cllr T**  
 Strathclyde Regional Council  
**GRANT Cllr Bernie**  
 London Borough of Haringey  
**GRAY Cllr J**  
 Strathclyde Regional Council  
**GRAY Dr Judith**  
 GP in Manchester  
**GREEN David**  
 Urban Studies Centre, Bethnal Green  
**GREEN David**  
 Energy Advice Unit, Newcastle  
**GRIFFITHS Hywel**  
 Community Support Programme  
**HACKIE Barry**  
 Commonground Resource Centre,  
 Sheffield  
**HALE Angela**  
 War on Want  
**HALLETT Slim**  
 Coventry Workshop  
**HALSALL Catharine**  
 Birmingham Youth Volunteers  
**HALSALL W**  
 Weller Street Housing Co-op, Liverpool  
**HAMILTON Edith**  
 Women's Education Group, Liverpool  
**HARDING David**  
 Dartington College of Arts

**HAWKINS Cllr Andy**  
 London Borough of Lewisham  
**HAYMAN Keith**  
 Coventry Resource and Information  
 Centre  
**HEAL A R**  
 British Petroleum  
**HENRY Brendan**  
 Belfast City Council  
**HILL Geoff**  
 CVS, Leeds  
**HINDLEY Clifford J**  
 VSU, Home Office  
**HODGINS M**  
 CRC, Birmingham  
**HOLMES Chris**  
 East London Housing Association  
**HOODLESS Elizabeth**  
 CSV, London  
**HORTON Cllr Peter**  
 Sheffield City Council  
**HOSTY Kieran**  
 ARC, Newcastle upon Tyne  
**HOULSTON M W**  
 Merseyside City Council  
**HOWIE David**  
 National Youth Bureau  
**HUBLEY John**  
 Leeds Polytechnic, Health Education  
 Unit  
**HUGHES John**  
 Merseyside City Council  
**HUGHES M H**  
 Shotton Action Committee  
**HUGHES Robin**  
 CVS, Liverpool  
**HURSLEY Mr**  
 Wrekin District Council  
**HUSSEIN Adam**  
 Liverpool 8 Defence Committee  
**JACKSON Brian**  
 Sheffield Tenants Federation  
**JACKSON Ced**  
 London Community Work Service  
**JACKSON J**  
 Wirral Social Services  
**JACKSON Keith**  
 Northern College  
**JAHAN Anwara**  
 Bangladesh Women's Association



**JAIN Ravi**  
 National Association of Asian Youth  
**JAMIESON Sarah**  
 LASPA, Liverpool  
**JENKINS David**  
 Leeds TUCRIC  
**JONES Elphin**  
 Mutual Aid Support Network, Wales  
**JONES Leena**  
 Tenants Federation, Sheffield  
**JONES Margaret**  
 Newcastle Inner City Forum  
**JONES Peter**  
 Liverpool Housing Trust  
**JORDAN Clive**  
 BASSAC  
**KENDALL Cllr Anthony**  
 London Borough of Hackney  
**KENRICK Peter C**  
 Newcastle City Council  
**KIRK Margaret**  
 Leeds Inner City Forum  
**KIRKHAM Roger**  
 Town and Country Planning Association  
**KNIGHT Barry**  
 VSC, London  
**KUENSTLER Peter**  
 Gulbenkian Foundation  
**KUYA Dorothy**  
 London Borough of Haringey  
**LANNING Adrian**  
 CVS, Solihull  
**LANSLEY Cllr Stuart**  
 SHAC, Lambeth  
**LEASK Phil**  
 Law Centres' Federation  
**LEE Nigel**  
 Nottingham Tenants Federation  
**LEIGH Sue**  
 Newcastle Inner City Forum  
**LOVETT Tom**  
 New University of Ulster  
**LOWENBERG Paul**  
 Thornhill Neighbourhood Project,  
 London  
**LUCAS Gill**  
 Kings Community Health Council  
**MACLACHLAN Peter**  
 Belfast Voluntary Welfare Society  
**MACDONALD Kelvin**  
 Town and Country Planning Association  
**MACKAY Libby**  
 Vauxhall Neighbourhood Council  
**MACKIE D**  
 Commonground, Sheffield  
**McALEESE Sister Mary**  
 British Council of Churches  
**McCLAUGHLIN Paddy**  
 Omagh Community Development Project  
**McQUAIL Paul**  
 Department of the Environment  
**MAGUIRE Jean**  
 Maryhill Housing Association, Glasgow  
**MELLOR Nigel**  
 City of Liverpool  
**MILLER Christopher**  
 War on Want  
**MILLS Richard**  
 Gulbenkian Foundation  
**MITSON Roy**  
 Abraham Moss Centre, Manchester  
**MONRO A**  
 Business in the Community  
**MOTT Albert**  
 Carr-Gomm Society Ltd, Leeds  
**MUNRO Joan**  
 Gulbenkian Foundation  
**MUFTI Rashid**  
 Liverpool 8 Defence Committee  
**MURPHY Foster**  
 The Volunteer Centre  
**MURRAY Rab**  
 Howwood Road Community House,  
 Glasgow  
**MYTTON Ann**  
 Gulbenkian Foundation  
**MALLEN D**  
 Inner London Education Authority  
**NABARRO Rupert**  
 Urban Economist  
 A representative  
 National Association for Multi-Racial  
 Education  
**NATTON Barry**  
 Merseyside Improved Houses  
**NICHOLSON Christopher**  
 BBC External Services  
**NICHOLSON Martin**  
 Liverpool

NUTTALL P  
Sheffield City Council  
OHWOISI E C  
CRE, North West Region  
PAGE Steve  
Hall Lane Centre, Leeds  
PARIS Garnett  
Enterprise STEP, Nottingham  
PARK John  
London Borough of Greenwich, Housing  
Directorate  
PARRY Alan  
Bootle Arts  
PARRY Brian  
Sports Council  
PARTRIDGE Simon  
Com Com  
PEARCE Juliette  
Harehill Health Action Group, Leeds  
PHILLIPS Ray  
Newham Parents Centre, London  
PHILLIPS Trevor  
SKIN, London Weekend Television  
PHILLIPS-BELL Mal  
AFFOR, Birmingham  
PINNINGTON Margaret  
CETU  
PLATT W D G  
Riverside Health Project  
PLOUVIEZ Maggie  
Volunteer Centre  
POPAY Jennie  
Unemployment Forum, NCVO  
POLEHAMPTON Hugh  
Leicester City Council  
POTTER Gwenda  
Bristol Community Education Centre  
POWELL Alan  
Voluntary Action Centre, Rochdale  
POWER Anne  
Liverpool Priority Estates Project  
PRASHAR Usha  
Runnymede Trust  
PRESTON Peter  
*The Guardian*  
PRICE Graham  
WEA, Birmingham  
PRINCE Cllr John  
Liverpool City Council

RADFORD Jim  
Community Resource Unit, London  
RAKUSEN Jill  
Freelance writer  
RANDHAWA Ravi  
Lambeth Inner Cities Consultative Group  
RAVEN Faith  
Royston  
REDAILLI Giulio  
Architect, Italy  
REDMAN Peter  
Circle 33 Housing Association  
RETI T K  
Cheshire County Council  
RICHARDSON Maureen  
Nottingham  
RIDLEY Prof Fred  
Liverpool University  
ROBINSON Eric  
Bradford College  
ROBINSON Jane  
Sandwell Area Health Authority  
ROBINSON Terry  
Federation of Hackney Tenants  
Association  
ROBSON Earle  
Society of Jamaicans, Leicester  
ROSS Bernard  
Shelton Trust  
RUDD John  
Bellfield Community School, Rochdale  
RYAN Jim  
Port Talbot Trades Council  
SACKER Pete  
Sheffield City Council  
SAYERS David  
London Borough of Islington  
SCOTT Connie  
Newcastle Tenants Federation  
SCOTT-SAMUEL Dr Alex  
GP in Liverpool  
SERGEANT Richard  
Walsall CCR  
SHARMA Anita  
Lambeth Housing Advisory Centre  
SHARMAN Nick  
TUC, South East Region  
SHARRAT Jill  
CVS, Manchester

**SHARRAT T**  
 Lancashire Education Committee  
**SHONE David**  
 CVS, Merseyside  
**SIMMONS Cllr Michael**  
 Leeds City Council  
**SIMPSON Alan**  
 CRC, Nottingham  
**SKOLDEBACK Lennart**  
 Swedish Tenants Movement  
**SMITH Father Austen**  
 Passionist Inner City Project, Liverpool  
**SMITH David**  
 Mutual Aid Support Network, Wales  
**SMITH Ian**  
 Southwick Neighbourhood Action Project  
**SMITH Dr Michael**  
 Centre of Leisure Studies, Salford  
**SNEDDON George**  
 Glasgow District Council  
**SOMMERFELD Paul**  
 CRC, Merseyside  
**SOULSBY Cllr**  
 Leicester City Council  
**SPAWTON Geoff**  
 West Glamorgan Common Ownership  
**STARES Rodney**  
 Swindon  
**STERLING Sue**  
 Wallgrave Hospital, Coventry  
**STEVENS Jon**  
 Community Forum, Birmingham  
**STEVENS Cllr Val**  
 Manchester City Council  
**STEWART Prof Gordon**  
 Glasgow University  
**STEWART Ian**  
 Strathclyde Regional Council  
**STEWART Prof Murray**  
 SAUS, Bristol  
**STILES Jenny**  
 Association of Community Workers  
**STUBBS W H**  
 Inner London Education Authority  
**SWALLOW Brian**  
 CVS, Hull  
**TAMBOER R C**  
 Amsterdam  
**TAYLOR Ann**  
 DHSS, North West Region  
**THEA Dan**  
 London Borough of Lambeth  
**THOMAS Maureen**  
 Sutton Centre, Nottinghamshire  
**THOMAS Saskia**  
 Gulbenkian Foundation  
**THORNE Stan**  
 MP for Liverpool  
**THORNE Sue**  
 St Thomas's CHC, London  
**THORNICROFT John**  
 ATV, Birmingham  
**THORNTON Clenys**  
 Royal Arsenal Co-op Society  
**TORKINGTON Protasia**  
 Student, Liverpool University  
**TRAISH Phil**  
 Dunterlees Tenants Association, Glasgow  
**UNDERWOOD Jacky**  
 SAUS, Bristol  
**U-WURIE Mohammed**  
 Hackney Community Action  
**VERNON Cherry**  
 Dudley Youth and Community Service  
**WANG Brian**  
 Merseyside Chinese Community Services  
**WARD Sonia**  
 Law Centre, Leeds  
**WEATHERBURN Ross**  
 Knowsley District Council  
**WEAVER Eugene**  
 Charles Wootton Centre, Liverpool  
**WEBBER Jon**  
 London Borough of Hackney  
**WEST Harry**  
 Bristol Folk House  
**WHEELER Richard**  
 British Council of Churches  
**WHITFIELD Dexter**  
 Community Action  
**WHITTON S**  
 City of Birmingham  
**WILLIAMS Laurie**  
 Further Education Inspector, Birmingham  
**WILLIAMS Rostyn**  
 CRC, Oxford  
**WILLIS Mary**  
 COPE UK

WILSON Bob  
Schools Council  
WISEMAN Cllr David  
Glasgow District Council  
WORLOCK Archbishop  
Liverpool  
WORTHINGTON Cllr A  
Strathclyde Regional Council

WYATT Anna  
ICOM, Leeds  
YOUNG Bob  
London Borough of Hackney  
YOUNG Cllr R J  
Strathclyde Regional Council  
ZULFIQAR Mohsin  
TUBE, Manchester

In addition to the above list there were a number of press representatives and Richard Bourne, the conference Press Officer.

***Conference papers available from the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation***

***1 Discussion papers:***

***Community Strategies for Education***  
***Community Strategies for Employment***  
***Community Strategies for Health***  
***Community Strategies for Housing***  
***Community Strategies for Policing***

***2 Submission to Scarman—The case for Community Policing (by John Alderson, CBE, QPM)***

***3 Inner Cities Policy: A Community Perspective (Murray Stewart and Jacky Underwood, School for Advanced Urban Studies, University of Bristol)***

***BCA/BRAG Report available from Peter Beresford, Battersea Community Action, 27 Winders Road, Battersea, London SW11.***





ISBN 0903319 35 7  
PRICE £2.00