

PUBLICATIONS

Jouni Niskanen

COMMUNITY
GOVERNANCE



SEINÄJOKI UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES

PUBLICATIONS OF SEINÄJOKI UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES
A. RESEARCH REPORTS 4

JOUNI NISKANEN

COMMUNITY
GOVERNANCE



SEINÄJOKI UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES

Seinäjoki 2006

PUBLICATIONS OF SEINÄJOKI UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES
Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulun julkaisusarja

- A. RESEARCH REPORTS Tutkimuksia
- B. REPORTS Raportteja ja artikkeleita
- C. TEACHING MATERIALS Opetusmateriaaleja
- D. THESES Opinnäytteitä

Orders:

SEINÄJOKI UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES
LIBRARY
Keskuskatu 34, 60100 Seinäjoki
Tel. 020 124 5040, fax 020 124 5041
e-mail seamk.kirjasto@seamk.fi

ISBN 952-5336-74-3 (PDF)
ISSN 1456-1735

TIIVISTELMÄ

Jouni Niskanen 2006. Community Governance. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulun julkaisusarja A: Tutkimuksia 4, 137 s.

Valistusajan jälkeen emotionaalisia, uskonnollisia, tai perinteisiin tukeutuvia julkisen vallan toimintatapoja ja organisaationmuotoja on karsittu ja pyritty rationaalisuudella ratkaisemaan julkisen hallinnon tavoitteet ja hallinnon periaatteet. Rationaalisuus äärimuodoissaan on kuitenkin johtanut moniin yhteiskunnallisiin epäonnistuneisiin kokeiluihin. Rajaton globalisaatio uhkaa nyt kansalaisten hyvinvointia eikä julkisten palvelujen tuottamiseen riitä vain julkinen hallintokoneisto. Hyvinvointivaltion rationaalisuus itsessään byrokrationa ei välttämättä tue kansalaisten ja yhteisöjen hyvinvointia vaan jopa latistaa kansalaisten aloitteellisuuden. Julkisen hallinnon uudistamisessa pääpaino on ollut markkinaohjautuvuuden lisäämisessä tavoitteen ollessa julkisten palvelun taloudellinen tehokkuus. New Public Management ei kuitenkaan vastaa rationaalisena toimintamallina kansalaisten inhimilliseen yhteisöllisyyden tarpeisiin vaan on jopa sen kanssa ristiriidassa.

Tutkimuksessa käydään läpi uusyhteisöllisyyttä täydentävänä julkisen hallinnon uudistamisen mallina. Ensiksi käydään läpi eräitä vaihtoehtoisia uudistusmalleja, ja etsitään uusyhteisöllisyydelle pohjateorioita. Uusyhteisöllisyyden ilmenemismuotoja verrataan Yhdysvalloissa, Britanniassa, Saksassa ja Suomessa.

Uusyhteisöllisyys osoittautuu olevan hyvin vaihtelevan muotoinen ilmiö. Julkinen hallinto voi kokonaan vetäytyä organisoimasta jotain palvelua olettaen että kansalaiset itse organisoivat korvaavaa toimintaa. Kansalaisille, yhdistyksille, asukasyhdistyksille tai kyläyhteisöille voidaan antaa mahdollisuuksia itse huolehtia omista asioistaan joko houkuttelemalla siihen tai pakottamalla siihen. Yhteisöllisyyttä voidaan tukea sisällyttämällä mm. vapaaehtoistyö osaksi koulutusta. Kansalaiset voivat huolehtia lähiöiden turvallisuudesta. Nollatoleranssi voi suojata yhteisöjä rikollisuudelta. Julkinen ja yksityinen sektori sekä kansalaistoiminta voivat olla kumppanuussuhteessa esimerkiksi työttömyyttä hoidettaessa. Hankerahoitusta on käytetty erittäin runsaasti luomaan uudentyyppistä yhteisöllisyyttä ja tukemaan olemassa olevia yhteisöjä.

Uusyhteisöllisyys voi olla radikaaliakin julkishallinnon kannalta, sillä se korostaa kansalaisten ja heidän yhteisöjensä itseohjautuvuutta, mutta useammin yhteisöjen toiminta vaatii julkishallinnolta resursseja ja muuta tukea.

Avainsanat: yhteisö, julkinen hallinto, uusyhteisöllisyys

Vararehtori, HTT Jouni Niskanen,
Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulu
Keskuskatu 34, 60101 Seinäjoki
Puh. 020 124 5007
e-mail: jouni.niskanen@seamk.fi

ABSTRACT

Jouni Niskanen. 2006. *Community Governance*. Publications of the Seinäjoki University of Applied Sciences, Publications A. Research reports 4. 137 p.

Since the Enlightenment emotional, religious or traditional habits and customs have been reduced in public administration, and rationality has been the aim and principle in the governance. However, ultimate rationality has led to failed societal experiments. Nowadays limitless globalization threatens the well-being of citizens and the bureaucratic or market-oriented modes of operation are not sufficient for the provision of public services. The welfare state is a bureaucratic system itself and it does not necessarily support citizens' and communities autonomous activities and well-being but suffocates their initiatives. In recent times the mainstream in public sector reform has been market-oriented governance, the aim of which is economic efficiency. The New Public Management does not answer to the social needs of citizens.

In this research report, Community Governance as a third alternative is compared with bureaucratic and market-oriented governance. First, alternative phenomena and background theories are investigated. Secondly, practical examples of Community Governance are compared in the United States, Britain, Germany and Finland.

Community Governance proves to have various forms. Public authorities can withdraw from certain services and expect that autonomous, bottom-up activities take care of the tasks. Citizens, associations, tenants' boards and villages can be either motivated or forced to take care of bottom-up actions: voluntary work may become a part of education and neighborhood watch-groups may take care of community security. Public authorities' zero tolerance is more often taken into use to protect communities. The public and private sectors and citizens may work together in partnership to promote social issues. Project funding is widely used to create new types of communities and to empower the existing ones.

Community Governance may be radical from the public administration's point of view since it emphasizes citizens' and their communities' autonomy, but more often communities need resources and other support from public administration.

Key words: community, public administration, Community Governance

Vice President, DSc (Admin) Jouni Niskanen,
Seinäjoki University of Applied Sciences
Keskuskatu 34, FIN-60101 SEINÄJOKI, Finland
Tel. +358 20 124 5007
e-mail: jouni.niskanen@seamk.fi

Sisällys

1. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE	9
1.1. Research tasks	9
1.2. Criticism of bureaucracy and descriptions of alternative models	11
1.3. Definitions of concepts.....	21
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	25
2.1. Classical themes.....	25
2.1.1. Communitarianism	25
2.1.2. Catholic Christianity.....	35
2.1.3. Community philosophy	36
2.2. Citizens' autonomy	38
2.2.1. Anarchism	38
2.2.2. Corporatism	40
2.2.3. Radical Right	43
2.3. Social theories	45
2.3.1. Sociological perceptions of people in the system.....	45
2.3.2. Social work and empowerment	50
2.3.3. Social capital	57
2.4. Contemporary main stream	59
2.4.1. Third Way	59
2.4.2. Participation	62
2.4.3. Partnership	66
3. EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REFORMS	71
3.1. United States	71
3.1.1. Tocquevillean community spirit re-discovered.....	71
3.1.2. Mixture of reinventions	76
3.1.3. Community Governance programs	77
3.2. Britain	81
3.2.1. The New Left	82
3.2.2. Modernizing government	84
3.2.3. Community Governance programs	85
3.3. Germany	88
3.3.1. Catholic subsidiarity	88
3.3.2. Contemporary communitarian discourse	92
3.3.3. Conservative-corporative system	94
3.4. Finland.....	96
3.4.1. Coalition of "land spirit" and the New Left	96
3.4.2. Decentralized services, problems of participation	99
3.4.3. Community participation programs.....	100
3.5. Summary of the comparison.....	106

4. CONCLUSIONS	109
4.1. Old ideologies re-mixed	109
4.2. Possible problems of Community Governance.....	116
4.3. Community Governance completes bureaucratic and market-oriented governances	119

REFERENCES	124
-------------------------	-----

Table 1. Four Models of Organization.....	14
Table 2. Bureaucracy and Collectivistic Democratic Organizations.....	15
Table 3. Four Models of Government	16
Table 4. Three Modes of Governance	17
Table 5. Three Paths in Developing Bureaucratic Local Governance ...	17
Table 6. Four Modes of Governance	18
Table 7. Centralized and Decentralized Administration	19
Table 8. Orthodox Management and Its Three Alternatives.....	20
Table 9. Examples of Participation.....	64
Table 10. Four Reforms in US Public Administration	72
Table 11. Three Reforms in UK Public Administration	82
Table 12. Five Reforms of German Public Administration	90
Table 13. Four Phases in Finnish Post-war Public Administration.....	98
Table 14. Comparison of Community Governance Reforms in Four Countries.....	108
Table 15. Theories behind Community Governance.....	111
Table 16. Potential Benefits and Problems of Community Governance .	117
Table 17. Bureaucracy, Market-oriented Governance and Community Required	119

1. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE

This report examines alternative paradigms to the development of public administration. There are examples of governance reforms, which evolve the sense of community to improve the well-being of citizens and, at the same time, ease the role of public authorities in delivering social welfare.

1.1. Research tasks

The aim of this book is to explore Community Governance - how it covers many alternative ways of reforming public administration. Gates (1999, 521) states that the challenges and problems we face as a society are increasingly becoming the responsibility of local and regional communities. There are, and in all likelihood will continue to be, fewer and fewer public-sector financing available to deal with the critical issues facing our society. Power has become more widely and thinly distributed within the community and the democratic composition of communities has become increasingly diverse.

In particular, these activities are supposed to reduce the citizens' welfare dependency on public, top-down hierarchies. Community Governance as a reform answers primarily to the challenges of poverty, unemployment, crime, social exclusion and other social problems. The empowerment of individuals and communities is important. The capacities of communities are trusted and possibly supported or empowered by public authorities. Public welfare bureaucracy expects that autonomous associations and citizen groups know what is best for their members and have their own means to achieve independent goals.

The aim of this study is to research the concept of Community Governance as a source of reform in arranging local welfare services from the point of view of administrative science. Focus is given to comparing the experiences between two-party systems (United States, Britain) and coalition systems (Germany, Finland).

More specifically, the aims are to:

- Uncover relevant theories behind Community Governance, and
- Review some applications of Community Governance projects in the United States, Britain, Germany and Finland.

Communitarian theories became popular in the 1990s, but I shall discuss both older and newer background theories and compare practical examples of Community Governance policies.

Democracy and civic society are strong themes in Western countries, and mainstream political rhetoric supports them. The British system consists of two parties, one of which, the Labour party, has reformed its socialistic tones. German politics comprises three major alternatives: the Social Democrats, the conservative CSU/CDU and the Greens. The German cabinets constitute at least two parties. The Finnish political system constitutes numerous amounts of parties and the cabinets are always coalitions.

In both of the two-party countries, the winning party can change public policies completely. In the other two countries, the policies must be more compromising. Therefore, it is expected that policies concerning public administration development are more moderate.

The method used in this study is explorative. It is a qualitative method and it is related to inductive logic. The explorative method seeks concepts, defines and re-defines them. The primary aim is not to explain, but to create concepts and form new questions. The explorative method allows the researcher to seek conceptual similarities and differences between cases where comparability is weak due to the differences in the cases. The method is not used for testing explicit hypotheses, but to create concepts and to develop hypotheses. The empirical material is not yet used for testing theories, but to develop new theoretical ideas. The outcome of the studies by which the explorative method has been used can lead to the ability to choose particular traditional qualitative or quantitative methods and to make limitations in further studies. (Uusitalo 1991, 60–65; Yin 1994, 4–9.)

Researchers who use qualitative methods must possess the ability to make typologies and simplifications of complex material to allow the general lines and general concepts to describe the main points of the research field (Ragin 1994, 84–85). Creating concepts from complexity is important since basic, simple words, typologies and categories make the social phenomena more comprehensible.

The explorative method is particularly suitable for creating concepts as described. Through exploration, I seek general characteristics in Community Governance policies and attempt to explain how they differ from each other. In this study, similarities are connected to the central theoretical criteria of the theoretical themes for Community Governance. The result will transpire as a general picture of various forms of Community Governance practices. The conclusive results of the study will be presented in the last chapter of this study.

1.2. Criticism of bureaucracy and descriptions of alternative models

Since the Enlightenment, modernism has attempted to achieve justness, efficiency and rationality. Modern societies, whether capitalistic or socialistic, have created efficient, bureaucratic organizations to facilitate efficient administration. The efficiency of public institutions may have been taken for granted as a goal in and of itself. The efficiency of governance can also lead into an awkward situation: post-bureaucratic public administration is economically efficient but at the cost of the well-being of citizens.

Weber (1968, 217–223) outlined principles of rational bureaucratic administration. Caiden (1991, 124–125) and Savas (1982, 1–4) have stated that public bureaucracy has increased enormously and become a threat to democracy and personal freedom. Reforms in public bureaucracy have concentrated on market-oriented modes or operations. The New Public Management (NPM) doctrine externalizes services, which were previously publicly owned and publicly provided, to services which are publicly purchased and privately provided. The philosophical setting in these reforms lies in individualism. (Hood 1991, 4; 1996, 271; Jann 1997, 100.)

Criticism toward operations which are carried out according to NPM has also increased. The promotion of markets and competition has been seen more as an end itself, a value instead of an instrument (Uusitalo 1997, 21). NPM encourages passivity among citizens and discourages them to exercise their original power of voice, although they may have much to contribute to their communities (Vigoda & Colembiewski 2001, 275). The government's economic efficiency is important, but it is not an adequate prerequisite for the well-being of citizens. If a society is to function well, the people outside the economically efficient governmental institutions must also possess a certain level of well-being. The well-being of the citizens is not necessarily a synonym to the public organization's efficiency.

Modernism created a rational, industrial class society but, in the later phase, also deconstructed them into individualized fragments. Citizens have now been forced to share the risks and failures of modern systems in the name of progress, efficiency or one truth. Modernism developed to a stage where society could only offer contingent careers and working opportunities, leading to more unstable family relationships and lesser predictability of life (Raunio 2000, 66–67; Heiskala 1996, 146–158). The unintended social consequence of free-market capitalism in this phase is “brazilianization”, by which Beck (2000, 1) means diversity, uncertainty and insecurity in people's work and life.

Marxism and other forms of Communism have failed. Modernity was no longer capable of producing single finalities (Ashley 1994, 53). The capitalistic system, private ownership and individualism have been said to prove the end of history (Fukuyama 1992). Lyotard (1985) and Beck (1997, 37) describe postmodern society and state that society has become pluralistic and diverse, without a grand narrative guiding its development. The rational modern narratives of class struggle or the welfare state have hollowed from inside. Socialistic utopias have collapsed and privatization and globalization have clouded citizens' vision of the state as an actor whose performance they might praise or blame (Taylor 2000, 156).

ATTAC's (Association for Taxation of Financial Transactions in Order to Aid Citizens) international popularity has rapidly grown. What was once a French movement is now an international movement, and it describes the fear that many people feel concerning global capitalism. The movement has its roots in Ramonet's (1997) article, which calls for the rising up against the seemingly uncontrollable power of globalization (Kilambi 2000). Tobin (1978), a Nobel Prize winning economist, proposed the idea of a tax on foreign exchange transactions where speculators move around the globe as they seek to profit from minute differentials in currency fluctuations. The ATTAC and other anti-globalization movements have been demanding that tax.

Instead of accepting one or any single rational paradigm of organizing public administration, postmodernists suggest that we should accept alternative rationalities, which better fit our own and our communities' values. This postmodern challenge is also a matter concerning public administration.

We can name alternatives as postmodern management, shared governance, bottom-up initiatives, or other. Developing the public sectors' activities can also benefit from the citizens' own activities, i.e. citizens could organize part of the services as communities or by themselves, instead of having them be carried out solely by public authorities. It is not privatization, New Public Management, or exceeding capitalism to its limits – it is something else. Local governments are increasingly forced to take care of their social challenges. A solution lies in re-inventing the way communities operate. As Gates (1999, 519) and Bellefeuille & Hemingway (2005, 496) argue that we need to make a shift from government to governance where citizens, businesses, non-profit organizations and workers across the public sector can come together to address social issues and take action. In this text, I use the expression "Community Governance". The reform of public bureaucracy can also be seen as a shift from government to governance, which means "softer" ways of steering or guiding society or communities (Newman 2002, 8–9) or networks (Bevir & Rhodes & Weller 2003, 192).

The core problem of modernism is that public services, valuable as they may be as such, are too good, they have been entrenched too long and they have taught people not to trust themselves or their communities. The systems have become too expensive and complicated and there may not be will among people to finance all of these public services by taxes any more. People have forgotten what it is to implement the same things by themselves. Therefore, it is worth contemplating how the “life-world” and the community ought to be, or could be, activated in order to implement welfare tasks.

The emergence of alternative qualitative narratives in science rejects positivistic scientific frameworks and offers representational alternatives for truth, including in the administrative sciences. Boje, Gephart and Thatchenkery (1996, 4–8) collected alternative administrative practices for modern, Tayloristic bureaucracy. For example, the interpretation of feminists or marginal groups concerning efficient, privatized administration reveals chauvinism or other types of hidden meaning in the development texts of the predominant organization (Calton & Kurland 1996, 164).

In the 1990s, a dogmatic, liberal climate of opinion prevailed which virtually shut down political alternatives. Objections of progressive, market-oriented forces were treated as “socialistic” or “utopian”, or simply as impractical assaults on “competitiveness”, “efficiency” and “growth”. Through profit orientation, mismanagement of public bureaucracy has turned into debilitating consequences in some cases. Recent demonstrations against globalization show that citizens are worried about the small democracies in local communities. (Falk 1999, 5, 74, 107; Hudelson 1999, 154; Kopperi 2000, 70; Spithoven 2002, 336.)

There is a difference between the modern and postmodern, but one must be cautious in premising what the concepts would mean in practice, especially in the delivery of public welfare services. Leonard (1997, 14, 100–109) suggests evaluating postmodernism as a process of innovation where certain principles of modern bureaucratic organizations are compared to postmodern flexibility. Postmodern critique of modern organizations takes as given the monolithic character of modern bureaucratic organizations. Post-modernity is best understood as the latest stage of modernity in which we look back, from the present, and are critical in a new way about the trajectory by which we have arrived at the present. What we see forces us to realize that the present is different. Criticism of bureaucratic systems has resulted in experiments, for example, in new community-based health services, in efforts to reduce depersonalization and personal dependency, and in attempts to strengthen the voice of the consumer. The forms of postmodern organization are less hierarchical, more community-based and participative forms of human service organization.

There are philosophical and practical streams affecting public services that are interesting and worth examining. Social capital, empowerment, Third Way, communitarianism, and partnership are today's different expressions for the various "postmodern" alternatives for "modern" public bureaucracies. These reforms aim at lessening the dependency on modern, top-down hierarchies. Postmodernism is a widely used descriptive concept (Heiskala 1996, 148). However, I shall not refer to the transformation of public administration as postmodernism; instead, I refer to it as Community Governance. Community Governance is a policy, which answers to the challenges of postmodern administrations, where the sense of community is essential for understanding how the well-being of citizens functions. It includes those forms of public activities, which aim at the improvement or sustainability of the well-being of individual citizens, especially within autonomous communities and by autonomous communities.

There are administrative typologies concerning communities, which have been presented in scientific literature. The emphasis on communities' capacities is not a new notion.

Thompson and Duden (in de Leon 1997, 245) present a framework of various organizational structures based on the premise that decision-making is the central organizational act. Firstly, are the goals of social actions known or unknown? Secondly, are the means for achievement known or unknown? If the goals and means are both known, we can refer to bureaucracy. If both are uncertain we speak of anarchy. If goals are known but the means are unknown, the result is pluralistic competition, i.e. markets. If the goals are unknown but the means are known, we speak of community (Table 1).

Table 1. *Four Models of Organization (de Leon 1997, 245).*

	Means known	Means vary
Goals and regulations are given top-down	Bureaucracy	Market
Goals and regulations are set from bottom-up	Community	Anarchy

The previous division resembles that of the public sector, private sector, third sector and the fourth sector. The third sector was taken to use in the 1970s and it possesses synonyms such as non-statutory sector, nonprofit sector, "gemeinnützige Organisationen", "gemeinnützige Unternehmen", or "économie sociale". The third sector consists of activities that have an organizational structure consisting of volunteer members. Its associations must be independent from public authorities, although they must follow regulations and they may receive grants from the public sector. They are autonomous and do not seek profit. The fourth sector is an unclear

concept consisting of the rest, families and individual relationships. (Helander 1998, 33, 53–55.)

Rothschild-Whitt (1979) makes an interesting attempt to describe collectivistic democratic organizations. They are organizations that have explicitly rejected Weberian instrumental rationality in favor of value-rational behavior. They are outside the established public organizations, and fulfill social needs without resources from bureaucratic authority. Examples of such collectivistic organizations are free medical clinics, free schools, legal collectives, alternative anti-authoritative organizations and food cooperatives. Table 2 compares the differences with the Weberian principles of bureaucracy. Commitment is typical for collectivistic organizations since the members are homogenous and their rules and incentives are based on the fulfillment of their own emotional values.

Table 2. *Bureaucracy and Collectivistic Democratic Organizations Compared (Rothschild-Whitt 1979).*

	Bureaucratic organization	Collectivistic democratic organization
Authority	Obedience	Consensus, incumbency, open to negotiation
Rules	Written, stable	Minimal, ad hoc, subjective
Social controls	Hierarchy, supervision, sanction	Personalistic or moralistic appeal
Social relations	Impersonal, role-based	Holistic, personal, affective
Recruitment and advancement	Specialized training, standards of competence	Based on friendship, personality attributes
Incentive structure	Promotion, financial	Value fulfillment, solidarity
Social stratification	Inequality	Equality
Differentiation	Specialized, segmented	General, holistic

Self (1988, 48–138) describes principal differences between the individualist, pluralist and corporatist reforms of public administrations. Individualist reform refers to the privatization of public property and the adoption of market-type mechanisms in the public sector. The pluralist state means that there is more emphasis on intermediate institutions such as churches, and self-governing associations. Corporatist reforms include trade unions, planning bodies, and other institutional forms which are based on peoples' participation and negotiation with citizens.

Peters (1996, 117) exhibits four alternative models for the future development of governments (Table 3): Market Government, Participate Government, Flexible Government and Deregulated Government. The market-type government splits

services into purchasers and providers, i.e. creates internal markets and utilizes market incentives, but the government controls the monopoly of authority in purchasing the services it wishes. Low-cost is the primary interest. In the Participate Government Model, part of the authority is allocated to the people. Participate Government emphasizes bottom-up activities and peoples' responsibility. The Flexible Government relies on virtual and temporary project forms, and aims at lower costs and better coordination. The deregulated form of government allows greater managerial freedom and creativity in carrying out tasks. Peters points out that citizen participation has been a dominant political theme of the 1990s in the United States and in Britain.

Table 3. *Four Models of Government (Peters 1996, 19).*

	Market Government	Participate Government	Flexible Government	Deregulated Government
Principal diagnostic	Monopoly	Hierarchy	Permanence	Internal regulation
Management	Decentralization	Flatter organizations	Virtual organizations	(no particular recommendation)
Policymaking	Internal markets, Market incentives	TQM, teams	Managing temporary personnel	Greater managerial freedom
Public interest	Low cost	Involvement consultation	Low cost; coordination	Creativity; activism

Lowndes and Skelcher (1998, 318–319) present three ideal models of governance: the Market Model, Hierarchy Model and Network Model (Table 4). Governance by hierarchy corresponds to a bureaucratic relationship with its problems and advantages. The Market Model of governance resolves the relationship of property rights. Flexibility is a key element in this type of governance. The Network Model of governance is based on the assumption that actors can identify complementary interests. Bases of relationship in this form are trust, loyalty and reciprocity. This model of governance is based on voluntary relationships.

Table 4. *Three Modes of Governance (Lowndes & Skelcher 1998, 319).*

	Hierarchy Governance	Market Governance	Network Governance
Normative basis	Employment relationship	Contract, property rights	Complementary strength
Means of communication	Routines	Prices	Relational
Method of conflict resolution	Administrative fiat, Supervision	Haggling, resort to courts	Norm of reciprocity, reputation concerns
Degree of flexibility	Low	High	Medium
Amount of commitment among the parties	Medium	Low	High
Tone or climate	Formal, bureaucratic	Precision and/or suspicion	Open-ended, mutual benefits
Actor preference or choice	Dependent	Independent	Interdependent

Ståhlberg (1998, 53) defines three different paths to take in developing local governance from bureaucratic administration. The paths are liberal, managerial and communitarian. The liberal path refers to privatized public services. The managerial path refers to the public ownership of public service facilities but the more efficient use of them. The communitarian path refers to citizens' own democratic actions and empowerment of local communities within municipalities (Table 5).

Table 5. *Three Paths in Developing Bureaucratic Local Governance (Ståhlberg 1998, 53).*

	Liberal path	Managerial path	Communitarian path
Orientation	Individualistic	Paternalistic	Collectivistic
Civic role	Consumer	Client, user	Citizen
Functionary principles	Incentives for producer, balancing demand and supply	Signals of clients satisfaction, incentives for quality improvements	Formulation of community's will
Forms of participation	Free choice, information of products, consumers' rights	User satisfaction surveys, complaints, consultation	Consumer democracy, community debates, devolution
Limits of influence	Withdrawal, exit, competition	Gossip, public image, evaluation	Persuasion, voice, credibility
Structure	Market, network, horizontality	Decentralization, accountability, verticality	Local autonomy, municipal boards, horizontality
Intellectual base	Economics, public choice	Administration, organization theory	Politics, democracy theory

Newman (2001a, 26–27; 2001b) divides the modes of governance into four directions and states that reform may have an overlapping element in all of the directions (Table 6). The Hierarchy Model describes continuous trust in the formal rationality of bureaucracy and its procedures. The Self-governance Model empowers local communities and people to take responsibility for their own issues. It emphasizes local democracy and participation. The Open Systems Model emphasizes networking between existing organizations but does not entail democracy or citizen empowerment. The Rational Goal Model puts emphasis on Management by Objective, and on the accountability for results. Each of the four categories are based on distinct assumptions pertaining to power and authority, the relationship between the government and the governed, views about change, and source of legitimacy. For example, public administration reforms in the UK have elements of more than one category in its contemporary Third Way.

Table 6. *Four Modes of Governance (Newman 2001a, 26).*

	Continuity, order, emphasis on legitimacy,	Innovation, change, emphasis on delivery,
Differentiation, decentralization	SELF GOVERNANCE MODEL Devolution of power Self-steering networks Associational governance Participatory democracy Expectation by state of “responsible”, self-governing citizens and communities.	OPEN SYSTEMS MODEL Co-governance through networks Reflexive polity process Focus on outcomes Evaluation of outcomes but limited accountability.
Centralization, vertical integration	HIERARCHY MODEL Centralized state control Specification of processes, rules and standards Strong links to representative democracy Audit of conformance with “due process” strengthens accountability but limits capa- city to innovate.	RATIONAL GOAL MODEL Coordination through market mechanisms or managerial power to deliver “what works”. Specification of goals, targets, performance indicators Audit of outputs leading to short- term pragmatism.

The conceptual distinction of centralization or decentralization illustrates how public services must either be firmly coordinated by the authorities or organized bottom-up by the communities (Taylor 2000, 6). A centralized administration is essential when the outcomes must be similar in every case, equality among citizens is important, needs are not affected by politics and solutions are based on genuine wisdom. Public healthcare is a typical example of a centralized way of administering welfare services. A decentralized administration is possible where differences are tolerated, peoples’ needs vary, citizens can take part in the production of services, and there are several competing ways to measure how efforts have succeeded.

Educational and cultural services are examples of the decentralized services, which can be administered in various ways (Table 7).

Table 7. *Centralized and Decentralized Administration (Taylor 2000, 6).*

	Centralized administration	Decentralized administration
Differences in outcome	Unacceptable	Tolerated
Needs	Similar	Vary socially/locally
Citizens' involvement	Limited	Required
Type of solution	One best way	Several competing opinions

Fox and Miller (1995) create interesting alternative typologies for “orthodox”, i.e. rational, bureaucratic and effective scientific management (Table 8). They make reference to how an abundance of contemporary reforms heavily rely on the rigidity of traditional bureaucratic regulations, and how they further increase stiffness. The science of orthodox management, meaning rational bureaucracy, has long since made note of the problems of Tayloristic management.

The Japanese Total Quality Management and other management ideologies have noted the benefits of decentralization and dismantled functional structures. They also reject constitutional or neo-institutional forms of management, since relying more on jurisprudence leads to stagnation. Moreover, they reject communitarian and civic participatory management, because they claim that these neo-communities represent a false sense of community. They developed a fourth model, the “Discursive Model”, for management. By “discursive”, they mean that public authorities should allow people to talk publicly about political issues. They agree that many things can go wrong in these public debates but they present examples of successful city hall meetings and other forums where all, or randomly chosen citizens, have had the opportunity to publicly discuss important issues.

Table 8. *Orthodox Management and Its Three Alternatives (Fox & Miller 1995).*

	Orthodox management	Constitutional and neo-institutional management	Communitarian and civic management	Discursive management
Environment	Modernism	Legalism	Virtuosity	Life-world
Principles	Separation of politics and administration Scientific management Hierarchical control	Constitution Historicism Truth of justice	Tradition Religion Neighborhood Family	Public discussions Interpretations of discussions
Problems	Administration exceeds to politics Human psychology Devolving authority	Conservative Agency Aggrandizement	False consciousness	People not used to participating

There are many similarities within these concepts. Many of these examples show that there are alternative models for the development of public management. The address of reform is in the social well-being of the people. Policy-makers welcome efforts, which increase peoples' awareness of their own problems, capacities, and solutions. The plurality of the examples illustrates that the development of public administration did not end in the privatization era. At this point, I shall not continue to present other alternative scenarios of public administration's reform any further. I will, however, continue to define the concepts of Community Governance.

1.3. Definitions of concepts

The welfare state is an apparatus, which has the authority and capacity to make political and administrative decisions and implement welfare services for citizens. A welfare-bureaucratic solution dictates that both the purchaser and the provider are public, i.e. the public political authorities make the decisions, and the public civil servants implement set tasks. The market oriented-solution involves the notion that the purchaser is public, but the providers are mostly private. The community-oriented solution substantiates that the purchaser of well-being services is a public political authority, but the provider of the service is the community, to which the citizen belongs. Anarchism is a familiar concept, although it can lead thoughts to unfortunate moments in history. Nevertheless, autonomous communities could set their own goals and possess their own means to implement them.

Community is a term, which refers to various kinds of informal and formal associations. Communities can be of various kinds, but all communities have members, i.e. the individual citizens. There are virtual communities, which consist of people who are linked together on the Internet. Family is a basic form of community. A neighborhood is also a community. Associations and cooperatives are forms of community. A municipality, village or town is also a community.

Some forms of community are more abstract. A country and an ethnic group are often mentioned as communities. The Nordic welfare state is an ultimate fulfillment of the Hegelian concept of community as Lehtonen (1990) states. There are larger entities of communities such as the European Union, or the Islamic community ("ummah"), or even more abstractly, the "international community", which refers to the countries that allied with the US and fought against Iraq in 1990 and 2003. According to Bellah (1998, 16–19), a good community is one where there is agreement concerning the meaning of shared values and goals, and a certainty about how they will actualize in everyday life. Community is a form of an intelligent, reflective life, in which there is a consensus, but where the consensus can be challenged and changed – often gradually, sometimes radically – over time.

Communities are webs of social relations that encompass shared meanings and shared values. Communities need not to be geographically concentrated. Contemporary communities are part of a pluralistic web of communities. People are members of several communities at the same time. These communities can be professional, residential and others. It is best to think about communities nested, each within a more encompassing one. Thus, neighborhoods are parts of more encompassing suburbs or cities or regional communities. These, in turn, often intersect with larger ethnic, racial, or professional communities. And most communities are contextualized by the national society. (Etzioni 1998, xiii–xiv.)

In this article, I refer to communities as organizations or informal social entities, which are outside public sector organizations. Large, private companies are also outside the concept. For the purposes of this article, families, tenants' boards, neighborhoods, voluntary associations, and villages are examples of communities. The boundaries are not clear, since municipality is a community, but at the same time, it is also part of the public sector.

Community needs its mental motivation, the community spirit. Community spirit implies an agreement concerning the meaning of shared values and goals, and how they will actualize in everyday life. Community spirit can be an expression of desire, rather than an accurate description of a situation. Therefore, it can be irrational and exclusive. It refers to practical means of furthering social and material refurbishment of neighborhoods, towns and larger local areas. Forms of community spirit include mutual trust, social connections, peoples' rate of participation, voting rate in democratic elections, community and individual empowerment, and various bottom-up initiatives.

The re-organization of public health, social, employment and environmental services continue but reforms are just not applying the New Public Management. Communities outside the public sector represent underutilized resources. Shared governance, social capital, empowerment, the Third Way, subsidiarity, communitarianism, partnership, reinventing, and compassionate conservatism are today's different expressions for Community Governance reforms. Community Governance denotes the idea that public authorities evolve the sense of community and raise community spirit in various communities. It means that the central government's authorities support and empower citizens, neighborhoods, associations, racial minorities, socially oppressed people, entrepreneurs and others to take better care of their own well-being. It consists of four arenas, as Hartley (2002, 420) has defined:

-
- Shaping and supporting the development of grass-roots communities
 - Negotiating and mobilizing effective partnership with other public, private and voluntary agencies
 - Voicing the needs and interests of the local community in regional, national, European and international arenas
 - Managing local authority organizations and giving their services a clear strategic direction.

There is growing international recognition that fundamentally different types of governance, public management and front-line delivery of local public services are required. Complex social problems, problems concerning an aging population, rising crime, and poor community safety long for new solutions. Merely pouring more tax money into social transfers or increasing the duties of public social and healthcare workers is not enough. The focus should be on empowering citizens to improve their own well-being. Privatization of top-down Keynesian welfare-state services is not the solution since it merely creates new problems. A flatter welfare management structure, the establishment of area offices, making counseling services more accessible, and decentralizing decision-making bring the organization closer to citizens. Establishing informal advisory groups and a citizens' jury increase bottom-up influence and empower citizens.

One central building block in Community Governance is the citizens' responsibility to the community. A prerequisite of public authorities involves the idea that people and communities are responsible for their own bottom-up actions. Those citizens who are not behaving in a responsible manner are violating the interests of the other members of the community. Responsibility is given back to individuals by leaving, supporting, or forcing them to take care of themselves. Public authorities yield tasks to the bottom level, withdraw from responsibility and allocate part of them to the communities. Practical forms include, for example, partial budgeting, removing bureaucratic obstacles from self-aid, or requiring obedience from citizens in exchange for social transfers.

High morality is typical in Community Governance programs. Projects that deal with social exclusion or criminality or otherwise improve community spirit may have spiritual and religious motivation. Social problems are solved by mental upbringing, with the help of churches or other faith-based organizations. Conservative, old-fashioned values return, as they are considered to be valid even today. Zero tolerance ("shaming, blaming, jailing") is the ultimate tool to confirm a citizen's awareness of her/his responsibility to the community. If a crime is repeated, the criminal will be publicly shamed or sent to prison.

A “good life” is a philosophical, Neo-Aristotelian term which means living a virtuous life and not harming oneself or fellow citizens (Haatanen 1997, 39). A synonym to the word “good” is “well-being”. The role of the state and welfare services is to secure the well-being of the population (Giddens 2001, 340). Well-being as an objective means that citizens enjoy emotional, economical and social safety. There are also other derivatives, which can be included in well-being, such as the equality of people or the feeling of belonging. The aim of Community Governance theories is well-being in a broad sense. Well-being is a collective concept; it refers to an individual’s well-being in the company of other people. The libertarian, ego-centric “me” is not enough, because “I” am not able to live well with “my self-interest” without other people, the “community”.

New Public Management methods consist primarily of market-oriented modes of governance, whereas there are also other reforms, which basically do not apply the market mechanism. Those reforms can be labeled as Community Governance reforms. Both are types of public withdrawals. Forms of Community Governance in public services entail the notion that public hierarchies no longer implement welfare tasks. Communities take control of the well-being of the citizens, set their own independent goals, and have their own traditional means, or otherwise, to implement them.

One aim of Community Governance is efficiency. The efficient use of taxpayers’ money in public education, public health and social care, and public safety is always an important objective. The institutional welfare state has experienced more and more difficulties in producing these services within a budget. Therefore the responsibility of maintaining and improving well-being in becoming more efficient is given back to the communities.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Ideas of what makes up a good community are not new. The communitarians have not invented the idea of communities, as there are many older theories connected to the concept of community. They vary from older and to newer, from theoretical or more practical. Numerous theories and practices of social work have benefited from the concept. Belonging to a state and obeying the rule of the state has caused controversy and many authors have rejected the state as being a particularly supreme or novel form of community. On the contrary, the state has been seen as an ultimate evil to “natural” communities.

2.1. Classical themes

Since Antiquity, there has been debate concerning whether human beings are a part of a larger entity or whether one should consider herself/himself an individual. Individualism and collectivism are the main topics in the debate about human nature. The classical philosophers Plato and Aristotle were both collectivists; they perceived that people need community to achieve happiness. The Enlightenment was an 18th-century philosophy, by which natural science, individualism and “rational reasoning” began to replace the values of community.

2.1.1. Communitarianism

In recent discussion, “Neo-Aristotelianism” has been used to refer to strands of social analysis and philosophical argumentation. The term has been identified with a neo-conservative social diagnosis of the late capitalist societies. Such societies are viewed as suffering from a loss of moral and civilized orientation, caused by excessive individualism, libertarianism, and general liberalism, when faced with the task of establishing fundamental values. (Benhabib 1992, 24–25.)

Plato’s main focus concerned a perfect society. He created an outline for a utopian society in his book, *Republic*, out of his derision for the tensions of political life. His message stated that the state is necessary for the well-being of the people. The state guarantees a perfect society. Aristotle, Plato’s student, was not concerned with the theoretical principles of a perfect society. He wanted to improve the existing one. Aristotle suggested that the society itself should reach for the best possible system that could be attained. Community-oriented thoughts can be best found in Aristotle’s works *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*.

Aristotle discussed when a human being's life is at its best and how the state can be organized to benefit the lives of most human beings. Aristotle denoted how the state is also a community. Human beings should be virtuous to achieve the final aim, "eudaimonia", which means happiness. Without membership in a community, human beings are either bad or above humanity: a tribeless, lawless, heartless human being. Aristotle says,

- "But he who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god, he is no part of state... That is why, if he has not excellence (virtue), he is most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony."

Only in a community (state, village, family) can a human being act virtuously and become happy. Virtues (or "human excellences") are common to all people; private virtue of a single individual does not exist. A human being has his task, "telos", which he can only achieve in a community. (Aristotle 1991, 1730–1737, 1747, 1986–1988.)

During the Enlightenment, Utilitarian philosophers (Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill) calculated how to maximize the benefit of most human beings. Liberalists (John Locke, Adam Smith) emphasized individual freedom. The development of human rights, natural sciences, rational reasoning, technical development and other reforms in society put trust in individualism and scientific evidence. Jean-Jacques Rousseau essentially linked individual freedom to life within a collective. Immanuel Kant described how the free will of individuals could be combined with the benefit of others. Taylor (1995) describes how traditional values have declined since the Enlightenment until now. Modern life in a welfare state is based on juridical, technical and economic calculations which the Enlightenment introduced.

The term "Neo-Aristotelian" is most often used to designate the position of the "communitarians", who grieve for the decline of moral and political communities in modern societies. Communitarians are critical towards globalism, capitalism and technology (Benhabib 1992, 25); however, they should not be seen as anti-liberal, but, rather, as a branch of liberalism (Lutz 2000). The word "communitarianism", as used in the 19th century, meant a community formed to put into practice communistic or socialistic theories. Since then, the meaning has changed and it now refers most often to a conservative ideology (Etzioni 1997, ix; Haatanen 2000, 281; Milbank 2000). Byrne (1999, 31) makes a distinction between moral communitarianism, which assigns responsibility to individuals, and socio-economic communitarianism, which indicates some awareness that market capitalism is an unstable system that requires collective regulation.

Haatanen (1997, 99–100) makes a distinction between philosophical and sociological communitarianism. Philosophical communitarianism denotes that the community forms a deep, fundamental background of all human existence. Some of the critics of liberal theory never identified themselves with the communitarian movement, but the communitarian label was pinned on them by others (Laitinen 1998, 177). Philosophical communitarianism considers individualism in liberal theories as a utopia, since human beings cannot make decisions completely autonomously. Communitarians criticize Isaiah Berlin's concept of "Negative Liberty" (freedom from community) because, they state, people who have become too liberalized are not aware of common values. According to communitarians, liberty is a positive concept (human beings are free in a community), as opposed to Berlin's term. Communitarians disagree with Rawls' (1973) theory of justice. The main target of criticism has been Rawls' description of justice as a self-evident value from which the structure of a social system can be appraised. Whereas Rawls presented his theory of justice as universally true, communitarians argued that the various standards of justice must be found in various forms of life and traditions of particular societies. Hence, they may vary from context to context. (Riihinen 1996, 78; Bell 2002.)

Sandel (1984) comments on how liberalism relates to justice. An increasing amount of individual rights does not ensure common will, but disturbs the well-being of other people. Walzer (1987) expresses worry concerning the religious commitment of former Christians. MacIntyre (1984, 180–255) says that modern philosophy and Western people have lost their will to strive for virtues. He refers to Aristotle and says that people need virtues in order to be humans. MacIntyre's understanding is that modern systematic politics, whether liberal, conservative, radical or socialist, must be reformed from a point of view in which it owes allegiance to the tradition of virtues.

Taylor (1979; 1989; 1995) has explained the rise of individualism. Modern individualism developed during the Enlightenment, when Descartes, Locke and Kant developed forms of individual reasoning. Descartes replaced Plato's theory of ideas, which prevailed at the time, with his own rational, scientific logic. Locke's view of personal disengagement and reification of human psychology was considered radically subjectivist during his times. Kant insisted that morality could not be founded outside the human rational will, which was a rejection of all ancient moralities ("cosmic order"). These three classic authors established modern science, the modern concept of Western political liberal philosophy and the concept of morality. This led to chaos according to Taylor, since the development of disengaged, self-responsible reason has tended to authorize the subject as "unsituated", even as a punctual self. Taylor (1989, 507–508) says:

- “A total and fully consistent subjectivism would tend towards emptiness; nothing would count as a fulfillment in a world in which literally nothing was important but self-fulfillment”. “...the lapse of traditional standards, coupled with the belief of technique, makes people cease to trust their own instinct about happiness, fulfillment and how to bring up their children.”

Taylor (1995, 138–147) refers to de Tocqueville and to the principle of “subsidiarity”. Local issues must be kept local and the autonomy of the local people is important. He sees possibilities in the development of information technology by which citizens’ interests could again be channeled to the decision-making of common issues. Modern society can be so fragmented that atomized citizens are not able to express common will. Citizens think more individualistically and pay less attention to the issues at the society level. People may belong to single-issue communities (local community, ethnic, religious or ideological groups), but they are not interested in the rest of the society. Taylor mentions the juridification of the American society where the rights of individuals and ex-post court judgments more often replace political decision-making. Court judgments take place between two contesting opponents, and the outcome is non-compromising. The final judgments eventually guide all similar cases in the future as prejudgments; therefore democracy and participation, and political decision-making and planning have become less important.

Kymlicka (1990, 206–207) comments that the philosophical communitarians challenge many of the standard assumptions about the nature and value of self-determination. The community’s way of life forms the basis for publicly ranking the conceptions of the good, and the weight given to an individual’s preferences depends on how much she or he conforms or contributes to the common good. The public pursuit of the shared ends, which define the community’s way of life, is not, therefore, constrained by the requirement of neutrality. It takes precedence over the claim of individuals on the resources and liberties needed to pursue their own conceptions of the good. The state should encourage people to adopt conceptions of the good that conform to the community’s way of life, while discouraging anything that conflicts with it. A communitarian state involves publicly ranking the value of different ways of life. Communitarians object to both the liberal idea of self-determination and to the supposed connection between self-determination and neutrality.

The key figure associated with American sociological communitarianism is Etzioni who set the tone of the 1990s with his work *The Moral Dimension* (1988) (Lutz 2000, 341). He gathered a group of philosophers and political scientists around him and created a magazine, *The Responsive Community*, where communitarian thoughts could be fashioned. They criticize the libertarians, neoclassical economists, rational

choice political scientists, law-and-economics legal scholars and other laissez-faire liberals. The major ideas of the sociological communitarian movement are as follows (Etzioni 1997, xxv–xxxix):

- All citizens belong to interdependent and overlapping communities
- A communitarian perspective recognizes both individual human dignity and the social dimension of human existence
- Citizens acquire a lively sense of personal and civil responsibilities
- Communities and polities have obligations, including the duty to be responsive to their members and to foster participation and deliberation in social and political life
- A communitarian perspective does not dictate particular policies, but keeps in mind what is ignored in policy debates, the social side of human nature, the responsibilities that must be created by citizens, the fragile ecology of families, etc.
- A responsive community is one whose moral standards reflect basic human needs for all its members.

Etzioni has formulated his thoughts into concrete guidelines. He is not a social conservative or a religious fundamentalist and does not demand returning to the past but makes compromises concerning traditional values and the demand of the modern, individual way of life. Social order must be balanced with autonomy. The community's value of superiority is not taken for granted since individuals retain the right to adopt the values she or he accepts. Correspondingly, the community has legitimate expectations concerning the responsibilities of the individual members. Etzioni's philosophy is responsive to the individual, which is why he calls his clan the "responsive communitarians". (Etzioni 1996, 5, 254; 1999, 198.)

The decline of traditional social values forms the central tension in his thoughts. He claims that traditional American values have deteriorated, and self-interest has become a celebrated issue. The rate of crime, corruption and ethnic diversity has increased leading to the hiring of more police, drug agents, inspectors, border patrols, etc. These public interventions have not resulted in a safer, better society.

Morality is still important as the law's scope is only limited to that which is supported by the citizens' moral voice. In a communitarian society, values are handed down from generation to generation and they are not invented or negotiated. Since the existing values are bound to history and culture, they are not created or agreed upon. The same basic values of a good society, which were valid generations ago,

are valid even today although society has changed. (Etzioni 1996, 64–71, 138, 196–208; 1999, 198.)

The declined institution of family longs for moral anchoring once again. Child-bearing is important work and must be honored. Etzioni (1996, 160–216) insists that bringing children into the world entails a moral responsibility to provide material necessities as well as moral education and character formation. Two-parent families are able to discharge their child-rearing duties better than single parents in general. Divorces should be avoidable since they are not in the interest of children. Divorce laws should be modified to signal society's concern of the importance of marriage. Etzioni urges that all educational institutions should recognize and take seriously the grave responsibility of providing moral education. Traditional values such as tolerance, dignity of all people, peace, truth-telling, etc. ought to be taught. Education must be organized to achieve better integration between work and schooling. Many businesses that employ school students part-time ought to recognize that they are educators too.

Etzioni refers to Aristotle by saying that a person who is completely private has lost civic life. Caring, sharing, and being each other's brothers' and sisters' keeper are essential in preventing an ever-increasingly expansive government, bureaucratized welfare agencies and increasing regulation, police, courts and jails. Communitarians proposed the question of balance between individual rights and social responsibilities, between autonomy and the common good, a major concern. A good society requires an order that is parallel to the moral commitments of its members. Other forms of social order will only lead to high social costs, such as withdrawing from the working world, abuse of intoxicants, and a high occurrence of psychosomatic illnesses. In a good society members share voluntary commitment to a set of core values, instead of being forced to accept them. If there are a large number of police officers, tax auditors and inspectors, then there is a deficient moral order. (Etzioni 1996, 12–13; 1998, xii–xiii.)

The sociological communitarians had concrete advises and opinions concerning everyday problems and even the future of society. The US Democratic Party, especially, has adopted an abundance of the rhetoric in question, which was later copied by the Republicans, although Etzioni (1998, xviii) wanted to keep the communitarian message clear to avoid the labeling of it as an ideology adopted by all parties. Etzioni (1993, 4–15) built an agenda on balanced rights and responsibilities. A stop should be put to the manufacturing of new rights; claiming rights without assuming responsibilities is unethical and illogical, as responsibilities without rights are impossible. He wrote that free individuals require a community, one that supports them against encroachment by the state and sustains morality by drawing on the gentle prodding of kin, friends, neighbors, and other community members, rather than building on

government controls or fear of authorities. Etzioni (1996, 143) questions whether or not written laws or the threat of punishment can guarantee the virtuousness of individuals. He says that laws only reflect communities' virtues, and the working law in a good society is based on the continuity or morality of the people.

Communitarians are a social movement aiming at shoring up the moral, social and political environment. Without societal morality, public authorities are overburdened and markets do not function properly. Without moral commitment, people act without any consideration of one another. Freedom from governmental controls does not mean that they should also be free from responsibilities, or to be indifferent to the community. Communities provide social webs, as do neighborhoods, places of employment, and clubs and associations. The webs bind individuals to a group of people who care for one another and who help communities to achieve a civic, social, and moral order. (Etzioni 1993, 248–249.)

Etzioni (1993, 263–264) says that the core of social justice lies in the notion of reciprocity, each member of the community owes something to all the rest, and the community owes something to each of its members. Justice requires responsible individuals in a responsive community. The society can be made “more responsive” rather than fully responsive, because evidence strongly suggests that built-in contradictions can be significantly reduced but not eliminated (Etzioni 1996, 3–4).

The problems that Etzioni and other sociological communitarian thinkers discuss are generally problems of the American society. Etzioni (1999) has raised questions concerning dangerous privacy. Etzioni welcomes the listing, shaming and isolation of pedophile criminals, for example, to protect the security of children. He also states that identification cards should be obligatory for helping communities to protect themselves against criminals. A problem arising in the cyber-age entails common data encryption, which he opposes, since encryption also assists criminals in committing crimes. He concludes that selling personal data must be prohibited because it makes people vulnerable; the data may also contain invalid and wrong information. He allows public listings of dangerous criminals. Nevertheless, there is a need for balancing; for example, using medical records and other data is necessary in scientific medical research or in quality or cost control. However, the data must only be used in such a way that it cannot be used for identification purposes or used against individuals.

The contemporary communitarian movement is sometimes seen as anti-liberal, which it is not the case (Selznick 1998a). Communitarians have a strong commitment to political freedom, social justice, constitutional rights, rule of law, full citizenship, and a special concern for the poor and the oppressed. Communitarian morality recognizes the compelling power of liberal ideas while it also notes that

much liberal rhetoric, philosophy, and policy has been overly individualistic, ahistorical, and insufficiently sensitive to the social sources of selfhood and obligation. For communitarians, the common good is a major concern. Moral equality refers to the treatment of people as equals, invested with inherent dignity and responsibility, to grant them the right to define the good and pursue the good in their own way. Selznick (1998b, 61–71) states that moral equality and social inclusion, as well as equal opportunity are the values of communitarians and libertarians. Communitarians and most other liberals are concerned with the same issues—equality, liberty, rationality and the common good—but they have a different perspective.

In recent years a debate has revolved around the notion of Asian values, a term devised by several Asian officials and their supporters for the purpose of challenging Western-style civil and political freedoms. Asian communitarians claim that they place special emphasis upon family and traditional social harmony, which is based on thousands of years of culture. These administrative systems are based on traditions of village communities, village elders, local princes and prince bishops. The caste system is a good example of the Asian religion that is based on citizens' traditional class segregation. Democracy, equal rights of the citizens and equal opportunities, civil rights and the principle of parliamentarianism are imported ideas for the Asians. Some Asian politicians defend their own systems saying that they represent the Asian communitarianism, a concept which binds the long history of civilization to today's system. During 20th-century development in Asia, Confucian traditions have been forced to deal with the rise of communism and market economics thereafter. Democracy in the Western sense is rare, and the authoritarian regimes in Asia like to create antagonism between the "individualistic West" and the "communitarian Asia".

Asian individuals do not break codes of tradition, but defend the prosperity of their own clan, which is accepted as proper conduct. Surveys pertaining to international value systems have indeed verified statistical deviation between the values of the Asian people and the occidental people. Inglehart (1971, 1977) was one of the first to discover the statistically significant difference in global values. Inglehart (2000) has also illustrated that improvement in the economic situation improves the possibility to maintain a democratic system. Rokeach's (1973, 1979) survey on value systems, which contains a list of 18 specific basic values, also indicates statistically significant differences in values in different hemispheres. Hofstede (1984) invented the term "power distance", which means how far away the people are between the bottom and the elite of the society, a long distance being typical in the Asian cultures. Schwartz's (1992) international value system surveys also indicate that values vary between the Western societies and the Eastern societies. In the Asian societies, the individual has more obligations to the family, relatives, community and culture, which preserves the individual's relative position in the community.

In Asia, the life of the people is linked more closely to religion, cf. Confucius's thoughts. The basic values of Confucianism are love for one's fellows, filial piety, decorum, virtue, and the idea of the superior man. A sensible ruler rules the Confucian society like a father rules his family. Another Chinese philosophical system is Taoism, founded by Lao-tzu. The central concept involves the "Tao" (the "Way"), an elusive and irrational concept denoting the force inherent in nature and the code of behavior that is in harmony with the natural order. Hindus, Buddhists and various animists respect forefathers and make sacrifices to souls and spirits. (Heikkilä-Horn & Miettinen 2000, 36.)

In China and other parts of East Asia, the family was the predominant social and economic institution in the agricultural society, and in many respects it furnished the theoretical model for other institutions, such as the patriarchal dynastic state. Confucianism emphasizes human respect, personal responsibility and mutual support. Confucianism also emphasizes the respect of seniority and the relationship between child and parents. Traditionally, these aspects have been linked with village community. (De Bary 1998, 17–29.)

Muslims spread Islam from Arabia to the Far East and North Africa. The Islamic term "ummah" means that Muslims are melted together into the Islamic global community despite differences in their racial or ethnic origins. Muslims live under the rule of Islam, understand it, embrace it and have become one community until the Day of Judgment. It should never happen that any people (or ethnic group), who has embraced Islam, apostatize from it. (Hizb ut Tahrir 2002.)

Asian interpretations state that the government should not militate against the Confucian ideal of traditional community life. Islamic fundamentalists have similar opinions. Western critics state that the Confucian tradition in China can be used to legitimate authoritarian administration. They also state that Islamic countries have introduced communitarian identity as the "jihad" (an effort to expand the territories ruled by Muslims at the expense of territories ruled by non-Muslims) or "purdah" (seclusion of women from public observation), and it is often the case that the women, children, peasantry and laborers maintain the authentic cultural identity. Asians prioritize individuality, community, and rights and responsibilities differently than in the West. The Chinese would be more willing to sacrifice a civil or political liberty in cases of conflict with a social or economic right; for example, there may be wide support for restrictions on the internal movement of farmers if these are necessary to guarantee the right to subsistence. In the West, the priority would definitely be set on the peoples' right of free movement. Different priorities, assigned to rights, between East and West can be of great significance when it comes to decisions about democracy, rationality, and rightness. (De Bary 1998; Bell 2002; Noor 2002.)

Communitarian initiatives have met with an abundance of criticism. Communitarianism can refer to too many dissimilar things. Communitarianism can be seen as a “correction” of liberalism, but the communitarians do not relate how their theories work in practice. The communitarians do not provide constructive answers as to why their communities would not eventually become racist, introverted, and segregated (Haatanen 1997, 97–111; 2000, 283). Koskiahio, Nurmi and Virtanen (1999, 178) claim that American communitarianism does not accommodate with European cultural heritage. Sirkku Hellsten (1998, 55–57) expresses doubt about the types of service production a government could have under communitarian rule? They refrain from calling themselves a political party, but every change they try to afford is political. She poses a practical question: which welfare tasks should be allotted the responsibility of voluntary activism? Hellsten notes that the communitarians refer to apolitical, small communities as ideal systems. They ignore the traditional Left – Right gap, and therefore their aim is apparently an apolitical civil society. In the American communitarian movement, there is simply too much of something for everyone.

Criticism, in regards to the importance and essence of communitarianism, is closely connected to its theoretical relationship to liberalism. Kymlicka (1990, 215–230) writes that individuals are capable of questioning and rejecting the value of the community’s way of life, and then the attempt to discourse such questioning through a “politics of the common good” seems an unjustified restriction on peoples’ self-determination. Liberals and communitarians both aim to secure the range of options from which individuals make their autonomous choices. Kymlicka concludes that liberals fail to recognize that people are naturally social beings. Liberals think that society rests on artificial social contracts, and that state power is needed to keep naturally asocial people together in society. Communitarians believe that people naturally form and join social relations and forums in which they come to understand and pursue the good. The state is not needed to provide that communal context, and the state is likely to distort the normal processes of collective deliberations and cultural development.

Cochran (1989, 430–432) assesses communitarian discourse in political theory and finds it increasingly attracts commentators and critics who develop two related points. First, they defend liberalism with communitarian attacks. In particular, they defend the notion of “Self” in liberal theory. Secondly, they argue that focus on community undermines liberal tolerance and human rights. The theory of community is also said to be too thin. Communitarians have focused a great amount of attention on criticizing liberal theory resulting in a situation where they have not sufficiently delineated all of the elements of community. Moreover, they have not discussed in depth the ways in which the individual and community interact.

Bauman (1996, 89) concludes that communitarianism is not a remedy for the inherent defects of liberalism. Both communitarianism and liberalism are projections of dreams born of real contradictions inherent in the plight of autonomous individuals. Each one is a one-sided projection, which, for the sake of its own coherence, tends to gloss over the elimination of its bases. Community without freedom is a project as horrifying as freedom without community.

2.1.2. Catholic Christianity

Thoughts behind Community Governance can also be found in the philosophy of Christianity. The appeal to Christian values resonated deeply into Christian countries and provided a socially powerful justification for the emerging welfare state. Medieval Christian notions lie at the root of modern concepts, such as democracy, and balance among branches of the state, freedom of conscience, and limited government.

The first major step in developing a comprehensive religious teaching concerning a citizen-state relationship came in the fifth century with the publication of Saint Augustine's (354–430 A.D.) work *De Civitate Dei* (St Augustine 2005, Books V, XV, XIX). St Augustine believed that the state is an unnatural institution and, if the human race had never fallen, the state would not be necessary. Man had fallen, however, and that meant the state was necessary to control vice and to promote public virtues, especially the common good. Nevertheless states were limited in what they could achieve in this realm. The church alone could provide mankind with the fullness of truth and salvation. Yet even in the limited sphere of the state, justice was necessary for the state's functions. Otherwise, the state reflected the sinful desire to dominate others and was nothing more than "a large gang of bandits".

In the Middle Ages, several ideas were added to the basic Augustinian heritage. One of the most important was the recognition of a difference between the temporal and spiritual powers, which Pope Gelasius I first formulated in the year 494. God himself had designed distinct roles for the church in the spiritual realm and for the state in the temporal realm. The beginning of the separation of church and state had emerged in the Christian West. Pope Gelasius' teaching was probably meant to secure the autonomy of the church, but it also gave the state a more positive role compared to the beliefs of St Augustine. (Medieval sourcebook 2005.)

A major step in developing this insight occurred in the thirteenth century with the work of St Thomas Aquinas. He emphasized the work of the Greek philosopher Aristotle as a guide to the positive functions the state could exercise. St Thomas

Aquinas believed that the state was a natural institution for several reasons. Mankind can only reach full development through communities and can only do certain things within properly constituted political systems. Thomas said that human beings are born into the community of the family and are dependent on it for years in order to survive. The family provided an indispensable basis for both the private and public good. However, the state, too, is a necessary community in making sure that families do not merely become feuding tribes. Both the divine and paternal governments extend to the individual, not merely as a member of society, but as a person subsisting in her/his own nature by her-/himself. Thomas revived Aristotle's idea of the state meeting the essential demands of human nature. The state is more than a remedy for the Fall; it is also a natural expression of human nature. (St Thomas Aquinas 2005.)

Catholicism's still more communitarian bent has its sources in medieval developments. Protestant religion supports individualism; a Protestant acts individually and makes the most use of the fellow members of the society to save her/his soul (Työrinoja 1998, 74). Therefore, the Protestant is more independent from the church, from the state and from other communities. Catholics have more ties to the community.

During the 19th century, utopian communities were founded in America on the basis of the principles of Christianity and socialism. French Etienne Cabet inspired the foundation of numerous Christian communities in America. Many 19th-century philosophers also argued for a community-based "happy medium" between laissez-faire capitalism and socialism (Hudelson 1999, 49, 61). Before the Second World War, Pope Pius XI (2002) also emphasized the principle of subsidiarity, stating that Christian communal civic activity is important as a front to rising totalitarian ideologies such as fascism and communism.

2.1.3. Community philosophy

After the Enlightenment philosophical theories deviated from dogmatic Christianity, and various secular philosophers wrote about the relationship of human beings with the traditional community and its values. German philosophers, especially, are worth mentioning.

One important philosophic descendant of Plato's state centralism and Aristotle's natural community is Georg W.F. Hegel. Hegel (1999, #356) writes about the relationship between the "wholeness" and the "part":

- “...Ohne Ganzes gibt es keine Theile... sie haben Selbständigkeit nur im Ganzen, das aber zugleich die den Theilen andere Selbständigkeit ist”.

His philosophy is often complicated and contradictory, but he concluded that every human being belongs to a community, and the state especially is the highest form of community. Hegel came to the same conclusion as Antiquity’s philosophers, but he applied different vocabulary and logics. By “Sittlichkeit” Hegel means that the private life of the people and families should be attached firmly to the will of the state, and that a particular ethico-political community is more valuable than the value of any single individual (Kotkanvirta 1998, 101, 104). According to Hudelson’s (1999, 66) interpretation of Hegel’s thoughts, people are born into families, nationalities, religions, races, genders, and social classes. The way people look at the world and the way they feel about it are products of historical circumstances and people are expressions of their own time.

Hegel’s philosophy is opposite to Nietzsche’s ultra-individualism (MacIntyre 1984, 56; Pietarinen & Poutanen 1998, 168–170). Nietzsche (1969) wrote that the older a moral, virtue or value is, the more revered it becomes. People accept postulates without proof because it is tradition. Nietzsche (1969, 134) wrote that all communities consist of weak persons and their values are the values of weak people. Strong visionary individuals avoid joining communities of the weak, but use the weak people for their own benefit without a guilty conscience. Owen (1995, 138) explains that Nietzsche’s antipathy towards traditions and virtuosity pertains to individual self-understanding as a product of a complex history of the entwinement of judgment and agency in the life of a community. Communities and traditions hinder individual development, while the purpose is to restore the quality of the individual’s life. Nietzsche realized the malfunctions of communities and wanted to restore the quality of individual life.

The dispute about good or bad communities continues even today in Germany. Heidegger (1996, 113, 121) explained that human existence (“Da-sein”) means being constantly with others (“Mitda-sein”). He continues the classical dispute between individualism and collectivism, the eternal philosophical topic, with other words:

- “... I ‘am’ not in the sense of my own self, but I am the others in the mode of the they. ...In terms of the they, and as the they, I am initially ‘given’ to ‘myself’”.

2.2. Citizens' autonomy

2.2.1. Anarchism

Community-oriented thoughts also have anarchistic roots. Anarchists denied the meaning and importance of government. They demanded that citizens' civic communities should replace governments. Villages and workers' unions, which act independently, could better benefit the ordinary citizens. The state represented only meaningless wars and greedy capitalism.

Proudhon was a 19th-century French, anti-governmental anarchist. He was not a communist in the Marxian sense, although he was familiar with Marx and the popular socialistic themes of those times. Proudhon had personally experienced injustice by governmental institutions, which prompted him to begin writing about how society could be fair to its citizens. He wanted to abolish public administrative systems, private property and religion. He wanted to establish contracts and local laws in place of governmental laws. (Woodcock 1972, 51, 98, 171; Nozick 1974, 11; Hudelson 1999, 48.)

In his work, *General Idea of Revolution in the Nineteenth Century*, Proudhon expresses his often-quoted dislike of bureaucrats:

- “To be governed means to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so...”

Bakunin, a Russian-born nobleman, became another key figure in European Anarchism in the mid-19th century. He promoted revolutionary consciousness and socialistic instincts in Switzerland and elsewhere in Continental Europe. He considered himself a collectivist, not a communist. Workers should strive to create their future world in the very heart of the existing world alongside, but altogether separated, from it. Capitalistic society has been unfair and ordinary people have suffered due to a militant state. Bakunin (1992a, 51) wrote:

- “The State, and the law which expresses it, exists only to perpetuate the slavery of the people for the benefit of the bourgeois. ... Political equality will be an illusion so long as economic and social equality do not exist, so long as minority can become rich, property owning, and capitalist through inheritance.”

Freedom, welfare, peace, and education for all, as well as political, economic, social equality and work for all comprise Bakunin's values, which he thought, along

with other anarchists, were achievable by abolishing the state and private property. Bakunin (1992b, 140) describes the state as:

- "...an authority, domination, and force, organized by the property-owning and so-called enlightened classes against the masses".

Bakunin taught about class struggle and the use of violence in certain circumstances, and he denied the possibility of compromise between workers and the bourgeois. Bakunin (1992b, 147) also welcomed conspiratorial activity to achieve a just society. He shared Proudhon's ideas of rejecting the state and wished to replace it by a federal structure of independent economic and social communities. He wanted to see the society and the property organized from below upwards (Woodcock 1972, 275–277; Cutler 1992, 15–17). Bakunin's (1992b, 146) solutions were the associations:

- "But how to reach this paradise? ... For this, the workers have a single mean, association. Through associations they educate and enlighten one another, and by their own efforts they end this deadly ignorance, which is one of the main causes of their slavery. Through associations they learn to aid, to know, and to support one another, and in the end their influence will be greater than all the bourgeois interests and all political powers put together."

Kropotkin was another Russian-born nobleman, a third key figure in anarchism in the 19th century. Kropotkin (1974; 1995) outlined in his works a society, which combines labor-intensive agriculture and small-scale industry. A worker-controlled federation of self-governed workshops and networks of small, self-sufficient communities linked with voluntary agreement were his idealistic visions of an economic structure. The parliamentary system should be abolished, as well as the capitalist rule and the wages system. The simple right to the well-being of the individuals and families were humble aims, while the "right to work" referred more accurately to "the right to work like a slave and be exploited by capitalists".

Kropotkin rejected all forms of government, whether representative or authoritarian, from parliamentary democracy to the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat. An anarchist-communistic society could only be achieved by means of social revolution carried out by the people themselves, bottom-up. He did not express to what extent violence should be used to achieve that, but violence played a lesser role for Kropotkin than for other anarchists. (Shatz 1995, xvii.)

The anarchists' plans were quite different compared to communistic opinions. Engels (2002) stated in 1847 that communism is the doctrine of the conditions of the liberation of the proletariat. Marx and Engels (2002) conclude in their Communist Manifesto that communism is the abolition of private property; economical activities

were to be confiscated to the state and state-owned industrial and agricultural production was to be favored. History now reveals that all of the proletarian revolutions soon formed into despotic dictatorships (Bauman 1976, 121; Courtois 2000).

2.2.2. Corporatism

Corporatism and its derivatives are systems whereby power is entrenched in the labor market. The central idea of the corporatist movement lies in the notion that every profession is an autonomous community and it can take care of the members' well-being and negotiate the conditions of work with the employers' corporations. The corporative system protects its members, prevents strikes, eases poverty and puts a stop to revolutionary communistic movements. Ideologically, corporatism has many roots. Corporatists reject individualism, socialism, communism, capitalism and state-centralism. (Lehtonen 1990, 156–157.)

There are anarchistic, socialistic, and nationalistic streams which gave plurality to the corporative movement. The bottom-up type of organizing laborers' benefits without the interference of the state is called anarcho-syndicalism. The syndicalists denied central supervision of the state. Fascists accepted the state's role as a supreme community. Nazism went beyond that and created an even more state-centralistic system.

The desire of the anarcho-syndicalists was to free society of all politically and socially coercive institutions that stand in the way of the development of free humanity and a socialistic society (Rocker 2002). In this sense, collectivistic associations of laborers are not to be regarded as closed systems permitting no further development, but merely as economic assumptions as to the means of safeguarding a free community. Trade union organizations should provide workers with an opportunity to achieve the utmost in their struggle against employers, and at the same time provide them with a basis from which they will be able to proceed in a revolutionary position with the reshaping of economic and social life. The aim, a socialist economic order, could not be organized by any central government, not even by a proletarian dictatorship. It entailed the solidarity of workers in which the producers themselves took over the management of all plants in such a way that the separate groups, plants and branches of industry were independent members of the general economic organism. They systematically carried out production and the distribution of the products in the interest of the community on the basis of free mutual agreements. Therefore, anarcho-syndicalism differs from communism.

Anarcho-syndicalism was the dominant, ideal type of governance for radical workers in France, Spain, Italy, Australia, and America. The largest anarcho-syn-

dicalist organization in the United States was the *Industrial Workers of the World*, founded in 1905. The first country to set up workers' societies was Russia, but anarcho-syndicalism as a worldwide radical movement went into decline after the bolshevists' coup d'état. In Spain, the anarcho-syndicalists were pushing for an anarcho-syndicalist revolution in 1936. The military, Catholic Church, fascist party, monarchists and capitalists demolished the syndicalists' republic in the Spanish civil war. (Meyers 2002.)

Fascism manifested in Italy in the 1920s. It represents state centrism where labor and the monopolistic, capitalistic production system were employed for the benefit of the nationalistic state. Mussolini did not believe it would spread elsewhere (Allardyce 1979, 381), but some countries copied it. Fascists underlined state-centered collectivity and national community spirit in their ideology.

Fascism in Italy rose out of the chaotic political situation and economical problems that had lasted a long time there. It was initiated as a Leftist revolution in 1922; however, it later relied on the support of the bourgeois. Hegel posed as one intellectual foundation for fascism by viewing the state as a sacred community and the individual an absolute subservient to the state. Authoritarian governments were powerful enough to fight liberalism, international capitalism, communism and Judaism. Liberalism was rejected since it not only fragmented society into isolated individuals, but it also encouraged the fragmentation of industry into bourgeoisies and proletariat. The most important issue for fascists was the unity of the nation. Religion was also important for Italian fascists. (Whisker 1983.)

Fascism was able to attract followers by offering class solidarity and fabricated, common ethnic heritages and found the enemy within to be those who did not share these characteristics of community. A sense of community was sewn together with the fabric of tradition, customs, language, religion and culture. Those not possessing these characteristics of community were different, hence evil, the cause of the problems of state. Fascist leadership, notably Mussolini, admitted to the multi-faceted influences of liberalism, Marxism, syndicalism, socialism, Catholicism and nationalism in their ideology. The state was the culmination of all human endeavors. Production, full employment, wages, prices, distribution and the like were guaranteed by the state. However, Italian laborers were bound to the bottom-up type of syndicalism, anarchism and radical militancy ("sovversivismo"), rather than independent from the Fascist regime. In comparison, the German working class gladly joined in on war efforts, whereas the Italian working class was reluctant to take any part. (Whisker 1983; Vivarelli 1991, 42; Abse 1996.)

Germany's deprived middle class was frustrated with the Weimar Republic which had been an experiment of the welfare state, but collapsed financially. Nazis ex-

hibited essentially conservative lower-middle class values and heroic symbols of national achievements. Ideology was based on vulgar interpretations of Hegel's and Nietzsche's philosophies, anti-Semitism, anti-communism and social Darwinism. Hitler promised a new moral order, which would compensate for personal devaluation and humiliation by restoring pride of place to the national community ("Volksgemeinschaft"). The Nazis could successfully replace the Weimar Republic's collapsed institutional welfare system through voluntarism and the party's charity, which were also used as a didactic tool to heighten German national community. (Gephart 1996, 25; Burleigh 2000, 223.)

They admired fanatic total obedience and blind fate, which were apparently related to the approval of Catholic rituals (Weisbrod 1996, 30; Burleigh 2000, 99–104, 382–383). Individual rights were subordinate to national community, which entitled collectivistic oppression against the enemies of community. Ideologically, the community consisted of people of the German race ("Volk") and was exclusionary. Laws were instituted to protect and serve the rights of the national community, rather than to defend the rights of the individual against an arbitrary executive. Crimes or deviant attitudes were considered as acts of betrayal toward the national community, and therefore political. Eugenics, sterilization, euthanasia and war were considered as racial regeneration because annihilating the weakest and prohibiting them from reproducing was necessary in vitalizing German national community. (Burleigh 2000, 165.)

Corporatism is still very much alive today, surprisingly, as the Nordic welfare state (Lehtonen 1990, 252). In the Nordic welfare state, the role of the labor unions is so important that the Nordic societies are not centralist states, but corporatist states. The government controls the trade unions and the employers' associations, but without the trade unions' approval, governance would not be possible. The large scope of agreements between political parties and corporations are important in order to fully understand the stability of the Nordic societies. Spithoven (2002, 334) states that collaboration with the state and unions of employers and employees represents modern, successful and democratic corporatism.

During the 1990s, after the collapse of socialism in Russia, anarcho-syndicalism has revived and is now rapidly challenging capitalism and globalization. Noah Chomsky (2002) is one of the most cited authors whose critical attitude against capitalism and globalization is well known. The notion of humanistic community among workers and international solidarity remains as the basis of ideology among anarchistic dissidents. Nation-wide industrial labor unions are still important in abolishing the capitalist system. However, a sense of class warfare, international solidarity, networking and global solidarity are needed to achieve well-being for all people in the working class (Meyers 2002; Industrial Workers of the World 2002.)

Despite the small numbers of anarcho-syndicalists, they have many supporters especially among young people who have demonstrated against global social injustice and pollution. The popularity of the ATTAC movement among leading politicians indicates that ex-socialists have found it to be an intellectually tempting foundation for their personal commitments to democracy, collectivity and the equality of people.

2.2.3. Radical Right

Radical Right ideology is complex, multifaceted and even internally inconsistent. It articulates the role of the community rather inexplicitly; some of the branches of the ideology support capitalism and some support the role of traditional communities. Radical Right, New Right, Neo-conservatives, Paleo-conservatives, Libertarians, Neo-liberals, and Anarcho-capitalists are labels that are cast over the multitude of different theoretical or more practical alternatives to branches within Radical Right.

Today, some anarchist, anti-state ideas are alive within anarcho-capitalism. Rand (1964, 119–128; 1967, 19) advocates capitalism, since it is a social system based on the recognition of individual rights, including property rights, and freedom of state. All human relationships are voluntary in a free society and human beings are free to cooperate. The principle of individuals' rights is the only moral base of all groups or associations. It is better for the individual to live free from all types of despotism. Theoretical philosophy, labeled as "Libertarianism", has partly similar aims compared to the anarcho-capitalistic branch. Rothbard expresses his dislike of public authorities and regulations since they do not represent the majority of the people in any accurate sense. (Rothbard 2002a; the Center for Libertarian Studies 2002.)

Rothbard (2002b) sympathizes with those who were intentionally against the strong militant government and taxing welfare state. Nozick (1974, 4–6, 122, 131) explains that it is morally legitimate to have a protective minimal state, since a situation without a protective state would mean uncertainty for the inhabitants. What persons do to one another, limits what they may do through the apparatus of a state. Most of the Libertarians and the Anarcho-libertarians express their dislike of state very clearly and support the ethos of free capitalism, but they comment very little on the role of community. They do not suggest anarchy, since a situation where no state exists is too uncertain for everyone. Some Libertarians accept the minimal role of the state-community.

Margaret Thatcher, the British neo-conservative prime minister in the 1970s and 1980s, advocated for a strong centralist state with a strong police force and armed

forces. While she liberated the market and privatized public enterprises, she simultaneously centralized public administration and weakened the role of local government. Therefore anarchism, meaning the disappearance of state, definitely would have been a nightmare for her. While representing Radical Right's reforms she was state-oriented, which is quite interesting and it shows the ideological plurality within the ideology.

Community-oriented thoughts do not grind against liberal values as such. Traditional conservative values are often associated with liberal market ideologies. Free markets do not destroy community and community spirit. On the contrary, liberalism reconciles markets and communities with the idea of "micro-conservatism" or networks of communities, which provide each individual with a meaning in life. The role of the minimal state is to sustain a political order in which a multiplicity of communities can survive. (Bevir & Rhodes 2003, 52.)

Common to all Radical Right's thinkers is that they all believe that the centralist welfare state erodes individual responsibility. By fostering dependence on social services, they tempt citizens in refraining from working hard, saving, and behaving in a responsible manner. The radical New Right thinkers emphasize conservative values, delayed gratification, work and saving, commitment to family and the next generation, education and training, self-improvement, and moral upbringing. The voluntary sector embodies virtues that are dear to traditions, such as neighborliness, self-reliance and community solidarity. A special place is reserved for the church in the Radical Right's social policy. (Stoesz & Midgley 1991, 31, 37.)

Conservatism is a branch of liberalism and it probably best describes the mainstream of contemporary, community-oriented thinking in Radical Right. Conservatives strongly favor free markets, but they also prefer self-organization to central control because they believe that the markets' or public administration's control of social life is impossible. Moral community declines when people rely on the government to solve their problems rather than on themselves and those with whom they live. Conservatism involves recognition that moral community is required for the coherence of individual and social life, and that a reasonably coherent community's way of life is a practical necessity. All trends toward individualism and hedonism destroy the possibility of moral community. Conservatives are therefore confident that the moral and social future will resemble the past more than the present. (Conservatism 2003.)

2.3. Social theories

Various concepts can be associated with the discourse of the Community Governance policy. Subsidiarity, partnership, participation, empowerment, and social capital, etc. are often applied both in the strategies and in the practices of social theory.

2.3.1. Sociological perceptions of people in the system

One important root of sociology lies in German romantic historical writings of the 18th and 19th centuries. During those times, people felt it important to demonstrate that there is a national German culture (“Volksgeist”) present in the language, folk-songs, folktales and traditions. Sociology was actually born out of a collectivistic reaction to the individualistic wave availing in those days; therefore one of the core concepts in sociology has always been the community. (Lehtonen 1990, 21.)

Lehtonen (1990, 350) states that the sociological concept of community can be divided and logically dated into four categories. First, the community of tribes and families has existed as long as we can look back into history. Secondly, a community based on status is also an extremely old concept. They consist of guilds, clubs, brotherhoods, secret societies, etc. which have been particularly common in medieval Europe. Thirdly, since medieval times and throughout the evolving of the capitalistic system, people have written specific contracts that state with which economic terms they collaborate; hence, we have communities based on contracts. Communities based on contracts are the predominant form of community even today. Lastly, ideological communities refer to political parties.

Many communities seem to be determined by the Internet, public media, advertisement, common taste or style rather than manifestation of a unified political will. Communities can be virtual, i.e. imagined, or symbolic and simulated as Bauman (1992a, xix) described.

The conceptual distinction between the “home community” and the “cold systems” are more specific in German sociologist Tönnies’ works. Tönnies’ work, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, introduces the more important sociological concepts in the title of the book. The “Herrschaftliche Gemeinschaft” refers to authoritarian family relationships, a form of despotic government or other tyrannical relationship; the “Genossenschaftliche Gemeinschaft” refers to emotional ties within families, relatives and local communities; and the “combined form of Gemeinschaft” is visible in the commitment to marriage or to religion. “Gesellschaft” refers to formal relationships with employees, landlords, the state, debtors, etc. The relationships

between people in communities are always more or less a mixture of these ideal types. (Tönnies 1887; 1965, 19–80; 1974, 174.)

Töttö (1996, 157–160) sums up Tönnies' contribution and states that he was a sociologist who was concerned about the vanishing of true social relationships. "Gemeinschaft"-type communities are based on emotions; they exist on the level of families, villages and towns. Norms and control are based on mutual agreement, habit and religion. "Gesellschaft" is based on rational aims, and is most evident in judicial relations. The law functions as a normative control system. There is a conceptual gap between the "organic" and the "mechanic". Tönnies summarizes the differences between traditional communities and normative "systems".

Durkheim continues with these ideas. He was also influenced by 19th-century German corporatism (Lehtonen 1990, 158). Durkheim (1968, 154–160) wrote in his well-known book, *Suicide*, that active social connections and communities prevent individuals from committing suicide. Durkheim explains that in order to maintain themselves, small communities are obliged to exercise severe control over themselves and subject themselves to especially rigorous discipline. To justify the ever precarious tolerance granted to them, they must practice greater morality. A small confessional community living in a possibly hostile society must become compact and coherent with a strong feeling of self-consciousness.

Durkheim (1968, 160–210) postulates that religion protects human beings against the desire for self-destruction because it constructs a community. The greater the number of dogmas and precepts, the interpretation of which is not left to individual consciences, the more authorities are required to convey their meaning. The more numerous the authorities are, the more closely they surround and the better they restrain the individual. Being capable of supporting a sufficiently intensive collective life is essential. The family is also a powerful safeguard; the stronger its constitution, the greater its protection. Great national wars have the same effect as political disturbances if they excite passions.

Durkheim (1968, 217–240, 241–276) continues by stating that a community can be too strong and force a member to commit a suicide. Altruistic suicide signifies that this sacrifice is imposed by society for social ends, because of duty. Anomic suicide is the result of a lack in regulation and the consequent suffering caused by it.

If the ties within families and other traditional communities are broken, other forms of belonging to community should be established. Durkheim (1968, 378–379) suggests that in addition to the communal support of faith, or family and politics, a society of workers of the same sort would be the answer. An association of members

who cooperate in the same function, i.e., an occupational group or occupational corporation, should be set up. Corporation fulfills the individual's emotional needs. Since it consists of individuals devoted to the same tasks, with solidarity or even combined interests, no soil is better calculated to bear social ideas and sentiments. Its control extends to all parts of life. It is always in contact with the individual by the constant exercise of the functions of which it is the organ and in which the individual collaborates. Wherever the individual is, she/he finds it enveloping her/him, recalling her/him to their duties, supporting her/him in times of need. According to Durkheim, corporation comprises everything needed to give the individual a setting, to draw her/him out of her/his state of moral isolation.

According to Durkheim (1968, 380, 390), the state is not capable of solving the problems of the individual. The state is too cumbersome and too far removed to be able to solve the suicide problem of an individual. Durkheim's way to resolve this is to set up a cluster of collective forces outside the state, though subject to its action, whose regulative influence can be exerted with greater variety. They are close enough to the individual facts, directly and constantly in contact with them, to detect all their nuances and they should be sufficiently autonomous to be able to respect their diversity. Durkheim suggests that a multiplication of the centers of communal life without weakening national unity is the act of occupational decentralization. Occupational groups must be the bases of political organization. He saw that there is no turning back to the previous forms of communities, such as religious societies or large families. Nevertheless, he appreciates the effect of community orientation on the mental welfare of the citizens. Then again, the community can be too tight, resulting in comparable problems.

Max Weber viewed the proliferation of organizations in contemporary society as a sign of the continuous rationalization of social life. Rational action, as distinct from both traditional action (an unreflective acting out of habit) and affective action (an uncontrolled act triggered by a momentary emotion and perpetrated without consideration of the consequences), is one in which the end to be achieved is clearly spelled out, and the actors concentrate their thoughts and efforts on selecting such means to the end which promise to be the most effective and economical. To Weber, bureaucracy, meaning the role of the office, is the supreme adaptation to the requirements of rational action. (Bauman 1992b, 79.)

Foucault's "gouvernementalité" describes the same top-down rationality. It suggests that since the Enlightenment governments have gradually and intentionally increased efforts to express and administer the right way of living for citizens, in relation to their commodities and health and well-being, to improve their capacities and at the same time to improve the rationality of the society. The welfare state and economy has administered everything a citizen needs physically, but not mentally.

Habermas (1989, 118–139) proposes that societies simultaneously constitute systems and life-worlds (“*Lebenswelt*”). The system consists of an objective world, i.e. economic and power structures. The life-world comprises human interaction. Communicative actions are processes of interpretation in which cultural knowledge is “tested against the world”, and they are at the same time processes of social interaction and socialization. Communicative actions involve participants pursuing their plans cooperatively on the basis of a shared definition of a situation. Participants negotiate with each other and devise the unfolding action that they are undertaking.

Colonization of the life-world involves dismantling traditional forms of life and the differentiation of the structural components of the life-world (culture, society, and personality). This type of colonization is also possible when exchange relations between the subsystem and the life-world are regulated through differentiated roles (being employed, consumer, client, or participator). (Habermas 1989, 356.)

Habermas (1989, 367–368) criticizes modern capitalism, administrative jurisprudence and the strong welfare state. He is almost a romantic advocator of community and humanity. The colonization of the life-world by the system is visible in a welfare state that has expanded too broadly. The principle of social participation and social compensation is, like freedom of association, a constitutionally anchored institution that can connect up easily with the legitimate orders of the modern life-world. The thesis of internal colonization states that the subsystems of the economy and state become more and more complex as a consequence of capitalist growth, and penetrate ever deeper into the symbolic reproduction of the life-world. Central areas of cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization have been openly drawn onto the vortex of economic growth and jurisprudence.

According to Habermas (1989, 367–372), the jurisprudence process in the welfare state suggests that legal principles have established fundamental rights of the child in relation to her/his parents, the wife’s rights in relation to her husband, and the parents’, teachers’, and pupils’ rights in relation to the public school administration. The slogans of “equal opportunity” or the “benefit of the child” have meant formalization of relationships and removal from the life-world of social interaction between family and school. The compulsion toward litigation–proof certainty of grades and the over-regulation of the curriculum lead to such phenomena as depersonalization, inhibition of innovation, breakdown of responsibility, immobility and so forth.

Habermas (1989, 392–393) explains the reason for the movements and demonstrations of German citizens in the 1970s and 1980s. Conflicts arose in domains of cultural reproduction, social integration, and socialization. They were carried

out in sub-institutional or extra-parliamentary forms of protest. The underlying deficits reflect a reification of the communicatively structured domains of action that respond to the media of money and power. Single-issue movements, minority demonstrations, tax-protest movements, etc. reflect the conflict between the system and the life-world.

Habermas (1989, 398) suggests that the only protection against an empiricist abridgement in the problematics of rationality is a persistent pursuit of the tortuous routes along which science, morality and art communicate with one another; this reflects the meaning of communicative rationality. A communicatively rationalized life-world would have to develop institutions within itself through which set limits would be rendered to the inner dynamics of media-steered subsystems subordinating them to decisions arrived at in unconstrained communication. Practical questions of general interest would be put to public discussion and decided upon on the basis of discursively achieved agreement. Mahmoodian's (1997, 163) interpretation of this idea is that agents collectively reflect their activities and act more or less as they have agreed to do.

Bauman (1992b, 71–75) proposes that when a group of people agrees to something that other people presumably reject, we speak of a community. The most important is the spiritual unity that the members have. Ideally, such circumstances would be at the fullest among isolated people who live their entire life in the same company. That is why every community is actually a postulate, an expression of desire, rather than an accurate expression. For this reason, building an intentional community can be dangerous.

The idea of community as spiritual unity serves as a tool for drawing non-existent boundaries between “us” and “them”. It is an instrument of mobilization, of convincing the group, to which the appeal is made, of its common fate and shared interests to solicit a unified action. The invoked facts of community remain steadfastly beyond the control of the people to whom the appeal is made; they are made members of a community without choice if the people reject that they are betrayers of their ancestors and their own nature. The more comprehensive the communities are, the more oppressive they can be. Joining a community can be an act of liberation and a start of new life, especially in religious communities where the whole of the members' lives could become property of the community. Most political parties seek no more unity of thought than necessary, but faith forces people to follow rituals and possibly empowers them to missionary activities. For example, in single-issue communities, such as sports clubs, and in neighborhoods rules are less strict; people have only part-time roles in them, therefore they are less a part of the community and, at the same time, less oppressed.

All of the afore-mentioned sociological theories made a distinction between the unity of people and the system. They all agree that public authorities have taken over tasks which were once the responsibility of the civic society. Capitalism works in the interest of the state. The welfare state as such is not intended to be oppressive to citizens but it is too large and too bureaucratized compared to the horizon of individuals. Rights of individual citizens and public welfare involvements have substituted the natural interrelationships of individuals and the interdependences of communities. Sociologists have also recognized the dangers of natural communities.

2.3.2. Social work and empowerment

The theory of social work is concerned with the individual's relationship with the community, and the possibilities to empower citizens, especially the socially excluded, in taking care of themselves. Social work aims at improving the individual's economic, social and cultural well-being, as well as that of her/his community.

Social problems ascended from expanded industrialization and capitalism during the 19th century. There were numerous philanthropic associations, which aimed to solve injustice and social problems within society. These associations concentrated first and foremost on the problems of children, mothers and prostitutes but gradually a wide range of social problems were covered. The theory of social work evolved and at first adopted theories primarily from theology, sociology, and psychology. It also has a long tradition of empowering citizens to take care of themselves. Casework, family casework, social group work, and community care, etc. are the main forms of contemporary social work. In some radical branches of social work, the aims have been reformatory, meaning that changes in the community are also the aims of social work. The theory of social work involves an array of plurality; social work is mainly implemented by local administrators. (Toikko 2001, 2005.)

Brazilian educator Freire (1975; 1977, 55–58) invented the radical concept “Liberatory Education”. He recognized that public education was not value free. Poor and oppressed people should not be taught to obey the values of a (corrupted) establishment. They should be made aware of their process of displacement and be taught to dare to fight against oppression. Peoples' critical consciousness (“conscientização”) enables individuals as subjects of change to liberate themselves from conscious or unconscious oppression. Indirect oppression can hide behind the disguise public social assistance. People must be taught to learn to help themselves, since official “helpism” destroys the fundamental human quality, individual responsibility. Freire's radical but popular opinions forced him to exile from his native country in the 1960s, but his ideas still remain.

One of the most important concepts in contemporary social work is "empowerment". Froland, Pancoast, Chapman and Kimboko (1981) have divided the social empowerment models as follows:

- Personal Network Strategy: social workers strive to find a client's friends and relatives and mobilize them to enable the client to live near that network without relying too much on public support.
- Volunteer Linking Strategy: professional social workers and volunteers are obliged to collaborate. The public sector is responsible for the outcome of social work, but volunteers support the clients in completing daily tasks.
- Mutual Aid Network Strategy: those in need of support comprise a group rather than a single person. The group consists of clients who have a similar problem. The idea is that the members of the group provide each other with reciprocal support.
- Neighborhood Network Strategy: the aim is to build and support social networks. Certain key persons are responsible for maintaining the networks. The public sector and networks are responsible for services, and gradually the tasks are allotted to the network.
- Community Empowerment Strategy: this involves improving social conditions by exceeding local autonomy and democracy.

Payne (1991) divides empowering social work into three categories:

- Reflective-Therapeutic Perspective: social work which enables individuals, groups and communities to achieve the best possible welfare and well-being. Social workers are in constant reflective interaction with the clients and this mutual process assists citizens in formulating perceptions concerning a good life.
- Socialistic-Collective Perspective: society is divided into the elite and the oppressed. The aim of social work is to radically empower people to work for themselves against the oppressive elite.
- Individualistic-Reformist Perspective: views clients as individuals but simultaneously assesses clients' needs according to the public authorities' point of view and provides support using available resources. The aim is to help the client live by the limits of normal society.

Empowerment is also used as a tool to improve the capacities of racial minorities. With regard to contemporary social work, it implies bringing the balance of power to all clients at social services. Personal learning, freedom and the development of individuals can only occur in mutuality with others. Experiences with women's groups, civil rights workers, and many others committed to liberatory action, indicate

that collective power and collegiality protect the individual more than authoritarian and hierarchical modes of social work carried out by public bureaucrats. Empowerment involves both critical consciousness and the development of appropriate skills and competencies related to liberatory praxis.

Empowerment means that power is not given, but created within the emerging praxis in which co-learners are engaged. The basis for this is critical consciousness; it is expressed through collective action on behalf of mutually agreed goals. Empowerment is distinct from treatment; it enables people by building their skills and competencies—these being commonly associated with conventional policy. Education for empowerment differs from traditional schooling, both in its emphasis on groups (rather than individuals) and in its focus on cultural transformation (rather than social adaptation). The role of social workers is to facilitate the process through which learning, development and change can take place. Clients are referred to as partners who also have the responsibility of caring for themselves. (Ward 1995, 58, 61; Heaney 2000.)

The aim of social work's empowerment process is to assist clients in overcoming negative personal valuations, enabling them to consider themselves as being capable in solving their own problems. Together with the social worker, the client is able to find solutions to her/his problems, and see that the problems can be solved (Payne 1991, 229–230). Beresford (2001, 509) purports that the full and equal involvement of current social service users, and other citizens who may become users, are needed to develop the type of social policy that people want and will support. Contemporary healthcare policy-makers are also grappling with the concept of patient empowerment. In the healthcare sector, empowerment refers to a growing insistence that citizens should be allocated a greater role in the logistical and decision-making matters of public healthcare. The range of patient's authority can vary from a patient's modest wish to have her/his physician's decision reviewed to the democratic control over the public hospital, choice of physician and influence over the type of treatment. To become empowered, patients must wrestle with budgetary authorities and have the freedom of choice and control over decisions (Saltman & Figueras 1997, 58–60).

With regard to healthcare counseling, medico-centered or nurse-centered authoritative guidance and the patient prescription model focus on the problem of patient control or non-compliance. Recent studies have shown that the problems between healthcare practitioners and patients are associated with communication problems. The communication of practitioners is seen as a simple linear process of transmitting messages from an active sender to patient who is a passive receiver. The Patient Empowerment Model involves patients becoming aware of their own changes in

knowledge and understanding, decision-making skills, enhancements of self-esteem and sense of personal control, and the development of various social, health and life skills. Topics recommended for empowerment education include defining personal well-being, improving self-image, examining personal motivation, stress management, problem solving and other support. Consultation, advice sequences and questioning are practical methods in healthcare counseling, for example in AIDS counseling and therapeutic conversation. (Feste & Anderson 1995, 140–141; Poskiparta, Kettunen & Liimatainen 2000, 70–73.)

Empowerment is easiest to define when it is absent: powerlessness - real or imagined, learned helplessness, alienation, and loss of sense of control over one's own life. Being empowered includes several basic components. A high self-esteem indicates a positive attitude toward oneself and one's behavior. A sense of self-efficacy refers to the experience of oneself as a cause agent. Knowledge and skills provide the basis for development of social competencies. Political awareness and participation means growing critically conscious. It enables people to develop their own concepts of social justice and tools to realize the goals. Social participation comprises a broad spectrum of groups, organizations and activities and can be referred to as user involvement. It offers the opportunity to help others as well as oneself, the possible development of new knowledge and skills, enhanced feelings of personal control, and therefore increased self-esteem and self-efficacy. Responsibility refers to the notion that one must take control of one's own life and make one's own decisions; this clearly requires accepting responsibility for oneself and others. Increasing empowerment means increasing access to essential resources. (Payne 1991, 229–230; Schwerin 1995, 61–70, 82; Evers 2006.). The European Commission (e.g. 1998; 2002) and national governments now utilize empowerment in many strategic and practical social programs.

In many other disciplines of social science, scientists are conscious of the negative impacts of over-individualistic reforms in the public sector. In the United States, the American Political Science Association (APSA) adopted a new interdisciplinary section, "Transformational Politics", in 1991. The ethical imperatives that concern Transformationalists include the politics of participation, politics of social justice, conflict resolution, human growth, ecology and empowerment. Transformationalists are interested in a variety of social and political movements and phenomenon, such as the peace movement, the democratic movement, and tools for enhancing democratic participation, communitarianism, and individual transformation. Empowerment is a core concept for them also. It is associated with the positive transformation of individuals, groups and structures, although empirical studies have not yet been able to show unanimously that certain types of organizational forms would be able to facilitate personal or communal empowerment. (Schwerin 1995, 3–6; Peterson & Speer 2000, 40, 48.)

”Advocacy” is a related concept and it also refers to the promotion of citizens’ own control and involvement in their lives, communities and services. Professionals in social care provide case advocacy to enhance clients’ access to provisions designed to benefit them. Advocacy seeks to promote social change for the benefit of social groups from which clients come. There are other closely related concepts: “horizontality” means that the public sector, voluntary workers and companies are equal partners in practical social work; “regionalism” means that social work should be planned regionally based on local resources and local problems; “decentralization” means that authority is locally allocated; and “participation” means that the client has the right and duty to take part in the planning of practical work. The client is responsible for helping herself/himself. Plurality means that social welfare is enhanced in various ways. The decentralized, pluralistic and participative models should replace authoritative social bureaucracy. Small, client-centered units should guarantee service production and flexibility. Clients should also be involved in the planning, implementation and delivery of social services. (Hadley & Hatch 1981, 1–32; Payne 1991, 229–230.)

Community care means that care should be carried out within the community; local citizens and the public sector together take care of the people. The principle of contemporary social work involves the notion that social care tasks should not be carried out in public institutions only, but be brought closer to the people, in the communities where they live. In Britain, community care was mentioned in several laws for the first time in the 1940s. Institutional care for the elderly, people with mental health problems and people with physical or learning disabilities has been, at least in part, taken over by the community. For example, there are self-help groups which consist of people who have the same problem and who try to find common solutions to that problem. The members of the groups are both recipients and providers of aid. There are also self-help groups for unemployed people, the indebted, drug-addicts, alcoholics, and the somatically or physically challenged, etc. and their families. Self-help groups have concentrated mostly on improving their members’ financial situation and employment. In many cases they collaborate with public authorities, but in some cases their activities are considered to be a sign of mistrust in the public sector’s capabilities in handling social-care issues. (Nylund 1996, 193–205.)

Social work in the British Beveridge-type system was once tightly centralized but it was later decentralized during the era of the neo-conservatives in the 1980s. The contemporary core principle in community care involves the idea that care of the elderly and the physically or mentally handicapped ought to be carried out in various decentralized, non-institutional ways. During the Thatcher era in the 1980s, “paid good neighbors” and “patch workers” were hired to work in favor of social well-being in the neighborhood. Families were more or less forced to take care of

certain selected social services. The new duties of home and neighborhood care were especially suited for housewives. In Britain, the introduction of primary care groups in the late 1990s has meant giving responsibility to all aspects of healthcare in local communities, as well as providing primary care and integrating it with community services. (Mikkola 1996, 60–61; WHO 2000b, 532.)

The West-Berlin model was an early example of community-oriented social work reform. Self-aid and support of alternative groups were accepted and integrated as part of official social policy. (Anttonen 1989, 94–100.)

The Swedish welfare state has been a stereotypical example of official “helpism”. A report (*Tid för omsorg* 1982) suggested that social problems should be solved where they arise, in the community. Communities should socially control and support their members who have problems. Care should also be based on the activities of the community members, i.e. the members should produce services for themselves. Co-operatives, voluntary work and obligatory community service are practical suggestions for arranging social services in a modern society (Lundström & Svedberg 2003). Nowadays, there is a large third sector which offers self-help and self-organization services to patients and clients. Volunteer centers emerged during the 1990s and they work in close cooperation with municipal social services. Volunteer workers carry out a part of the work, often with a paid co-operator or head of operations. In many cases, leading politicians or civil servants have established these volunteer centers, and experiences indicate that the public administrative system can work well with the voluntarism of citizens.

Other contemporary issues include social support networks and care management. Public services were considered unable to fulfill the constantly growing demands, especially with the elderly (Biegel, Shore & Gordon 1984). Griffiths (1988) suggests that social care workers be made more clearly responsible for the clients in an administrative sense, because the clients—as empowered as they may be—are not able to manage the complex bureaucracy involved in care. The role of social workers as caseworkers has changed, in part, to that of case managers or care managers, which means that it is the duty of the social worker to manage the process through which an individual client goes during recovery. The social worker as a care manager is a supervisor who encourages the patient to deal with the bureaucracy and other logistics in the complex process of care. There are many other labels and names for the various new social work practices, such as voluntary visitors.

The aim is the same for different countries: to support the oppressed and the weakest members of the society in living at home as independently as possible. Their aim is to help the people work for themselves. In some countries, community work has also had radical aims because there are advocates outside public governance.

In Finland, community care has been considered a non-political, non-radical issue since philanthropic associations, deacons and municipal social workers have carried out this kind of work for several decades.

In the healthcare sector, communal responsibility and capacities are more often applied to preventive healthcare actions. Local, bottom-up activities of citizens focusing on public health problems can be quite significant. The World Health Organization (2002) declared in the Ottawa Conference in 1986 that healthcare promotion is a process of enabling people to increase control over themselves, which indicates that the public authorities are not the only body responsible for public healthcare services; people are also responsible for their own health. The charter emphasized the role of the community in healthcare, not just the role of public healthcare bureaucracies.

There are several examples of community-oriented, public healthcare work where local politicians, the media, voluntary organizations, and primary healthcare personnel work together to improve citizens' awareness concerning public healthcare. Statistics pertaining to community diagnoses have indicated that local action programs need be implemented to reduce/prevent citizens from smoking, being overweight and physically inactive. Changing the behavior of workers and people with less formal education, especially, has decreased the cases of cardiovascular diseases in many countries. Since the 1970s, many projects have improved citizens' awareness of common diseases.

To facilitate the decrease of heart disease, community-oriented projects have empowered middle-aged men and women, as well as other groups, reducing their overeating and changing their ways of living. Various forms of community response have been created with regard to other major public healthcare problems, such as alcoholism. These include healthcare interventions for heavy users of alcohol, courses for restaurant workers on the responsible serving of alcohol, counseling and support services for the family members of heavy users, and for young people. Community actions can break down barriers between the various sectors of municipal administration and create contacts between professionals, volunteers and families. Today, the World Health Organization still promotes local community initiatives to assist public healthcare services in functioning more efficiently. (Haglund 1985; Brännström 1993; Holmila 1997.)

2.3.3. Social capital

The concept of "social capital" is one of the latest innovations in economics and social sciences, although capital has been associated with immaterial capacities before (e.g. Proudhon 1984, 18, 63, 120). Social capital refers to trust between people.

Coleman (1988) explored reasons why young people drop out of school. Social capital within the family and outside it, in the adult community surrounding the schools, showed evidence of considerable value in reducing the probability of dropping out of school. Putnam (1993) uses social capital in his study to explain the successes and failures of administrative county reforms in Italy during the 1970s. His study discloses that civil society had a significant impact on the implementation of administrative reforms and economic development. The modes of activity in civil society in northern Italy favored horizontal connections and trust, resulting in a high level of GDP. Society in southern Italy was marked by an authoritarian, vertical social structure breeding mistrust and resulting in low economic growth. Putnam (1995) has subsequently researched the degeneration of social networks in America and found similar phenomena. Fukuyama (1995) published a study of trust combined with virtues and the creation of prosperity. Some countries are not well off even their societies are based on close family ties with strong government control.

Studies indicate that social capital is necessary to enable modern production: the greater the mutual trust, i.e. the social capital, the higher the Gross Domestic Product per capita appears to be. Whiteley (2000) performed a statistical study pertaining to the economic growth of 34 countries over the period between 1970 and 1992. His data consists of the Penn World Database of national economic time series, the World Value Surveys and UNESCO's cross-national data on educational investment. His findings suggest that social capital has an impact on growth, which is as strong as that of human capital or education. During the 1990s, the World Bank added social capital to three other forms of capital: human capital, physical capital, and natural capital. Citizens' interest groups, values and social norms and other social structures affect economic development. In that way, the concept links social structures and norms with economics.

The concept has been developed in the World Bank (2005) as part of research on sustainable development. Sustainable development has three parts: ecologic, economic and social. The World Bank refers to horizontal and vertical associations and peoples' engagement in social and political decision-making. Kajanoja (1999, 22) summarizes the concept:

- All link the economic, social and political spheres, and assume that social relationships influence how markets and states operate.
- All focus on relationships and the ways in which stable relationships among actors can enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of both collective and individual actions.
- All imply that social capital can be strengthened, and that this is a process that requires resources.
- All imply that social relationships and institutions have publicly feasible characteristics. Because the benefits of such good cannot easily be appropriated privately, most rational actors under-invest in them. Hence, there is a case for public support in social relationships and institutions.

There are many other interpretations of the concept. Most writers admit the weakness and indefinite meaning of social capital. The definition of social capital depends on the writer's field of science, cultural background and ideological point of view. Social capital builds a bridge between economics and social sciences (Hjerpe 1998, 5), and another interpretation involves the notion that social capital creates a positive connection between the social and the economic world (Kari Hellsten 1998, 35). Jäntti (1998, 105) states that the concept of social capital is merely a new name for old concepts of economics. Kiander (1998, 96) notes that the discussion is becoming reminiscent of the themes of communitarianism. The government plays a secondary role in the development and creation of social capital. Supporters of social capital and communitarianism feel that a society that is excessively atomistic is unstable and not safe enough to live in and manifest prosperity.

The economical perspective highlights the importance of community development at the macro level - at the measurement level of Gross Domestic Product - and provides local communities with a view of the national economy. The concept of social capital brings forth issues that usually have not been observed in economic thinking before. Issues, which this new form of capital raises, are feasible governance, social cohesion, and sustainability of culture and the importance of trust.

Social capital emphasizes horizontal co-operation instead of vertical, governmental top-down command. Examples of this horizontality include many local partnership projects that combine public administration, companies and the third sector together into a network. Some features of the public welfare state foster the needed social capital, and some features erode it. Social capital reforms the welfare state because it allocates the responsibility of development to civic society. The relationship between the roles of the welfare state and social capital is rather complex; some authors feel the welfare state creates and strengthens social capital in the welfare state process, whereas politicians and mainstream national economists think that the welfare state

destroys and prevents the creation of social capital. Kajanoja (1999, 25–26) purports that the welfare state and social capital support one another.

Nummela (1998, 71–74) connects the concept of social capital to budget cuts. Nowadays, the development of the citizens' own autonomy allows public administration to place their concentration on its most essential duties. Partnerships and communicative culture advance a culture of cooperation between the public and private sectors.

The concept of social capital is useful in the sense that it includes the importance of the public sector. It deals with the principles and values of proper governance. It gives shape to reform policies and emphasizes the catalytic role of the public sector as a maintainer of community activities. The popularity of social capital is not due to the clarity of the idea, but due to the flexibility of the term; it can include all types of desired ideas. (Fisher 1997; K. Hellsten 1998, 35.)

2.4. Contemporary main stream

2.4.1. Third Way

During the 1980s and the 1990s, the political success of the neo-conservatives was overwhelming in the United States and Britain. A counterbalance to neo-liberal politics with socialistic or communistic themes was no longer possible. In Britain, the political Left had to transform its politics to be able to answer the conservatives' challenge. The Labour party had to reform itself and thus became the New Left. There are several political dilemmas that have challenged the New Left: globalization, individualism, no clear political alternatives between Left and Right, low democratic participation and ecological problems.

The Third Way is now an international movement associated with the politicians on the moderate Left in the 1990s, most notably with President Bill Clinton, Prime Ministers Tony Blair and Gerhard Schröder of Germany, Lionel Jospin of France, and Massimo d'Alema of Italy (Brown 2001). Giddens (1998, 36) concludes that the Third Way does not aim for socialism or re-nationalization of privatized industry; it accepts market-oriented modes of operation and entrepreneurship. Third Way politics strives for the welfare of communities and democracy, and it counterbalances the ultimate forms of self-interest. Spithoven (2002, 335) summarizes that the Third Way is a consensus between market economies, modified by both socialist and Christian principles of humanism, and state intervention. It blends the best features of planned and market economies within a broadly liberal-democratic political framework. Political action complements the function of markets.

The top-down actions of the state cannot guarantee social cohesion by appealing to tradition. People should live their lives in a more active way, and they need to accept personal responsibility for the consequences of things they have done and of the lifestyle they have adopted. The theme of responsibility, or mutual obligation, was common in old-style social democracy, but was highly dormant. People must find a new balance between individual and collective responsibilities. Giddens claims that the Left favors greater equality, while the Right views society as more hierarchical. Third Way politics should preserve a core concern with social justice, while accepting that the range of questions which escape the Left/Right divide is greater than before. Third-Way values include equality, protection of the vulnerable, and freedom as autonomy, no rights without responsibilities, no authority without democracy, cosmopolitan pluralism, and philosophic conservatism. (Giddens 1998, viii, 64–66.)

The idea of philosophic conservatism is a valid concept in Third-Way thought. Modernization and conservatism are normally treated as opposites. However, modernity needs to cope with tradition. The Third-Way program includes topics pertaining to the democratic state, peace, an active civil society, democratic family, a new, mixed economy, equality as inclusion, positive welfare, the social investment state, a cosmopolitan nation, and cosmopolitan democracy. The fostering of an active civil society is a basic part of the politics in the Third Way. In contrast to the old Left, which tended to be dismissive of concerns about civic decline, these new politics accepts such anxieties as genuine. Giddens (1998, 78-79) proposes that the government play a major role in renewing civic culture:

- “We can’t blame the erosion of civility on the welfare state, or suppose that it can be reversed by leaving civil society to its own devices. Government can and must play a major part in renewing civic culture.”

The government and civil society promote the renewal of the civil society itself and this requires the involvement of the third sector, protection of the local public sphere, community-based crime prevention, partnership among the government and civil society, community renewal through harnessing local initiative, and democratic families. State and civil society should act in partnership to facilitate each other’s work, but also to act as a control upon the other. The theme of community is fundamental to new politics. Focusing on community is necessary as globalization progresses due to globalization’s downward pressure. Giddens writes that modern communities should not try to recapture lost forms of local solidarity, but concentrate on social and material refurbishment of neighborhoods, towns and larger local areas.

The main concern is to integrate the weaker strata of society back into civil society. This can be achieved through civil involvement and government action. The government should be prepared to contribute programs and encourage bottom-up decision-making and local authority. The struggle against social illnesses, such as crime, should be coordinated with community-based approaches. (Giddens 1998, 80–84, 87–88.)

Family policy is the key test for new politics. Recapturing the traditional idealized family of the 1950s is not possible. Only a minority of people now live in what might be called the “standard” family where both parents live together with their children conceived in the marriage and where the mother is a full-time housewife and the father is the breadwinner. However, rules can be set to promote common agreement upon the principles of a good family. The rights of children are of utmost concern. (Giddens 1998, 58, 95–97.)

Giddens (1998, 106–108, 117) states that the welfare state needs radical reform, but it could and should play a major role in society. Giddens concludes that only a welfare system that benefits most of the population will generate a common morality of citizenship. “Welfare” should not only be targeted at poor people. A residual welfare system, as in the United States, creates divisive results. Giddens defines welfare in a larger context. He views welfare not only as an economic concept, but also as a psychic one, and it belongs to everyone.

Navarro (1999) states that the Third Way is based on excessively simplified stereotypes of both neo-liberalism and social democracy. He concludes that the Third Way is breaking down the social democratic tradition and conservatism is evident in its main objectives. Navarro also points out that there is nothing new in the Third Way’s proposals concerning education and community services and continuing education for helping socially excluded people in finding work. Social Democrats in Scandinavia, as well as Christian Democrats in Germany, have presented those types of services long ago. Apparently, Third-Way ideas are, in part, warming up old objectives, but obviously they are as important as before. Navarro’s opinion apparently reflects the Socialists’ frustration with mixing ideologies and the refusal to see possibilities in the new mix of approaches. The political parties on the Left have adopted neo-conservative values, and combined them with environmental and global issues. They have formed them into new mixtures, which cannot be described quite simply.

There are differences between Blair’s policy and Giddens’ ideological writings. Driven and Martell (1999, 157–158) observe that Giddens gives more emphasis to post-materialistic attitudes and issues concerning the quality of life than the Labor

party. Giddens (1998, 100–110) criticizes Blair's policy of concentrating excessively on expanding the level of education. Blair possesses a more meritocratic understanding of equality, but Giddens writes that equal opportunity or education are not the only bases for a modern civic society, since there are other measures of equality. One critic (Taylor 2000, 5) says that the Third Way represents old, socialistic state-centralism.

2.4.2. Participation

There is an abundance of literature dealing with peoples' participation in democratic decision-making. Demands for citizens' democratic participation today are different than they were in the 19th or 20th centuries. Uusitalo (1997, 36–39) refers to sociologists Baudrillard, Bauman and Maffesoli when she says that the participation of postmodern citizens is symbolic or simulated in nature because, while people identify with certain communities, they do not in reality bother to take part in decision-making processes. Communities are more often virtual or cultural; they seem to be determined by common taste and style rather than the manifestation of a unified political will. The media creates virtual or imagined communities suggesting that people identify with such characteristics that represent the sectors of society to which they feel they belong. The media creates a sense of virtual belonging but it does not demand active participation. The media itself participates and makes decisions on behalf of the people, which makes the role of the people in decision-making less necessary.

Still, people are interested in common issues. The relationship between public administration and citizens is complex; the public sector seeks legitimacy from the citizens, but it is the public authorities' duty is to control the citizens. The notion of the "great" democracy is valid but not the only model for legitimate participation. The problem is that, while a democratic participation system exists in institutions, citizens do not bother to go there to exercise their constitutional right to vote in public elections. A crucial question involves how to spark the interest of citizens in their legal rights and duties as a necessary part of governance.

The answer is in the form of a "small" democracy. Authorities have attempted to invent new ways for citizens to collaborate with other citizens within new democratic platforms. The issue of a small democracy is rising. Peters (1996, 57, 59) states that the communitarian theory is important for understanding the participatory models of government. The participatory model tends to view local democratic platforms as important as the democratic institutions on the national level. In a small democracy, governance should be more like collaboration from bottom-

up rather than coordination from top-down. According to this view, governance signifies the small democratic cooperation of citizens rather than involving them through coordination in top-down, bureaucratic organizations. The participatory approach may not entirely obviate the role of public central agencies either. The Participatory Model also concentrates on managing the participation of citizens and the relationship between state and society. It requires that citizens articulate their demands effectively and are interested in handling common or public matters. Classic communitarian methods, such as public hearings, town hall meetings and tele-democracy permit broader citizen participation. However, when the government must balance needed time and the task of reaching policy decisions, problems may arise. (Peters 1996, 47–71.)

The basic premise of the participatory model is that citizen involvement can occur through at least four mechanisms (Peters 1996, 67–69):

- Citizens and employees should have the right to complain if they believe the government has not served them properly.
- The Participatory Model requires that public employees are able to make independent decisions and influence policy directions taken by their organizations. This openness to influence from bottom-up is assumed to make objective, governmental decision-making better. This is based on the assumption that the decision will reflect the knowledge of the participants in the organization who are most closely in touch with the relevant environment.
- Enhanced participation in political decision-making: public decisions should be constructed through a dialogical process permitting ordinary citizens to exert a substantial influence over policy.
- Citizens themselves can be included in making choices about policy and even in delivering those services. When citizens are allowed to make choices and given more direct control over programs, the participatory state is similar to the market state in many respects. Consumer choice in the participation state is more of a political concept than a market concept.

Fox and Miller (1995, 129–159) classify several forms of participation (Table 9).

Table 9. *Examples of Participation (Fox & Miller 1995, modified).*

	Examples of participation
Few talk	Surveys, citizen panel, policy analysis
Some talk	Bioethical health decisions, recycling, city future forums
Many talk	Internet and other computer networks: irc, wiki, blog, chat, peer-to-peer, news groups

In the “Few talk” examples, public authorities listen to the opinions of the people, but do not answer to them. The public authorities can set up surveys and citizen panels, which reflect a relative statistical plurality of the citizens’ opinions. Policy analysis is a method of evaluation, which can also reflect the opinions of the citizens. The “Some talk” examples include forms of participation, by which the public authorities face an evolving, thickening conversation which develops into serious policy deliberation. Fox and Miller mentioned examples of healthcare policy formulation and recycling policies, by which the local authorities had to listen to the people. Public meetings and open-air hearings are required by many recent legislative enactments at all levels of government. The “Many talk” form of participation signifies the most pluralistic way of participation. News groups, irc-discussions, chats, wikis, blogs, peer-to-peer, etc. on the Internet are platforms of discussion, where the talk itself becomes the end, but it can also be the beginning of a virtual community, which facilitates the circulation of values and public opinion.

There are a variety of examples pertaining to the organization of community involvement. Citizen participation in decision-making may be quite different. When the Finnish and the British public healthcare systems were compared, results indicated that Finnish citizens are more empowered in decision-making through municipal healthcare boards. Appointed members reflect on the views of the citizens concerning political decision-making in local healthcare. The members of local community healthcare councils in Britain are not elected but appointed for longer periods of time, and the members do not necessarily reflect the citizens’ interests in healthcare. The role of the councils is more advisory and informative. (Saltman & Figueras 1997, 60.)

A British example of a community-wide, strategic planning process indicated that it improves the political climate of the community. The process of gathering input from residents, discussing the community’s weaknesses, working toward consensus, and implementing projects through teams makes a significant difference in the way

a community addresses important issues. Communities that apply active community planning proved to be better in the development of community spirit. As a result of community-wide, strategic development planning in small cities, political institutions have been redesigned for greater effectiveness. (McGuire, Rubin, Agranoff & Richards 1994, 431–432.)

The Oregon Public Healthcare Rationing Model is a renowned example of a program, which was constructed after long-lasting citizen participation. The state of Oregon attracted worldwide interest when it began an ambitious attempt to set priorities for systematic public healthcare. The Oregon healthcare system is primarily based on private care and private sickness insurance, which employers provide. The Medicaid system provides healthcare for the less fortunate, but it covers just part of their healthcare needs. There is a great amount of people who are above the official poverty line but are not able to purchase private insurance coverage. Oregon's Medicaid board decided in 1987 to stop financing organ transplantations for poor people due to high costs. Instead, they use that money more efficiently to provide cheaper care for more people. That decision eventually led to the deaths of some children, and this in turn resulted in protests. The Oregon authorities began to develop systematic principles for setting priorities. The Oregon Health Service Act was passed in 1989, and it stated that all citizens in Oregon should be properly covered by the Medicaid public health insurance system, but a list of publicly funded healthcare treatments should be established. The task of determining what should be on the list was entrusted to a healthcare services commission whose 11 members comprised of professionals and lay people. The work of the commission was conducted in public and involved consultation by experts and a survey of the community's opinions. Many citizens' panels were established to enable average people to participate. Their task was to comment on the list where various types of medical symptoms and the treatment of them were listed in order of importance. The community meetings and public hearings reflected the citizens' opinions concerning this ethical problem. Medical experts later added their own opinions. There were over 60 public meetings, one thousand telephone interviews, and 20,000 hours of work, and it all eventually produced a list of 714 conditions and their treatments in order of importance. The state of Oregon later decided that Medicaid would finance the first 565 conditions and their treatments on the list. The system was taken into practice in 1994. Some modifications have been made since then, but the publicly set priority system is still in use. (Ryynänen & Myllykangas & Kinnunen & Isomäki & Takala 1999, 47–50.)

Community-based Development Organizations (CBDOs) represent another American example of a healthcare program. These organizations comprise nonprofit, housing and commercial developers whose job it is to provide service and leader-

ship in communities that need help and that other agencies cannot or will not serve (The Enterprise Foundation 2005). As developers, their mission is to build homes for homeless people. Their role as a community-based, nonprofit organization is guided by community residents and, in part, is intended to empower the less fortunate. As developers of physical properties, they perform like for-profit builders. As organizations responsive to the community's needs, they behave more like nonprofit service providers.

Some results of community-based development movements are easy to measure. This means, for instance, that homes are built or facades are improved. However, Rubin (1993, 428, 436) concludes that the more important goal of these development organizations is to build the community and renew the sense of opportunity. Community-based development movements require an empathetic city administration that recognizes that voluntary movement requires nurturance not dominance. Public administration can and should help community-based voluntary development movements. In some cases, public administration may feel that independent organizations in urban development are a threat to public authorities.

Several conclusions can be made from experiences in various participation initiatives. Participation is meaningful to the local people and they are able to make real decisions concerning real issues. Neighborhood councils do not work if the participants are not happy with it. A community does not work automatically because the road from apathy to real collaborative activity is long. In the context of a deep-rooted sense of exclusion, the community has a long way to go and short-term results are probably incompatible with the genuine participation process. In community partnerships, external agencies should expect to face anger from residents. Possibly anger and conflict can also be sign a that an initiative is on the right track. (McArthur 1995, 68.)

2.4.3. Partnership

Partnership refers to the notion that public authorities collaborate with other public, private and third-sector organizations. Hyyryläinen and Kangaspunta (1999, 11, 18) describe partnership as a paradigm or reciprocal collaboration culture, which is a local form of a network society. It crosses the borders of enterprises, public authorities, third-sector associations and households. Jones & Bird (2000, 492) propose that partnership is a product of the failure of trade unionism and strong civil administrations. There are public and private partners of various kinds, often operating on their own account rather than through representative democracy.

Partnerships can be hybrid organizations funded by a mixture of private and public finances. Partnership can be horizontal between various sectors, or it can be vertical between various levels of partners. The Japanese term “keiretsu” means a network of businesses that own shares in one another as a means of mutual security. These partnerships usually include large manufacturers and their suppliers of raw materials and components. The terms of international strategic alliances, public-private partnership and Total Quality Management’s (TQM) customer relations methods link collaboration between employees, suppliers and customers.

Calton and Kurland (1996) mention an example of partnership from the automobile industry and apply the expression “stakeholder enabling”. The Saturn division of General Motors was created to develop a car model to compete against Japanese automobile products. The Saturn was developed in a partnership called “Group 99” where GM managers, professional staff and members of the United Auto Workers Union created a micro-social contract in a yearlong community discussion. The contract resulted in a collaborative governance system with state-of-the-art manufacturing capabilities. The benefits of the agreement led to a win-win situation between the employees and employer. Public authorities are often associated as partners in this type of industrial endeavor.

Many contemporary partnership projects in the public sector deal with the prevention of social exclusion and the enhancement of social well-being. The European Union’s efforts to prevent social exclusion, poverty, unemployment, marginalization and economic stress, in particular, are widely implemented. Social problems are interrelated and require a complex and coordinated policy response, drawing upon the skills and resources of a wide range of actors. Many programs within the European Union and its member states have aimed at building social cohesion and combating social exclusion. The problems have led the European Union to develop strategies for economic growth, competitiveness and employment including emphasis on local development initiatives.

In 1974, the European Council recognized the need to address the growing problem of poverty. Later, the Commission launched its first pilot programs to combat poverty. The second European Programme to Combat Poverty (1984–1988) adopted a more structural and categorical definition of poverty and involved agencies in taking partnership actions to resolve problems. The third European program 1989–1994 was a mid-term program to foster the economic and social integration of the least privileged groups. It adopted an approach, which was a later crystallized around three principles of multidimensionality, partnership and participation. (Geddes 1998, 32–33.)

Social cohesion implies a reconciliation of a partnership with market forces with mutual support. The objective is to reduce disparities geographically and between various social groups. Policies for labor market integration are central to secure the objectives of cohesion. Social inclusion involves the emphasis of the European Union on collective and corporative actions to enable people, who have little or no experience in participation or who are disillusioned with what they have experienced, to become involved in activities, debate and decision-making. It requires an active society which means that labor market policies link economic and social objectives for welfare and work and extend mixed market models to involve the public, private and voluntary sectors, and create new relationships between local, national and European actions. (European Commission 1993, 1994, 1995a, 1995b; Geddes 1998, 16–17, 20–21.)

The EU's mandate to tackle social exclusion was launched at the end of 1995 and confirmed in the Amsterdam Treaty. During the European Councils in Lisbon, Nice and Stockholm (2000–2001), EU member states made a commitment to promote sustainable economic growth and quality employment to reduce the risk of poverty and social exclusion between 2001 and 2010. The topics of the conferences included participation in employment, prevention of social exclusion, helping the most vulnerable and mobilizing all relevant bodies to achieve the previous targets. The co-coordinative objectives of the European Union's social policy agenda (European Commission 2000, 15–25) were to be transformed into national policies as National Action Plans (NAP) (European Commission 2002, 16). In March 2006, the European Council adopted a renewed framework for the social protection and social inclusion processes. There is a new set of common objectives: three overarching objectives and objectives for each of the three policy areas of social inclusion, pensions and long-term healthcare.

Partnership principles are continuously important issues in the EU's structural funds, in community initiatives and in social action programs. In the structural funds, the principle of partnership is closely linked to subsidiarity and decentralization, involving relevant authorities at all levels, and social partners, in the pursuit of agreed objectives and the sharing of responsibilities for decision-making, including the involvement of those nearest the problems for which solutions are being sought. In the community initiatives and social actions programs, the Commission has been in a position to promote wider "horizontal" partnerships among local actors. A wide range of programs and initiatives (LEDA, LEADER, URBAN, INTERREG, HORIZON, INTEGRA, etc.) have promoted both a local partnership framework and transnational networks of local partnerships.

The growth of multi-organizational partnerships in urban regeneration can be explained with ideas of its advantages, flexibility, synergy, added value and leverage. Local partnership involves public, private, voluntary and community interest as a precondition to most European Union funding schemes for regeneration. Experiences of the EU member states have indicated that partnership develops from (Geddes 1998, 72):

- Grassroots initiatives by local communities and their organizations
- Initiatives of employers or trade unionists acting at the national or local level
- Initiatives from local or regional government and public agencies
- Encouragement from national governments and ministries or a requirement for a partnership to be established as a condition for funding
- Opportunities offered or conditions imposed by EU programs.

In a majority of the cases, the partners in EU-funded partnership projects are public authorities, who form a vertical partnership combining regional and national public authorities. There is employer representation in many of the local partnerships. Representatives may be directors or owners of businesses or technical staff with specific skills relevant to the activity in the program. Trade unions are involved in one-third of the cases, whereas organizations in the voluntary sector are represented in over half of the partnerships. Partnership projects have various administrative structures (Giddens 1998, 83):

- A management or partnership board, which has both representational and managerial or strategic functions.
- Subcommittees or similar groups which oversee or undertake specific facets in the work in the partnership.
- A project team, which is frequently disaggregated into several sub-teams according to different areas of activity undertaken by the partnership.

In many cases, local partnerships have still had a positive impact on empowering excluded groups and promoting social inclusion in deprived areas. The outcomes of EU-funded partnership programs include the generation of a wave of new initiatives, which provide local communities with a central role in the process of regeneration. Partnership projects have been able to create and support employment and reduce social exclusion.

There are some critical evaluations also. Some partners do not have equal possibilities in the partnership. The public sector dominates and the excluded groups are more often the objects than the subjects of partnership management structures. These partnerships therefore represent partnerships on behalf of rather than with excluded groups. In some areas, the absence of strong associative conditions in the local society is a problem. Other experiences have shown that staffing and other bureaucratization of the partnership has prompted the danger of reproducing some sort of parallel local public bureaucracy. Despite the popularity of participation, many people have quite different and possibly conflicting motivations and objectives.

3. EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REFORMS

Next I will discuss a few examples of Community Governance reforms.

3.1. United States

In the 1990s, communitarian ideology provided the Democrats with an opportunity to answer to the era long dominated by the Republicans. Later, the Republicans regenerated themselves by adopting a major part of the Democrats' communitarian ideology and transformed it into "compassionate conservatism". Present ideologies emphasize the empowerment of communities and citizens. The welfare duties of the compassionate conservatives were decentralized by giving more responsibilities to the state and local administrations and religious communities.

3.1.1. Tocquevillean community spirit re-discovered

The American political tradition is based primarily on reformism, Protestantism and distrust of a centralist state. The role of associations and autonomous communities has been strong, as de Tocqueville (2001, chapter 12) describes the American society in the 1830s:

- "In no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used or applied to a greater multitude of objects than in America... The citizen of the United States is taught from infancy to rely upon his own exertions in order to resist the evils and the difficulties of life; he looks upon the social authority with an eye of mistrust and anxiety, and he claims its assistance only when he is unable to do without it."

Almost all politicians call for a smaller central state. Community spirit has been strong in American traditional thinking, and in recent times this has become a reinvented source of innovation. Until the twentieth century, Americans did not want a powerful central government. The well-being of Americans could be sustained if only people were left alone to fend for themselves and work things out privately without the state's intervention. American culture supports individualism; however, community spirit has been strong. Community spirit has replaced government control, which was important for the immigrants who emigrated from more authoritarian countries.

US public administration has developed according to several reforms. Stillman (2003, 36, 39, Table 10) divides them into reforms. The reforms do not replace each other, but they are complementary and parallel and they help us to understand their complexity.

Table 10. *Four Reforms in US Public Administration (Stillman 2003, 36).*

	Meritocracy reform	Efficiency reform	Entrepreneur reform	Equalizers' reform
Since	19 th century	Beginning of 20 th century	End of 1970s	The 1990s
Implicit state model	Bureaucracy	Business-firm organization	Free market economy	Participatory democracy
Value stressed	Top-down organizational effectiveness	Organized business efficiency	Bottom-up, competition	Flat organization, inclusive, diverse and open
Key actor	Civil servant professional	Efficiency experts	Public-sector entrepreneurs	Citizens of every kind
End goals promoted	Broad public interest	Most return for least cost	Returns for consumer	Justice, good, equity
Preferred methods	POSDCORB	Taylorism	Public choice, microeconomics	Democratic ideals

During the meritocratic or bureaucratic phase, governance has developed according to classic bureaucratic design. The democratic and bureaucratic principles were for the immigrants a major temptation since they had emigrated from aristocratic or despotic societies. The nation's bureaucratic organizations were well-ordered, neutral, with a clear hierarchy from top to bottom. Professional civil service formed the core, selected and promoted on the basis of merit criteria and equipped with necessary tools. Public administration and tasks such as social welfare also grew as a result of a growing economy.

Taylor's invention, which was adopted by the state, was a reform in efficiency. In the 1920s, all types of Tayloristic efficiency techniques spread to all levels of US government. Scientific management techniques and practices have since then been part of public administration. The third reform wave was the entrepreneurial reform of the 1970s, when market-oriented modes of operation according to the Public Choice Theory were taken into use. For Public Choice enthusiasts, governance is conceived like any business, which produces goods and services to markets. Proposals based on efficiency and entrepreneurial reforms to reduce governmental dependency and welfare dependency were made during Carter's and later Reagan's administrations. President Reagan fulfilled his radical campaign promises

by substantially cutting welfare expenditures. The Republicans' policy resulted in a huge federal deficit and serious problems within the public healthcare program, Medicare, record crime and welfare dependency.

The fourth administrative type of reform, dating back to the 1980s and 1990s, is what Stillman (2003, 35–36) refers to as Reform by Equalizers. The Equalizers were not interested in efficiency techniques or market-oriented modes of operation. Contrary to archetype wisdom within the residual American welfare state (e.g. Esping-Andersen 1990), most Americans receive public social welfare at some point during their life, although receiving welfare is stigmatized (Rank and Hirschl 2002). The administrative welfare bureaucracy is by no means small, and the public social expenditures are immense in relative and absolute numbers. The Equalizers draw solutions to these social problems from de Tocqueville's time. Their ideal management principle involves the autonomy of citizens in managing their own issues.

The Clinton administration adopted the ideas of the Equalizers to which Etzioni's contribution was especially important. These public service reforms are rather complicated to classify exactly since Clinton's administrative reforms amalgamated a number of different practical solutions. Most critics considered them a collection of New Public Management techniques, but they included issues such as citizens' self-management and participation, the principle of subsidiarity, accountability, community empowerment, and balancing rights with responsibilities to achieve a just, good society (Stillman 2003, 35).

The political program of the Democratic Party has for several years included community-oriented topics such as "opportunity", "responsibility", "security", "freedom", "peace", and "community". The Democratic Party calls for a smaller government and wishes to evolve national spirit. Personal responsibility and reawakening the sense of community are also mentioned as simultaneous targets, implying that the duty and responsibility of Americans is to give something back to their community and their country. Citizens, local government, the private sector, and civic groups are encouraged to come together and take responsibility in rebuilding their communities from bottom-up. The spirit of voluntarism and charity means that every school and college in America makes service a part of its basic set of ethics. National service is supposed to be expanded by helping communities render scholarships to high school students for community service. All walks of life are challenged to make a commitment in taking responsibility for themselves, their families, their communities and their country. (The Democratic National Platform 1996; 2000.)

Clinton's administration solved the fiscal problems caused by Reagan's neo-conservative cabinet, partly due to the flourishing economy. Clinton successfully initi-

ated policy reforms as well. The most successful was a federal law, which made a radical cutback in public social welfare but empowered the poorer strata of the society to work for their living instead of receiving allowances. The democratic era of the 1990s also included other communitarian reforms such as neighborhood watch groups, zero tolerance and community policies to prevent crime and social exclusion. (Etzioni 1999, 44; Easterbrook 2001, 12; Chait 2001, 17; Ngyen 2002.)

The Republicans were faced with a challenging task; they had to present something new because, after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of socialism in Russia, they were “like a dog leashed to a truck and had to figure out to what to do next”. Bush is not a philosopher, but with the assistance of prominent Christian authors, he wrote a religiously inspired political program, i.e. compassionate conservatism. It reflects the conservatives’ concern about social problems.

Biblical philosophers possessed many similarities with communitarian thoughts. Catholic and evangelical theorists argued that social benefits would result in better outcomes if the provision of various welfare services were moved from large, impersonal government bureaucracies to local, faith-based groups. Marvin Olasky, the main philosopher, is an old-fashioned defender of personal responsibility, who believes the government can play a salutary role in sustaining the network of obligations and the sense of personal responsibility necessary to a free and decent society. (Mahoney 2001; Arens 2001; Cnaan & Boddie 2002, 227.)

Olasky (2000, 16–20), one of the main ideologists, summarizes compassionate conservatism as follows:

- Assertive: voluntary associations for fighting poverty, rather than waiting for the government to do it
- Basic: social help rises from as low a level as possible, i.e. the family, neighborhood, association in a community, state, and lastly government
- Challenging: vigorous character-building initiatives for socially oppressed people instead of treating them like pets of public welfare
- Diverse: religious faith important in both providing and receiving welfare
- Effective: effectiveness important whether faith-based or secular
- Faith-based: religious philanthropy assumed to be more effective than a secular or public one
- Gradual: pragmatic monitoring of what works best in practice.

The Republicans have felt uncomfortable with social matters but Olasky (2000), a Catholic, defends conservative welfare policy that utilizes faith-based groups attempting to transform the lives of the poor in American society. Olasky emphasizes faith's power of transformation and proposes that former convicts attend Bible-study classes. Olasky refers to the Catholic principle of "subsidiarity" meaning that social and political problems should be addressed at the most fitting level. He also refers to de Tocqueville's defense of "the art of association". The government should not carry out responsibilities that can be carried out by families and associations. He also suggested reducing the role of the government to a facilitator of social services by increasing the responsibilities of municipalities and faith-based associations. George W. Bush Jr. presented his ideology of compassionate conservatism as follows (White House 2002):

- "It is compassionate to actively help our fellow citizens in need. It is conservative to insist on responsibility and results."

The problem was not the lack of funding, but the lack of citizens' motivation and religious commitment. The role of charity was to be increased and its financing was to be assured through tax deductions. Bush's argument was that religious groups that combine material assistance with a strong moral message perform better than public social welfare services because churches are not neutral in regard to recipients' personal moral commitment. The social well-being of people can be further improved by challenging oppressed people and communities to take care of themselves. (Economist 2000; Greenberg 2000, 394; Arens 2001.)

The Republicans have been advocating for the vitality of civil society against the intrusions of an overweening bureaucratic and regulatory state. The conservative narrative has now changed; the Republicans now defend the role of the public sector as the ultimate guarantor of health, employment and financial security. Bush's policy has moved the party beyond its one-dimensional, anti-governmental message. By accepting that the government can be "effective and energetic", compassionate conservatism made it easier for the Republicans to vote for spending on proposals that were popular anyway. Business-oriented conservatives have been preoccupied with threats to individual liberty and unshackled economic activity; but social conservatives have drawn attention to traditional values. Compassionate conservatism solves social problems by demanding religious commitment from people and communities in exchange of public social assistance. (Mahoney 2001, 124.)

Bush has introduced tax-credits, which would allow people to direct their tax payments to charities and churches rather than to the government. In short, these are the same issues, which the conservative communitarians have suggested and advocated during Clinton's administration.

3.1.2. Mixture of reinventions

The program, National Partnership for Reinventing Government, was one in which the United States' federal government promoted the modernization of public administration. It was launched by President Clinton's administration in 1993.

The program was influenced by Osborne and Gaebler (1992), and raised issues for developing an "entrepreneurial government". This "reinvention" is based on the Public Choice Theory, privatization, reengineering, and new organizational economics. It included such issues as the strategic management of federal government, stronger federal executive authority, better customer service, Total Quality Management and better performance measurement. At the federal administration level, they included cutbacks on federal government personnel and expenditures, improved performance measurements and adopted strategic management, as well as made improvements in the use of Internet technology in public services. (Durst and Newell 1999; Brudley & Hebert & Wright 1999, 20; Brudney & Wright 2002, 354.)

Reinvention is not a well-defined concept; therefore it is difficult to evaluate. Some selected programs, however, indicated that costs had been reduced, customer service had improved, efficiency and agency processes had improved, stewardship had been enhanced, waste had been reduced, and strategic planning had advanced, etc. (Durst & Newell 1999, 72–73; Brundney, Hebert & Wright 1999, 28; Mihm 2000.)

The Reinventing Program also included initiatives for improving the quality of life and safety in civic society. These community initiatives can be referred to as the development of a "third-party government" (Lenkowsky & Perry 2000, 305) meaning that national initiatives are tailored to the needs of local communities. The initiatives included in the program comprised partnerships with state and local governments and federal agencies to reinvent the way the government provides support to communities. The goals aimed to boost citizens' trust in the federal government and this, in turn, aimed at bringing the government closer to the citizens by providing information and tools to help communities manage their local programs and create results that people in the communities would appreciate. The topics included after-school programs, crime prevention practices and community planning initiatives, and pilot programs for testing them. The aim was to empower communities in many forms to improve the welfare of the citizens. The Clinton-Gore administration's agenda for communities included several tasks that were based on the idea of improving communities' own capability and collaboration with public authorities. In many cases, the initiatives included funding for various government programs, which were put in action on the state or local level of administration.

3.1.3. Community Governance programs

There have been other reinvention projects, which have aimed at empowering local communities. Similar issues have been presented earlier, for example during the Great Society Plan of the 1960s (Nalbandian 1999). The Federal Support for Communities Initiative sought contribution to the government-wide reinvention of federal support for communities in solving problems that communities identified. The initiative modeled solutions for potential government-wide partnerships, and empowered federal and regional employees to collaborate with local communities in addressing their needs. The primary task was to use federal resources effectively and establish learning networks for spreading effective models, the best practices, and lessons learned. The aim was also to develop sustainable community partnership between federal, state and local governments. Pilot communities were selected to collect relevant data and to measure the performance of public services. Strong local leadership and effective public and private participation were also targeted, as well as the reinvention and the elimination of barriers. The communities were selected to test innovative approaches and willingness to interact with federal partners. Federal field staff committed to the initiative as demonstrated by the precious, effective reinvention initiatives and experiences. The pilots were set to share lessons and success with other communities. Reforms included initiatives associated with local community development and partnership with the public sector. (Kamensky 1999.)

President Clinton envisioned the national voluntary service as an evolver of community spirit. The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 created a new federal agency, the Corporation for National Service (CNS). This agency's aim was to empower people to provide services to their own community. The CNS did not deliver any services itself, but the agency allocated funding for various community development programs through competition. There were three major service initiatives in the CNS. The first initiative, AmeriCorps, was referred to as a domestic Peace Corps with thousands of voluntary workers, the purpose of which was to integrate people from various ethnic backgrounds in doing voluntary work for the benefit of local communities. These workers served in organizations such as the American Red Cross and Habitat for Humanity. Clinton viewed the stimulation of community service as an increasingly valuable way of attaining public education objectives. He pledged to mobilize one million young people as tutors to improve school children's reading scores.

The second initiative, the Learn and Serve America Program, helped students to do better in schools and to carry out community assistance. The third initiative, the National Senior Service Corps, involved elderly people in voluntary work. People

from the age of 55 and older could take part to the program. (Lenkowsky & Perry 2000, 299–300; Corporation for National Service 2000.)

The Republican-dominated Congress fiercely criticized the programs. Throughout the history of the CNS, its funding has been cut to zero and then restored again. Political decision-makers had added other functions to the agency and changed its mission priorities. Moreover, the competition in funding various programs has not quite met expectations. Funds have also been administered, in part, to federal agencies to encourage the agencies to rely more on community service in implementing the programs. Critics have stated that these funds also seemed more like back-door funding to federal agencies. (Lenkowsky & Perry 2000, 301.)

One major reform was the work-based welfare reform. During the Reagan era, the Family Support Act of 1988 established that unemployed citizens are obliged to work for public social assistance (Karger 1991, 71, 77). Clinton promised in his 1992 campaign to go further and “end welfare as we know it”. In 1996, the President signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act. The motivations of the law lie in traditional conservative values: work, responsibility and family. The law meant transforming social welfare assistance into an obligation to do work instead of receiving social assistance (workfare). It included a program that aimed at helping people find work. It provided financial benefits for welfare recipients who actively searched for jobs, as well as guidance in job-hunting techniques and opportunities for education and training. The program also supported innovative state and local transportation solutions such as shuttles, van pools, new bus routes, and connection services to mass transit to help welfare recipients and other low-income workers to get to work. The law’s target group was predominantly low-income people with children. They are only eligible for temporary financial assistance for a span five years throughout their lifetime, and only if they work in exchange for their benefits. The law allotted responsibility to fathers for taking better care of their children. (Rahkonen 2000, 68–69; Nguyen 2002, 489; Lens 2002.)

The law also included a section called Charitable Choice. It encouraged states to involve community and faith-based organizations providing federally funded welfare services. It also established eligibility for faith-based organizations as contractors for services on the same basis as other organizations. The scopes of the services were nutritional education and food delivery, job search, vocational education, domestic violence counseling, health services, maternity services, etc. In the early phases of Charitable Choice, a faith-based organization contracting with the government had to remove all religious symbols, but now the religious symbols and ceremonies of faith-based organizations were permitted. Incorporating religious activities in

regular programs is now permitted; however, legal challenges concerning the political correctness of the act have manifested. Faith-based organizations are fiscally accountable to use government funds for the intended social services, but not for worshipping or proselytization. The scopes of social service that the faith-based organizations provide are spreading, and the models are very different. Financial incentives challenge the organizations to accomplish targets. Comments have indicated that some faith-based organizations have become more secular after receiving public funds. There are also reports, which state that those clients, who adhere to the strict policies of social welfare, are often accepted more easily. Politicians from the Republican Party have later embraced the merit of including religious groups in the circle of social services providers, although the effectiveness of this has not been tested. (Cnaan & Boddie 2002, 224–233.)

Statistics indicate that poverty, teen pregnancies and non-marital births have decreased during the 1990s. There has also been a large decrease in the number of welfare recipients. Critics say that the statistical success of the program is due to unusual prosperity and growth, with which it coincides. It is not related to the increase of self-sufficiency. Many localities cut the number of people on welfare by not permitting them to receive it in the first place; others only allocate a one-time cash payment instead of ongoing support. Other localities require recipients to look for employment before considering their welfare applications and many of these people never return to complete their applications.

Many recipients with disabilities are unable to work or understand the requirements for receiving welfare. Many people are also sanctioned for failing to comply with the work requirements or for violating the program in some other way. The central problem is that all former recipients of welfare do not earn enough to maintain self-sufficiency, and remain under the poverty line despite their hard work. Many people return to claim welfare within a year because the income they receive from work is less than their social assistance. Generally speaking, the people live below the poverty line although they are working. Problems with infrastructure, such as the lack of children's day care and public transportation, also exist. One result of this is that the responsibility of supporting these people shifts from the public sector to friends and family members, who are often the least able to help. (Lens 2002, 280–281.)

Community-based welfare-to-work agencies supervise job readiness and job placement for oppressed people. The attempts to teach top-down, middle class norms of punctuality, workplace discipline and proper workplace behavior stigmatize and disaffect participants. Another type of welfare-to-work agency, which concentrates on bottom-up empowerment and raises consciousness around issues such as gender

violence, racial discrimination and poverty can lessen the stigma attached to welfare recipients and create social ties that serve them emotionally and practically in the job search process. (Broughton 2001.)

Community policing was another important reform. Clinton's Crime Bill in 1994 mandated communities to prevent and fight crime. There are several forms of community policing. It brings police work into the domain of community planners and social workers. Police departments across the country have created community policing units to improve the quality of life in low-and-moderate-income neighborhoods where residents have accepted criminal victimization as a way of life. Police staff can systematically introduce themselves to local residents. They can also organize community watch-groups and attend meetings held by those groups. Channels for coordinating activities with other government agencies, citizen groups, and local schools appear to be widespread. Many programs featured regular meetings with citizen groups, mobilization of citizen groups, citizen satisfaction surveys, and community newsletters.

The police may collect data concerning neighborhood problems, which may or may not be directly related to local crime, such as housing code violations or recreation opportunities for local youth. They may also organize neighborhood cleanups or the demolition of abandoned property, often in collaboration with other city agencies. Bicycle patrols appear to be a component of virtually all community-policing programs. There are thousands of community watch-groups, and approximately ten percent of the population in the largest cities has attended watch-group meetings, despite the fact that getting people involved is difficult. (Gianakis & Davis 1998, 496-497; Lach 1999; Harpold 2000; Rohe 2001.)

Another program is called the Goals 2000 Educate America. The national goals emphasized better school completion rates, better adult literacy, and safer schools and enhanced parental participation. Parents' increased responsibility for their children's public education process is what Etzioni has demanded in his writings. Many states have adopted quality standards and performance measurements for primary and secondary schools. Despite the progress in many fields, follow up studies have shown that the public education system is unsatisfactory (OECD 2000, 102). The After-School Initiative supported learning opportunities for children during non-school hours, and the reduction of the time children spend without adult supervision.

President Bush continued the Community Governance initiatives that Clinton began. In 2001, Bush established centers for faith-based and community initiatives in five cabinet agencies to promote the faith-based community agenda. The task

of these centers was to evaluate policies, fund programs, agency communications and technical assistance strategies to ensure that they emphasize effectiveness and hospitality to faith-based and community-based organizations. The centers were located in such agencies as Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Department of Justice, and Education and Labor. The purpose of the centers was to promote good deeds by neighbors, particularly in the areas of juvenile delinquency, prisoners and their families, victims of crime, domestic violence, and drug prevention. (Department of Justice 2002.)

In 2002, President Bush announced his Welfare Reform Agenda. The themes continue along the same lines of the conservative welfare-to-work idea, which Clinton's administration began. Topics of the agenda included increasing work requirements, strengthening child support enforcement, encouraging marriage, and preventing welfare dependency. States were permitted greater flexibility in defining activities that led towards self-sufficiency, but the states are also responsible for increasing work attendance among families from 50 % to 70 %, or otherwise increase school attendance, abuse treatment, or other social inclusion activities in order to get their slump sum grants from the government. The government requires states to promote the well-being of children by organizing community-based abstinence education, the formation of marriages and families, encouraging two-parent families and responsible fatherhood. (Nguyen 2002.)

The Republicans' ideological crusade does not seem to want to dismantle the state, but sees the state as an enabler, a partner of civic society. Both major parties have attempted to empower citizens and communities to take part in governance. The ideological borders between the Democrats and Republicans have partially disappeared. The liberals and conservatives are both advocating rather similar conservative values.

3.2. Britain

The conservatives' victory brought Mrs Thatcher's cabinet into power at the end of the 1970s. The policy, which she pursued, had been a success, but the conservative era ended in 1997. The Labour's victory in the 1997 elections manifested the New Labour, a party different from the previous socialistic "old" Labour. Sociologist Anthony Giddens has coined the name "Third Way" to refer to the European New Left movement.

3.2.1. The New Left

The New Labour adopted many ideas from the conservatives. There has been much criticism concerning Blair's politics, which vary from "the New Labour is the son of Thatcher" to "the nanny state" to the argument that the Third Way is the only realistic, economically stable and socially acceptable model in a changing, globalizing world. (Driver & Marker 1999; Taylor 2000, 4.)

The differences in the policies in the old and New Labour and the New Right policies can be described as in Table 11. The ideas of the Third Way originated from a crisis in socialism. Since the late 1970s, the political Left has faced a bewildering array of problems, eroding class division, new social and political movements, and failures of communist economies and emerging global capitalism. Laissez-faire capitalism and market-oriented modes of operation were successful solutions for the regeneration of the public sector. The governance of the New Labour seeks to transform the state into an enabling partner by promoting the idea of networks of public institutions, communities and individuals acting in partnership and held together by relations of trust. (Bevir & Rhodes 2003, 55.)

Table 11. *Three Reforms in UK Public Administration (Bevir & O'Brien 2001, 537).*

	Old Labour	New Right	New Labour
Era	Until the 1970s	The 1980s to 1997	Since 1997
Public philosophy	Fellowship	Individualism	Stake-holding
Role of welfare state	Provider	Safety net	Enabler
State's relation to citizen	Paternalism	Withdrawal	Partnership
Characteristic organization of service delivery	Bureaucracy	Market	Network
Characteristic relationship	Command	Competition	Trust

The declaration of leading European socialists, "Third Way / Die Neue Mitte" (Blair & Schröder 1999), stated that the socialistic community values of equality, social justice, fellowship, and reciprocal altruism are still valid. Blair (1999) explained in his speech in the Socialist International that the new socialists believe in:

- "A role for collective, for people together, whether through government, the local community of informal solidarity".

The issues of discussion covered matters pertaining to global welfare and the environment. The New Labour has also learned much of Giddens' sociological contribution and from the trans-Atlantic dialogue with the American communitarian

movement (Butler 2000; Bevir & O'Brien 2001). Blair's and Schröder's political declaration emphasized local community development and individual responsibility. The Labour has been willing to allocate more financial resources to community development programs and give more autonomy to local decision-makers. They also placed emphasis on partnership, by stating:

- "Change couldn't be managed unless we decide to do it together, in partnership".

Partnership is a theme which implies that collaboration, the empowerment of citizens and responsibility have become important. The role of the government is not that of a controller, but an enabler aiming to empower citizens and communities.

The New Labourers continued to use market mechanisms and privatize public corporations where suitable, but they also wanted to emphasize that citizens are not just competitive and self-interested, but also co-operative and concerned about the well-being of others. The declaration adopted a conservative view about the moral responsibility of citizens. High morality towards the community and personal responsibility are knit together with personal rights. According to the declaration, individual rights have been elevated above responsibilities. However, the responsibility of the individual to her or his family, neighborhood and society cannot be dismissed and left to the state. Personal responsibility is the same as mutual obligation to the community. Lack of personal responsibility has resulted in a decline of community spirit, lack of responsibility towards neighbors, rising crime and vandalism, and a legal system that cannot cope.

According to Blair and Schröder, modern Social Democrats want to transform the safety net that is based on a springboard of personal responsibility. In practice, this is clearly visible in connecting social allowances with personal responsibilities. The citizen is entitled to welfare only when she/he fulfills the responsibility of taking care of herself/himself. Employment services provide a good example; they demand more autonomous activities from the unemployed. (Dwyer 1998; STM 2000, 26; Newman 2001, 23; Bevir & Rhodes 2003, 57.)

The Third Way's Social Democrats seek new ways of expressing institutional solidarity and responsibility to citizens without basing the motivation for economic activity purely on undiluted self-interest. The Neo-Libertarians' policy was destructive in their perspectives. The New Left supports and advocates forms of citizen empowerment. Flexible markets must be combined with a newly defined role for an active state. The top priority was set on investment in trust, or in other words, in human and in social capital. People still demand high-quality public services and solidarity for all who need help, but also fairness towards those who pay for it. All social policy instruments must encourage self-help and promote responsibility.

3.2.2. Modernizing government

The Labour government's reform plan for the public sector was called "Modernising Government". Whereas earlier management reforms brought improved productivity, better value for the money and in many cases better quality of service, they paid little attention to the policy process and the way this affects the ability of the government to meet the needs of the people. The five key commitments were 1) policy making for delivering results that matter; 2) responsive public services for meeting the needs of citizens; 3) quality public services; 4) information age government; and 5) valuing public service, not denigrating it. (Modern Local Government in Touch with the People 1998; Modernising Government 1999, 49; Williams 2000, 419.)

Old socialistic ideals of fellowship, which were based on the dictatorship of the proletariat, were rejected. The liberalistic "economic man" and individualism were also rejected. Welfare can no longer be provided by public authorities alone. However, it cannot be completely privatized either. The New Labour sees the public authorities as an enabler, which provides a stable framework for quality services. Partnership describes the collaborative attitude of the government, which Blair's administration also referred to as a "joined-up-government".

Practical forms of services are various forms of networking where partners can be from the public, private or third sectors. The philosophy is based on stake-holding and trust between partners. The point of the British New Left is that public bureaucracy is still needed but services can be arranged together with the networks and quasi-markets. For example, the reduction of unemployment means that all public and private bodies are responsible for creating jobs. Individual responsibility and judgment should complete hierarchical structures so that individuals and companies can make decisions and implement policies without being constrained by strict procedures. Citizens become involved in the partnership through various forms of participation such as citizen juries, interviews, satisfaction surveys and through interaction on the Internet. Together with their rights as citizens and consumers, they also have responsibilities to the community and to the society. The public sector can set quality standards, allow various forms of organizing services, and publish comparative benchmarking information. The providers of the services can be from the public or private sectors; it depends only on who provides the best value for the money. The private sector can co-finance, support, or replace public services, but all that must take place for citizens to benefit. (Bevir & O'Brien 2001.)

3.2.3. Community Governance programs

Traditionally, the role of local authorities has evolved from the Victorian tradition under which councils regarded themselves as being responsible only for discharging the functions allotted to them by Parliament. During the 1980s, increasing fragmentation of local government through compulsory competitive tendering and the creation of increasing numbers of special-purpose authorities has compelled local authorities to become centers of networks involving local businesses, trade unions, voluntary agencies, educational institutions and many others in joint planning and decision-making. The Local Government Act (2000) enables and requires the local authorities to accept this community leadership role. The Labour's government has launched community programs and also reoriented some old programs. It has set out plans to promote partnership with the private sector and voluntary organizations to deliver public services in innovative ways. (Foley & Martin 2000, 480–481; McInnes & Barnes 2000, 211, 225–226; Lowndes & Pratchett & Stoker 2001, 445.)

The local government was an important partner in the earlier *Modernising Government* program. The Labour wanted to encourage initiatives to establish partnerships in delivering public services through all parts of the government in ways that would be appropriate for local circumstances. The party also wished to establish common targets, financial frameworks, information technology links, management controls and accountability mechanisms that support such arrangements. The local government is responsible for one-quarter of the public expenditures for services in Britain, including education, social services, the police force, housing and public transport. Other groups were to be involved too, including the business and voluntary sectors. Councils' powers to work in partnership to tackle cross-cutting issues and promote social inclusion were meant to be strengthened. The idea was to collaborate with banks, the Royal Mail offices, supermarkets, accountants, broadcasting companies, etc. to engage them in partnership in delivering local public services (Modern Local Government in Touch with the People 1998; Modernising Government 1999, 49.).

The Best Value Initiative is the Labour government's version of the Conservative government's compulsory competitive tendering, market testing and audit and performance indicator reforms. It is structured under a different interpretation of the role of the government. The initiative notes a diversity of approaches for local service design and delivery, to enable those who can provide quality services most effectively should provide those services. The compulsory competitive tendering and other market-oriented modes of operation have created efficiency. While efficiency being still important, ensuring the quality of public services becomes more important than the lowest possible price. The government's role is to establish and

regulate nationwide quality standards of services. (Geddes & Martin 2000; Bevir & O'Brien 2001, 540–541.)

Many local authorities signed Local Public Service Agreements (PSAs) whereby they must meet targets agreed upon with local people and partners. The program promised to develop more responsive public services. The Labour's government has stated that partnership of businesses, public agencies, voluntary organizations and community groups are ideal for dealing with issues relevant to all interest groups. Firstly, future actions were to actively encourage initiatives to establish partnership in all parts of government in ways that suit local circumstances, to establish common targets, financial frameworks, and IT links, etc. that support such arrangements. Secondly, the task was to implement a community planning process to enable local authorities and other local, public bodies to adopt a common and co-operative approach to meeting local needs. (Lowndes & Skelcher 1998, European Commission 2002, 176.)

Education action zones, each consisting of a group of schools were established in 1998. The zones were intended to raise standards in disadvantaged areas by empowering people, communities, companies and local authorities to improve the quality of schools. An evaluation (Jones & Bird 2000) indicated that partners may have contradictory interests and varying degrees of commitment; some indicate that as yet, there is really nothing new compared to the previous policy, which follows the nation-wide, top-down education strategy.

The government has launched a community empowerment strategy which attacks area-based deprivation and the spiral of decline, such as unemployment and crime, and improves healthcare, education, housing and the physical environment. The program brought together local, regional and national bodies from public, private, voluntary and neighborhood management. The New Deal for Communities was a program which targeted the poorest neighborhoods containing less than 4,000 inhabitants. Earlier programs have been criticized for demanding results too quickly, but the New Deal for Communities was a long-term program. Funding for the program has been allocated for the years between 1999 and 2008. It is hoped that, by dropping competition in funding and adding more time to carry out, the program will lead to genuine community involvement. (Foley & Martin 2000, 483; European Commission 2002, 67, 174.)

Evaluation has indicated that these programs have been quite successful. Community empowerment zones in healthcare action and education have been created across the country, allowing local policy-makers to design solutions appropriate for the needs of local residents. Some of the community empowerment zones are outside

the major areas and therefore they cannot replace the nation-wide, anti-poverty strategy. Taylor says (2000, 4) that the proliferation of “zones” appears primarily to be a way for Whitehall to test out its own ideas free from the interference of locally elected councils. From this critical perspective, zones are more like test-sites for the central government, rather than locally driven experiments. Taylor (2000, 3–4) is critical and states that the paradox is the absence of decentralization or dispersing decision-making to local communities or frontline managers. Reforms aim at the central government’s modernity, efficiency, accountability, quality, and better technology, and not at making local councils more powerful or more autonomous. Then again, Williams (2000, 421), says that the reforms are less significant in the strategic policy-making of the central government, but they do define and regulate the networks, both inside and outside of government, better.

Recent evaluations of the Labour’s community participation have also caused criticism. Few people bother to get involved even if there are significant local issues at hand. There are natural joiners who become natural leaders on open debates, but many people are not interested in taking part in such activities. There must be a variety of forums for participation. Some people prefer completing questionnaires, and some prefer being involved in ongoing forums, such as youth councils or being involved in one-off deliberative exercises, such as citizens’ juries. Young people have liked the idea of small group or focus group discussions, particularly if honoraria are paid. One-stop shops could act as a local focus for accessing services and providing feedback. Educating citizens about participation was also important because people do not necessarily know what they are participating in. The view of the local councils, its services, its officers and its members has been viewed as negative through personal experience, or prejudice. The local council is too large and the local politicians and authorities are often considered distant. Young people, single mothers, and some ethnic groups, especially, are skeptical. (Lowndes, Pratchett, & Stoker, 2001, 449-450.)

Lengthy decision-making procedures and conflict between partners cause practical problems in partnership. There may be problems with the local government and local communities. Lowndes (2001, 453–454), among others, purports that only long-term community development and capacity-building initiatives can help to develop confidence and trust in excluded groups. Community-building takes such a long time that estimating how well the initiatives of the Labour program have worked is difficult.

The Labour introduced welfare-to-work programs in which the driving intention was to transfer recipients of public assistance to paid jobs (“active welfare”). The idea was that people should not be free riders of the community. A welfare contract

between the state and citizens empowers people in finding work and receiving a stable income. The party believed that people living on welfare should build on their potential to change their circumstances, rather than just wait for their welfare benefits. Young people should be offered training, single parents should be granted a tax reduction to assist with childcare costs and the long-term unemployed should be offered lessons on how to present themselves during job interviews. Social capacity was improved to enable individuals and communities to help themselves. Giddens (2001, 339) explains that although the above-mentioned efforts are necessary, the welfare-to-work initiatives could also mean cutting back on social security.

3.3. Germany

Germany possesses federalist and corporatist administrative structures. The cabinets are coalitions which constitute more than one party. Therefore, political compromises concerning the development of public administration are common. For historical reasons, the concept of community (“Gemeinschaft”) continues to arouse a great deal of suspicion in Germany. Germany is a decentralized federal state where the duties of welfare are organized according to the social-catholic principle of subsidiarity. Professional and trade unions, as well as churches, play a fairly large role in society. Problems of the welfare state and limitations of the neo-liberal remedies have initiated a debate of communitarian values and all the major parties have community-oriented ideas. Germany has a mixed system, in which the federal state, the states, municipalities, and citizens’ associations, churches and private enterprises administer welfare duties.

3.3.1. Catholic subsidiarity

During the period of early industrialism, a form of mutual aid emerged, which lent new life to old traditions of reciprocal support. Factory workers could not rely on public social welfare. The principle of subsidiarity means that a Catholic person should resist both self-interested pursuits and reliance on the activities of the public authorities. Catholicism advocates the communality of the citizens. It emphasizes the role of the church and the role of citizens’ communities. (Anttonen & Sipilä 2000, 195–200.)

German autonomous, proletarian, collective action is unique from a historical perspective. The labor force began to form association and put aside a few pennies a week from their salary for a common fund, which extended their provisions to employment dole, sick pay, medicine and medical treatment. Sometimes they also

succeeded in disbursing pensions for disability and old age, and even for maintaining the surviving kin of deceased members with a widow's mite. The funds were small in the beginning, but eventually millions of working men belonged to local "Krankenkassen" in Germany at the end of the 19th century.

The small mutual funds were vulnerable. Since the actuarial insight to the management of funds was lacking in general, the funds tended to exclude persons considered less decent, of an irregular walk of life or in hardship, since their punctual payment could not be counted upon. Moreover, corruption, fraud and mismanagement were common. The social homogeneity of the members caused a concentration of risks, and an accumulation of claims could have doomed the fund to bankruptcy. Only the dispersion of the risks could prevent the fund from failure but this tended to weaken mutual identification. Small cooperative funds and self-management of the nineteenth century was doomed to failure in other countries, but they survived in Germany. (de Swaan 1988, 11, 143, 148.)

To understand the complex discourse better, one must realize that not only does Germany have a federalist society, but also a centralist society. The state-legalistic thinking was abused by the Nazis who exhibited nationalism and essentially conservative values of the lower-middle class. The ideology promised a new moral order, which would compensate for personal devaluation and humiliation by restoring pride of place to the national community ("Volksgemeinschaft"). The Nazis were able to successfully replace the Weimar Republic's collapsed institutional welfare system by voluntarism and the party's charity, which were also used as a didactic tool to educate the German national community. The authoritarian state guaranteed the common good, morality and high values. The loyal servants represented the legitimate state and the state represented, above all, the interest of the parties and the people in the parties. (Gephart 1996, 25; Burleigh 2000, 223.)

Jann (2003) divides the German post-war welfare state reforms into different narratives (Table 12). During de-nazification, German political scientists developed the new "Staatslehre" to assist Germany in accepting pluralistic and democratic values as a prerequisite for good administration. Only democracy could guarantee the public good. An entire generation of German political scientists was brought up according to this new democratic narrative.

Table 12. Five Reforms of German Public Administration (based on Jann 2003, 114).

	Authoritarian state	Democratic state	Active state	Lean state	Activating state
Era	1930s–1940s	Beginning of the 1950s	Middle of the 1960s	End of the 1970s	Middle of the 1990s
Dilemma	People's basic needs, frustration	Authoritarian tradition	Interventionist, but incremental state	Government overload	Civil society's fragmentation, social exclusion
Type of failure	Weimar welfare state failure	Democracy failure	Market failure	State failure	Community failure
Solution	Authoritarian corporatist state	Democratically controlled hierarchical state	More centralized planning and budgeting	Less bureaucracy, competition initiatives	Autonomous self-regulated networks, trust in civil society

“Active state” is a reaction, which emphasized more efficiency in legal-democratic administration, demanding “more policy and less law”. Traditional administrative problem-solving was seen as merely reactive; therefore more active policy-making was demanded. Macroeconomics and financial and social planning were taken into use. Computerization advanced these processes.

At the end of the 1970s, market-oriented modes of operation led to a fourth phase, the “lean state”. De-regulation, de-bureaucratization and privatization commissions at the federal level were created when Kohl’s conservative government came to power in the 1980s. The German version of New Public Management was called “Neues Steuerungsmodell”.

The Social Democratic era during the 1990s, and lasting until 2005, represents the next narrative, the “activating state”. Towards the end of 1990s, new problems and dilemmas arose. Many socialists were inspired by the Third Way since it offered alternatives to the neo-liberal ethos and simultaneously kept the state as an important partner for the development of a welfare state. Individualism, social exclusion and fragmentation are a result of modernizations and differentiation of the modern world. To cope with these problems, not only did the state have to change, but also new forms of interactions had to be invented, enabling new forms of societal self-regulation. Solutions include creating and strengthening autonomous, self-regulated networks, which generate “public value” without the state. Therefore, the third sector between market and state, comprised in associations, non-profit agencies and clubs, was rediscovered. In this sense, the Third Way recalled the Catholic tradition of subsidiarity, which had structured former sickness insurance funds. (Jann 2003, 111.)

Today, the mutual funds have amalgamated into fewer, larger funds. The state has taken over the social-care duties in many other countries, but in Germany family policy, and other parts of social policy, is based on the communal activities of the citizens. The role of family and male breadwinners and his insurances are still a key part of German social policy. The traditional notion of the home forms the core of German welfare policy. Men are expected to work; the wives are expected to raise the children at home. The men’s salary, insurance, and work-based benefits support the families’ well-being and spouses are entitled to pension according to the husband’s income. The family institution is important, and the degree of participation among women in the working world is the lowest of the EU countries. Voluntary social work is important in the German society. There is not a universal governmental welfare system, but over 90 percent of the population belongs to the sickness funds, which arrange the majority of the social and healthcare benefits. (Anttonen & Sipilä 2000, 201.)

3.3.2. Contemporary communitarian discourse

Vigorous debate in Germany has been critical of the American communitarians because of its conservative tones. Communitarianism has been visible in party politics mainly through party programs and the speeches and writings of individual politicians. The present-day reality in Germany has been taken into account when developing ideas of community and a narrow, single, “correct” version of communitarianism has been rejected. The aim has been to adapt communitarian ideas to the network of various kinds of communities. The Social Democrats, the Greens and the Christian Democrats have utilized the vision of communitarianism, but it is different depending on the political affiliation of the proponent. Two main themes in which communitarian thought has been part of the political debate stand out. The first theme involves the changing role of the welfare state and the expanding third sector. Secondly, ideas based on communitarianism have been considered as a way to increase citizens’ participation in the political decision-making process. (Leino 1999, 9-10.)

The inevitable communitarian tone-setting of the Christian Democrats is visible in the party program of 1994 (CDU 2006a) and it emphasizes Christian values and the belonging of individuals and responsibility to the community:

- 9. Everyone is destined to and dependent on being able to live together with others in a community. The freedom of the individual is realized and upheld in her or his relations with other people and in the form given to social life. This means that every individual must assume responsibility for her- or himself and for her or his fellow beings.
- 16. The exercise of freedom requires an individual to be empowered to shape her or his life independently. From this fact is derived the principle of subsidiarity in the organization of society, according to which the state and local authorities should not become involved in tasks which can be carried out by the individual citizen or by smaller communities.

The conservatives support self-help groups and they want to encourage citizens’ willingness and ability to support and help their fellow citizens. The CDU has also adopted the term “solidarity” and they are in favor of financing the provision of state benefits not through individual contributions but via taxation. Furthermore, individuals should be encouraged and challenged to accept more responsibility for themselves and take on more of the costs involved, and the principle of insurance should be strengthened. There should be as many markets and as little government as possible. They welcome a society based on community spirit and solidarity, and oppose egoism, selfishness and violence in society. The CDU has renewed its party program during 2006. Mrs Angela Merkel, Chancellor and the chairperson

of the party, has demanded that Christianity, rightfulness and solidarity once again represent the main values of the party. (CDU 2006b.)

The program of the Social Democrat Party (SPD 2002) states that freedom, justice and solidarity are the basic values of German “democratic socialism”. Indications of the Socialists’ renewed values were more clearly visible in the paper published jointly by Gerhard Schröder and Tony Blair (1999), in which they outlined a vision of the new Third Way. Socialist values resemble communitarian values in questions pertaining to the duties of an individual toward her/his community and in increasing their possibilities to participate in the decision-making process.

The themes of the social policy of the Greens’ political program (Alliance90/The Greens 2002) include the encouragement of each individual’s self-determined development and the promotion of actions, which reflect and enhance solidarity with others. It also states that the social state must consider civic groups as partners in cooperation and support them by strengthening neighborhoods, promoting small social networks, assisting the work of self-help initiatives or agencies for social work, or associations and social groups. The diverse, active involvement of citizens forms an indispensable basis for a society where solidarity is a core value. In a living social culture, responsibility for oneself and the social environment is important. Only those participating in social life can influence it, which is why participation must be supported by the state. There need to be rights for voluntary work and voluntary involvement. Equitable participation in decision-making processes, individual self-determination, and sustainability are also issues in which the Greens’ are interested.

Communitarian ideas have found their place in politics, social policy, and in the development of civic society. Communitarian thoughts clarify the understanding of the duties of different sectors, the government, markets, the third sector and civic society. Communitarian themes have been useful in the formation of a unified Germany. Mental unification is a primary task for all the parties in Germany. In the former “DDR”, there were forms of partnership-type collaboration between state-owned companies and company trade unions, and between young people and the elderly, which promoted social cohesion (Geddes 1998, 51–52). The “Wessies” put more emphasis on personal liberty and responsibility; whereas the “Ossies” value state interventions more. A remedy has been sought in part from communitarian philosophy because it supports efforts to re-build bottom-up activities and voluntary work.

3.3.3. Conservative-corporative system

Germany is an example of social partnership in Europe, with the postwar consensus of a social market economy, which provides a basis for collaboration between employers and trade unions at the federal level (“Bund”), the state-level (“Länder”) and at the level of municipalities. Bodies responsible for unemployment insurance, social security and vocational training are characterized by tripartite partnership between the social partners and the government.

The differences in political parties are relatively small. The system can be called a mixed system, a Bismarckian system, a conservative-corporative system or “Sozialer Rechtsstaat”. The Bismarck-type welfare state relies upon the capacities of institutionalized, autonomous communities, especially in the insurance and social care services. The state plays a leadership role over the social insurance system and it contributes to the capital costs of the insurance systems, but the implementation of most of the services is decentralized to the civic society’s own corporations and communities, such as health insurance funds and associations.

Voluntary agencies administer and supply many of Germany’s healthcare and social services, and social partners organize social insurance based on the self-administration principle. Typical to Germany is that public opinion opposes the further intervention of the federal government in the implementation of welfare services. German society is built on the assumption that the civic society organizes the necessary services itself. All the major parties support this type of social market economy. The Social Democrats (SPD) and the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) are broadly based parties competing for the votes of the moderate majority. CDU integrates social Catholicism and neo-liberalism, but it has always been at pains to avoid too close an identification to an unambiguous bourgeois party. (Mangen 1991, 104–110; Anttonen & Sipilä 2000, 209; Rutishauser 2002.)

Although the principle of subsidiarity has been stronger in Germany than in other countries, there was growing criticism to the increasing influence of the state. Philosophers wanted to create a more communicative society because they thought that the public administrative systems had grown too large. The West-German fiscal crisis in the 1970s and 1980s led to a question whether the civic society or the state should carry the responsibility of the more expensive load of the welfare tasks. The Christian Democratic government of Helmut Kohl promised to broadly fulfill new solutions for the chronic problems created by the “Wendepolitik”. Conservatives demanded increased assistance for self-help and subsidiarity instead of bureaucratic welfare systems. The CDU/CSU called their politics in the 1980s “new subsidiarity” meaning that since the collective funds and insurance systems worked well and they produced good services, they should be strengthened. Community

activities such as voluntary work and self-help were to be increased. Then again, the Social Democrats emphasized the principle of solidarity more, meaning that the state should more closely oversee those groups, which did not possess enough resources or importance, would not suffer or be left behind from those citizen groups which were more capable of autonomously supporting themselves. (Mangen 1991, 120–124; Rutishauser 2002.)

During the beginning of the 1990s, German administrative reforms were subordinated to the unification processes, but they had also adopted the fashionable New Public Management methods. Referred to as the “Neues Steuerungsmodell”, NPM reforms included privatization, outsourcing, personnel management reforms, more decentralization, more accountability and more result measurements. All layers of government were involved in these leaner state (“Schlanker Staat”) programs, which have been especially numerous in local municipalities. (Jann 1997, 87; OECD 1998, 64.)

German municipal administration has during the lean-state phase adopted more private-sector managing principles. Some tasks of public administration were turned into “products” and public budgets were transformed into output-oriented and lump-sum budgets. The output-indicators and controlling reports were designed to increase accountability (Wollman 2000, 926–927). The New Steering Model has been a success, but it has also encountered serious difficulties and obstacles due to the economic and fiscal one-sidedness of the NPM modernization process.

The economic efficiency of administration is only one goal; equally important is the improvement of a political and participative democratic system. The concept of the citizen commune has been re-discovered. The citizen commune should ensure the political, participatory linkage between the citizen and administrative modernization. The status of citizens has improved by the institution of local referendums in the 1990s. The local population can address various matters of the local community, excluding budgetary and internal organization matters of local administration, via local referenda. In addition, citizens can nowadays directly elect and also recall the local mayor. (Wollmann 2000, 928–929.)

Social exclusion is a multidimensional problem and is at the moment substantiated in public discussion. The costs of social welfare are relatively high in Germany. More than one out of five households in unified Germany relies at least partly on social assistance. The most vulnerable are the unemployed, people with no qualifications, single parents and families with three or more children, and immigrants. In the eastern part of the country the problems are more common. Social political problems have caused the government to activate and promote personal empowerment. Each person is encouraged to be more responsible for her- or himself, and

at the same time her or his participation in social life must be secured. Moreover, the participation of non-governmental bodies is viewed as an important channel for solving social problems. The European Union's ESF (European Social Fund) is partly responsible for financing the numerous projects. (European Commission 2002, 97–99.)

In conclusion, one may say that German community-oriented reforms maintain a low profile and they are associated with Catholic principles of subsidiarity, which have been rediscovered. All of the governmental parties exercise community-oriented thoughts, which continue German traditions.

3.4. Finland

The Finnish cabinet constitutes a conglomerate of 3–5 political parties; therefore the development of public administration is always a mixture of compromises. All of the parties are supporters of liberal concepts (Saastamoinen 1999, 5, 8), but during recent years political parties have also adopted communitarian thoughts, especially citizen participation and bottom-up activities. The Center Party represents the agrarian tradition and has stood behind the idea of community spirit since its establishment. The Social Democrats also have prominent Third Way tunes in their programs.

3.4.1. Coalition of "land spirit" and the New Left

The Center Party is an example of the agrarian movement in northern European countries. Santeri Alkio was a "Tolstoyan" ideological father of the Finnish agrarian movement in the beginning of the 20th century. Alkio borrowed a major part of his ideology from the populism, which was an agrarian political movement in the United States between 1891 and 1905. The populists' ideological point was to synthesize a compromise to capitalism and socialism and they claimed to support the interest of ordinary people. Similar alternatives to socialism and capitalism manifested in other countries at the same time. (Alanen 1976, 367; Takala 1980, 126–130, 135–139.)

Alkio searched for a balance between capitalism and socialism, because he felt they both represented urban selfishness and that there was a need for an alternative in the political middle for the majority of the people, who lived in the countryside. He described in his texts of the 1920s that the fashionable socialistic and capitalistic ideologies demoralized the "land spirit" ("maahenki") in rural villages. He felt that the reason for this destruction was selfishness. Alkio admired the traditional agrarian

way of life and thought that urban life was full of immorality. The most important themes in his writings were the increase of land spirit through the development of agrarian cooperatives, small industry, voluntary work and advocating an ascetic, religious and sober lifestyle. (Alanen 1976, 204; Takala 1980, 1, 94–95, 138–139.)

The life of the rural people remains at the core of the Center Party's policy. The party's political program (Keskustan periaatteet 1996) has been re-written to better fit the urbanized welfare state and a society in the age of information technology. The former chairman of the party, Mr Esko Aho, has made efforts to introduce radical American Communitarian tones to the party's agenda (Vasabladet 2001). Some of his arguments included the ideas that parents should take a more active part in their children's primary education and that people need to comprehend how much public education and healthcare cost the community, and that drug tests and zero tolerance toward intoxicant abusers should be taken into use. The suggestions generated much debate.

In the parliamentary elections of 2003, the Center Party won. The victory was possibly due to the moderate, pro-welfare state policy. The themes were neither radical, nor particularly communitarian, since previous radical attempts (Työreformi 1998) had met fierce resistance among the trade unions. The Center did not emphasize community values in the latest parliamentary election in 2003, but, instead, campaigned especially for better institutional public social welfare and healthcare.

The program for the Finnish Social Democratic Party (1999) challenged capitalism and libertarian selfishness, but in a renewed form. Their policy follows more clearly the themes of the New Left, especially the Labour's Third Way tones. Community-awareness, solidarity, and responsible freedom are the cornerstones of moderate socialist ideology. Responsible freedom implies that the community assumes the responsibility for its members but the citizens take care of themselves also, look after each other and concern themselves with their community. The sense of integration and of belonging to the community incites citizens to commit themselves to the development of their community, which leads to the success of the community.

The party program extends Community Governance to the international level by demanding "internationalism, worldwide community awareness and solidarity towards the oppressed". The Social Democrats believe in the institutional welfare state structure and they would impose regulations on global markets, capital movements, and the operations of multinational enterprises. The party program emphasizes morality and solidarity issues. Membership of the community opens possibilities to the individual to develop her- or himself and in taking responsibility for the success of the community. Community is also seen as a defense mechanism against an unlimited market economy. There is no statement in the program pertaining to

the aim of communities or capabilities in assisting or replacing the public sector as a service producer. The program emphasizes needs and the responsibility of the citizens to participate in society's development.

The Young Finns ("Nuorsuomalaiset") was a liberal-communitarian (Lehmusto 1995, 7) party that suddenly appeared in the political field in the parliamentary election of 1994. It also advocated for the increase of personal power and responsibility. The public sector should only provide basic services and thereafter individuals should manage by themselves. (Penttilä, Tapaninen & Jutila 1994). This message was too puritan for the Finnish audience and the party lost all of its seats in the Parliamentary election of 1999.

The development of Finnish politico-administrative system after the Second World War can be described as in Table 13.

Table 13. *Four Phases in Finnish Post-war Public Administration.*

	Beginning of the welfare state	Growth of the welfare state	Efficient welfare state	Empowering welfare state
Era	1940s–1960s	1960s–1970s	Since end of the 1980s	Since 1995
Major political issues	Settlement of Karelians; High birth rate; Industrialization; Poverty	Urbanization; Soviet influence	Claims of inefficient public services; Neo-conservatism	Fiscal crisis; Europeanization
Administrative reforms	Stronger central state	Equally available municipal services; Centralized planning and budgeting	Privatization; Competitive tendering; Management by Objectives	Cutbacks; Quality assurance
Community Governance reforms		Village committees	Neighborhood boards; Experiments with municipal sub-councils; Free commune experiment: Health for All 2000 project	Empowerment of citizens and communities; Municipal citizens initiatives and referendum; EU projects; Partnership and participation projects; Health 21 project; Environmental LA 21 project

The beginning of the welfare state can be dated back to the end of World War II. The major issues were poverty and recovery from war. The 400,000 fugitives from Karelia had to be settled mainly in the countryside and industrial production had to be re-established after being destroyed during the war. The government was state-centered; the state directed and guided what the municipalities had to do and it also financed it.

Gradually, as welfare tasks increased during the next decades, the next major issue was urbanization. People moved to cities because small-farm agriculture was no longer profitable in many cases, and at the same time many new jobs were created in the cities. In addition, as many as 300,000 people moved abroad to work. This era was also characterized by the strong expansion of municipal public services. The state had money to finance welfare reforms, partly due to booming export trade with the Soviet Union.

During the 1980s, when Soviet influence was decreasing, privatization, competitive tendering and Management by Objectives sparked an interest in Finnish conservative politicians as the international wave of neo-conservatism made its way to Finland. At the same time, politicians experimented with local democracy enhancement.

Later, in the mid-1990s, the era of empowering the welfare state began. Finland joined the European Union and utilized the benefits of the European Union's possibilities to finance social development projects. Europeanization has been defined here as the process through which EU political and economic dynamics became a part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making. EU projects have emphasized the principle of subsidiarity, and they have forced the citizens, local authorities and associations to collaborate in issues concerning well-being. At the same time, however, citizens have expressed weak interest in participation, which concerns politicians and authorities. The Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health have launched projects that promote participation and partnership to empower citizens and communities to work for themselves.

3.4.2. Decentralized services, problems of participation

Finnish political decision-making is based on political coalitions. Therefore, policies always involve continuation. Radical, overnight reforms are rare. Most of the welfare services are produced or provided by municipalities, which harbor autonomy in such issues. Therefore, state-level politics do not directly affect the municipal level. The common principle is that the municipality is the ideal type of community. Citizens make decisions concerning matters in their own communities,

the municipalities, through representative democracy and the local administrative structure. The residents of municipalities choose their representatives in local elections for four-year terms. The civil servants in the municipalities retain the right and responsibility to implement the will of the local, political, decision-making bodies. The municipalities have also the right of taxation. The government can render obligations to municipalities through legislation only.

Despite of the principle of municipal autonomy and local democracy, there are problems concerning participation and opportunities to influence local matters among all citizens. The sizes of the municipalities vary from a few hundred people to half a million. The local administrative structure is complex and as remote to the ordinary people as the state's bureaucracy. The problem is that the citizens' interest in participating in municipal decision-making has decreased. The voting percentage in local elections has steadily fallen from 80 to 61 percent during the latest elections.

Evidently this calls for new channels for citizens to participate in local democracy. Perhaps municipal bureaucracies are such close-knit communities that the majority of the people feel motivated. There is high level of voluntary organizational activity. Four out of five adults are members of at least one non-governmental organization (Niemi-Iilahti 1999a, 243–245). This is a sign of a high interest in participation, and this potential should be applied once again in local affairs.

3.4.3. Community participation programs

Participation has been an issue on the agenda since the 1970s, and some international and EU programs have contributed to the participation debate. International strategies emphasize the active participation of citizens in local communities in the planning and implementation of e.g. public healthcare work.

Ståhlberg (1979, 117) explains that the strong position of official authorities and political parties and tradition, compared to other Nordic countries, has created a situation in which the local, bottom-up activities outside the public sector forums are rather weak in Finland. In the 1980s and 1990s, several parliamentary committees inspected possibilities to empower citizens in taking part in decision-making at the community level. Those plans were based on international trends, which emphasized democracy, equality and human rights (Salmikangas 1998, 12).

A municipal law from 1976 allowed the establishment of formal, municipal sub-councils, but a few experiments indicated that residents were not interested in insti-

tutional forms of local participation, especially if no funding, power or responsibility was allocated to the sub-councils (Salmikangas 1998, 26).

The Free Commune Experiment was a large project (1989–1993), in which hundreds of municipalities were temporarily allowed to organize their welfare services and administrative structures to best appropriate their circumstances. For example, the number of municipal boards and the amount of members on the boards were reduced due to improved economic efficiency (Hoikka 1994, 100). The new municipal law (1995) presented more opportunities for participation to the residents. They were now rendered the right to propose initiatives to the municipality and the municipality must act in response to them. Secondly, municipalities were made responsible to inform residents about forthcoming community plans and actions in their early stage of preparation. Thirdly, municipal referenda were also made possible. The law permits citizens to participate directly, together with political parties. However, the extent to which this is truly implemented depends on the municipal council. Participation has been increased through numerous development projects.

Since the beginning of EU membership, many projects promoting empowerment have been launched. Reports have indicated that these projects have enhanced village spirit, united the people and increased responsibility for fellow citizens. Village committees were established as soon as the 1970s, during a time when rural depopulation and urbanization weakened the vitality of rural villages. These actions activated residents most quickly in isolated, rural areas and the most active village committees began to register themselves as associations. During the 1990s, villages began to utilize the EU's LEADER project funding more extensively, and rural policies that emphasized self initiative in local communities. (All the Power of a Small Village 2003, 14.)

Today there are almost four thousand voluntary village associations and committees. The village residents participate in village committee meetings and the activities have become implanted as common procedure. An official board is nominated for all village committees. Village activities comprise chiefly sports and leisure-time activities, as well as enhancing traditional customs, but they are increasingly aimed at developing industries and services. Villages engage in economic activities that combine economic and social elements. (Katajamäki 1998, 13; Salmikangas 1998, 35; Kumppanuusaapinen 2000.)

A parliamentary committee proposed in the beginning of 1980s that "neighborhood boards" should be founded in communities consisting of 500–5,000 inhabitants (Osallisuustoimikunnan mietintö 1981, 81–83). Municipalities partook in experiments in city planning at the community level and environmental planning

in government-funded projects. Tenants in municipal rental apartments have been encouraged to take part in managing the dwelling where people of various occupations live. A law passed in 1991 made it obligatory for apartment buildings to have a Board of Tenants, but tenants' interests in this type of participation have been low (Salmikangas 1998, 29).

The World Health Organization's (WHO) *Health for All by the Year 2000* was the first program, which encompassed the idea that public healthcare reforms had to be introduced at the local community level. The strategy reorganized the priorities in the healthcare sector, made primary healthcare its main focus, and moved from a perspective that was predominantly disease-oriented and curative to one that emphasized the prevention of sickness, the removal of health risks and the promotion of health in the community. The improvement of healthcare required more than the services delivered by the public healthcare authorities alone; the contribution of other sectors – agriculture, animal husbandry, food, industry, education, housing, public works and communication – were explicitly recognized as vital for improving the health and well-being of the population. (WHO 1986, 13; Brännström 1993, 2–3.)

Finland signed an agreement with WHO in 1982 by which it was the first country to develop a national strategy for healthcare for everyone. The objectives in the agreement emphasized citizen and community participation and multi-sector collaboration (STM 1986; STM 1988, 13; Kokko 2000, 29). A reformed program was launched in 1993 (STM 1993). Two of the general aims of the projects were to promote multi-sector collaboration and citizen participation for accomplishing public healthcare objectives.

The practical ways for doing this have been to hold public hearings, local newspaper campaigns, public lessons, and to have authorities collaborate with patient associations (Perttilä, Winell, Haverinen, Lehto & Mikkola 1995, 37–53). Experiences have been positive for the most part, since low-level community collaboration has been widely welcomed. Some have felt disappointment because they consider the new policy as a mere continuation of the old centralist top-down healthcare governance. The abstract ideas of inter-sector “total health” governance did not spark much enthusiasm or lead to many new, specific types of bottom-up action (Kokko 2000, 30–31). The awareness of citizens, interest in the program, and the rate of citizen participation were quite meager, unfortunately. Municipalities had not been concerned enough to implement “total public healthcare” in all their activities. It was an experience of a bottom-up process, of which the authorities had only limited previous experience (Perttilä et al. 1995, 54–56; Sihto 1997, 177–178).

Yamey (2002, 1172) explains that community mobilization of the 1980's *Health for All by the Year 2000* became unfashionable, when neo-liberal values and competition, rather than collaboration, became dominant. Kokko (2000, 35) states that the underdevelopment of direct citizen participation is due to the plurality of well-developed public healthcare associations for patients. Membership in these associations is usually based on the formal requirement of having the specified chronic illness or otherwise having personal interest in the association. Many of these associations are very active both locally and at the national level. The voice of a single member may, however, be lost in these associations, but at large, the associations have long since been active in lobbying with politicians and defending the interest of the patients.

The Health21 (WHO 2000) is the latest version of WHO's international public healthcare program. This new version represents bottom-up participation much more explicitly and it encourages local municipalities and other bodies at the local level to collaborate to achieve local objectives. The European Union has also displayed explicit competence in public healthcare promotion since the Maastricht Treaty (Article 129), and the Amsterdam Treaty (Article 152). In its latest, updated Public Health Strategy (2000), the EU supports public healthcare promotion, but it emphasizes that the explicit sovereignty of healthcare issues belongs to member states.

With regard to the social sector, the Program for Preventive Social Policy was another major community-oriented program which began in 1995. It states that the prevention of social problems must include actions in all walks of life, in education, urban planning, nutrition, etc. Integration should reinforce communities to create new routines and added value to welfare policy (Väärälä & Simpura 1997, 2). Local preventive social policy includes numerous local programs, in which the municipalities act by themselves or in collaboration with other organizations, such as local associations and private companies. The abundance of projects is impressive, but their evaluation expressed the difficulty in setting up the structure of the project and arousing awareness in citizens and getting them interested in participation in local communities. (Lehtinen & Valtonen 1997.)

The Rio Earth Summit in 1992 resulted in a global action plan for sustainable development, the Local Agenda 21. Nations that signed the treaty agreed that a global partnership was needed for sustainable development. Chapter 28 of the Rio Earth Summit Treaty includes objectives (Lafferty 1999, 1–2; Institute of Global Communications 2002), which state that local authorities in each country should undertake a consultative process with their population and achieve a consensus on the LA 21 for the community. All local authorities in each country were encour-

aged to implement and monitor programs which aim at ensuring that women and youth are presented in decision-making, planning and implementation processes. The document stated that the local authorities should enter into a dialogue with its citizens, local organizations and private enterprises. Public authorities would learn from local bodies to formulate the best strategies. Local consultation and assessment processes would increase households' awareness regarding sustainable development issues.

The Finnish National Commission developed the Finnish Action for Sustainable Development program (Agenda 21) between 1995 and 1997. Extensive variation regarding the implementation and success of LA21 exists in Finnish municipalities. Small communities have successfully implemented LA21 because they receive their livelihood from tourism. It helps that there are particularly dedicated, influential individuals who promote the program in the communities. Residents in cities more often live a consumerist way of life. They do not know their neighbors well enough to form bottom-up environmental activities. There are several types of interests hindering community-oriented, environmental reforms. Meetings between authorities and citizens have a top-down tone. Citizens were involved at first after the official goals had been set and the activity models had been planned. The authorities had no desire for the contribution of the average people because the professional civil servants declared the means and the ends. The process was planned and controlled in an efficient way, but then again it meant that the citizens merely had a reactive role. (Niemi-Iilahti 1999a, 239, 244.)

The most active citizens in LA21 projects are those who also participate in other activities, a typical active person is a well-educated woman, aged 30+. Participation among men and young people is generally very low. Nevertheless, citizens have been involved in the process in a new participative way, although their number is limited and their opportunities for participation need to be improved. The international program has enforced the idea of spreading community-oriented participatory decision-making (Niemi-Iilahti 1999a, 244–245; 1999b, 54–55).

Häikiö (2000, 96–97) states that no permanent forms of citizen and community engagement, empowerment or participation were created. After the project was finished, the LA21 documents were filed and forgotten. Koskiahho, Nurmi & Virtanen (1999, 183) comment that local communities can solve local problems, but they are not able to solve the problems of the entire society. Solving problems would need communitarization of the entire society, which creates new problems.

The Ministry of the Interior launched the Participatory Project in 1997. The project searched for new forms of participation for young people. For example, young, school-aged teens could participate in developing municipal services by creating

public service charters and feedback systems. Teaching teens to participate in local matters can be seen as an investment in the future. Furthermore, teens could have their own councils in some municipalities.

Another aim of the program was to increase openness of public administration at the local level. Partnership programs with municipal authorities, the non-governmental voluntary sector and the citizens of the municipality were also on the list. Concrete, new actions have included regular meetings and hearings of civil servants, local politicians and citizens, citizens' hearings in various new local forums such as residential councils, and information programs by using the Internet or local TV. The project utilized ideas of "e-democracy" and developed models of global and local forms of autonomy and self-governance. Municipalities which the Ministry considered central in regard to participation formed the core of the project. The services a municipality provides affect the lives of the residents in many ways. The city of Hämeenlinna is famous for applying its so-called small democracy model for citizens, including three democracy projects as new forms of citizen participation. Some of these projects are aimed at young people whose voice has been neglected. (Osallisuushanke 2000a; 2000b; 2000c; Ministry of the Interior 2000.)

The Ministry of the Interior has later continued these participative actions in 2003 by setting up a project for developing local democracy as part of the civil participation policy program in which some cities and municipalities have partook. Some researchers (Koskiahio, Nurmi and Virtanen 1999, 182; Mattila 2003, 165–166) see these examples more as top-down governance than spontaneous bottom-up social engagements.

Pilot projects for the Local Partnership Program began in 1996, when about thirty federations of municipalities took part in local partnership projects. The experiment was funded by the European Union, Objectives 3 and 6. The aim of the projects was to prevent social exclusion by generating new jobs in new tripartite collaboration between public authorities, the private sector and the third sector. The experiences of Ireland and other European countries have illustrated that local partnership can indeed have a positive impact on empowering excluded groups and promoting social inclusion and cohesion in deprived areas. The partnerships have contributed to local social solidarity, by the involvement of local communities and disadvantaged groups in decision-making or building greater trust between authorities and groups such as young people. Traditional top-down programs have usually failed to yield desired results. (Katajamäki 1996; 1998; Geddes 1998, 135.)

The projects were conglomerates of private entrepreneurs, unemployed workers, schools, trade unions, non-governmental organizations, as well as municipal and state officials who gathered together to consider what reducing unemployment in

their own municipality would mean. The partnership programs have all had some type of steering group, which consist of members of the background organizations, i.e. the municipality, private companies, third-sector associations, etc. Their role is to supervise the key executive person who manages the project daily. The project's money flow is usually managed through the municipality or other public authority. During the first years, thousands of new jobs were created, which is a good result. The most successful method has been activating the third sector with funding from the public sector. Still, local partnership cannot be considered a miracle, but a new approach to dealing with unemployment. (Hyyryläinen & Luostarinen 1997, 9–18; Katajamäki 1998, 7; Reimavuo, Händelin, Reimavuo 1999, 14, 38.)

Partnership requires a long time and success depends on the commitment of the people and institutions involved in the projects. The most profitable outcome of partnership can be the founding of partnership itself. The longer the time the partners have to collaborate, the better the results will be. New types of partnership cultures have manifested; for example, the associations of private entrepreneurs and the local units of trade unions jointly arranged seminars and lectures for unemployed people. The people make the partnership, in official and unofficial ways, and therefore personal involvement and getting together is important. This mode of activity has opened possibilities to a new culture of joint responsibility. The problem is participants demand practical results too early and project funding is jeopardized too easily. Also, prestige and local patriotism may become more important than the contents of the joint effort. (Katajamäki 1998, 47, 65–66; Hyyryläinen and Kangaspunta 1999.)

The partners are equal and the initiatives should ascend from the bottom upwards. The role of the third sector is particularly important. The programs have contacted third-sector associations; the associations have hired unemployed people using public financial aid from various sources. There are similarities between the Local Partnership Program and communitarian thoughts since it includes moral tones, mainly the caring of other people. It should, however, be noted that the Local Partnership Program is not a “pure” bottom-up activity, since its initiator is the European Union and the partnerships involve large-scale activity.

3.5. Summary of the comparison

The divisions between two-party systems and multi-party systems were not feasible indicators of what policies are like concerning Community Governance. The most astonishing issue which arose in this comparison was that community-oriented policies are advocated by opposing parties in the political field. The US Democrats have adopted communitarian ideology first, but it was soon copied and re-labeled

by the Republicans. Clinton's policy strongly advocated communitarian values, and was later continued, in part, by the next president's administration.

The disappearance of old political boundaries is visible in Europe also. British neo-conservatives had such a remarkable influence that the socialists could no longer continue to advocate socialism as such. Socialistic programs have been partly rewritten and the Blair & Schröder contribution indicated that the Social Democratic Parties advocate similar community values as the US Republicans. The values which the European New Left advocates closely resemble that which the US Republicans advocate!

All of the countries view the state as a partner in all vital civic communities. The Republican Party is not an anti-state party, but it states that civic, preferably religious, communities should be empowered to be able to provide services more efficiently. Faith-based groups, especially, are important since they are not indifferent to the peoples' moral commitment. All the countries in the comparison acknowledge the important role of the central state, local authorities, markets, associations and other communities of citizens in society.

American community-oriented thoughts answer primarily to over-individualization, crime and community safety problems. The Republicans have felt uncomfortable with public social care matters, but they have found that the bottom-up, community-based solutions can be useful. Faith-based solutions are not only American, as the German principle of subsidiarity is originally faith-based also. The Americans are especially concerned about single mothers. The European way of Community Governance is linked with larger social exclusion, and low democratic participation.

The central governments play an important role since community-based reforms would not be possible without the specific governance of the central state. Public policy can be bottom-up and community-oriented. The community-oriented tasks include efforts, which suggest a stronger central state! Especially in the case of community safety, the state police possess more power. To improve the quality of life and safety in the community, the civil rights of racial minorities in the suburbs have been reduced. The reduction of crime, especially, seems to signify a strong police force and community watch-groups to support them. A strong public police force also supports the community and vice versa. Therefore, oddly enough, harsher sentences for criminals and the reduction of "individual freedoms" are the key to improve the well-being of communities.

The Europeans seem to be more concerned with globalization and environmental issues. The environmental agendas were put in action in Europe, but the citizens' interest to them seems to be rather low.

The welfare-to-workfare theory seems to be a dominant practical solution in the US and Britain. In both countries, social assistance is considered to disempower people and therefore people are forced to seek jobs or otherwise take responsibility for their own lives. The situation is opposite in Germany and Finland where corporatist associations (trade unions) fiercely oppose any attempts to weaken unemployment or social assistances (Table 14).

Table 14. *Comparison of Community Governance Reforms in Four Countries.*

	United States	Britain	Germany	Finland
Stereotype of welfare state	Residual welfare state	Beveridge-type welfare state	Bismarck-type welfare state	Nordic welfare state
Parties	Two-party system	Two-party system	Few-party system	Multi-party system
Contemporary main political ideology	Compassionate conservatism	Third Way	Consensus of moderate ideologies	Consensus of moderate ideologies
Political advocator(s)	Democrats, Republicans	Labour	CSU/CDU traditionally, also SPD and Greens	Center traditionally, now also SDP
Ideology answers to:	Individualization; Social problems; Social welfare expenditures; Crime; Declined civic morality	Individualization; Social problems; Global and environmental issues	Individualization; Social problems; Global and environmental issues	Individualization; Social problems; Global and environmental issues
Leader and financier	Federal state	State and EU	Federal state and EU	State and EU
Main tools	Community policing; Workfare; Collaboration with faith-based organizations	Partnership projects; Workfare	Participation projects	Participation and partnership projects

There is a greater difference between the American and European countries than there is within the European countries. In all of the countries, Community Governance ideas are linked to the further renewal of the welfare state and the political parties are more or less alike in that sense. The communitarian message is interesting to many political parties, from left to right.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I shall summarize the previous parts of this text. I shall discuss the impact of these reforms and how useful they are from our own Finnish perspective.

4.1. Old ideologies re-mixed

I referred to communities as organizations or informal social entities, which are outside the public sector organizations. They are separate from public institutions, but separate from market-organizations as well. I referred to Community Governance as a policy, which answers to postmodern challenges, where the sense of community is essential for the understanding of how the well-being of citizens functions. Community Governance includes those forms of public activities, which aim at improving maintaining the well-being of the individual citizens, especially within autonomous communities and by autonomous communities. Community Governance is a tool, in other words, and it can be used to complement the way in which the bureaucratic administration and the market-oriented administration govern society.

The well-being of the citizens is the central aim in Community Governance. It can be a rational aim, but the well-being of citizens can also be a cultural, racial, religious or other non-rational issue. The well-being of citizens is in the primary interest of the welfare state, and it is in the interest of the people and their communities also. Since the welfare state apparently cannot afford to handle all promotions of well-being itself, or the results can be accomplished better outside the public sector in a local community, there is no reason why Community Governance should not be utilized. Community Governance can fill gaps in the welfare network and provide services, which public authorities in reality cannot, and perhaps should not, produce.

Contemporary Community Governance actions cannot be anti-governmental or anarchistic, since ordinary people, their communities and the public sector have a rather similar aim: the well-being of the people. One can compare it with the Aristotle's concept of "eudaimonia", which can be reached only in community. Well-being denotes, above all, emotional and social happiness. It is closely connected to economical welfare, i.e. not being poor. However, contrary to the New Public Management doctrine, the economical efficiency of the public administrative system, the system's streamlined management of efficacy, etc. should not be the main concerns. Community Governance concentrates on "small" democracies, personal emotions and aims towards a good life, social inclusion, good manners, public safety, the feeling of belonging, etc.

The central premise in Community Governance is that the individual is always a part of some community. This sense of belonging should be emphasized and revitalized, since it improves the economy and the well-being of people. This also helps the government. Well-being comprises social, economical, participatory and emotional well-being of the people. The social and mental welfare of individuals is connected to belonging to some community. Therefore, when one belongs to a community that has good aims, it is also in the benefit of the public sector.

At worst, the aims of communities may be irrelevant to each other, but not contradictory. There may be communities which aim at coup d'état or radical reforms but such movements must be considered as peripheral or illegal. The boundaries between what is legal and what is illegal must be evaluated in the political legislative process.

In Table 15, the selected concepts are divided into two dimensions. Firstly, there are "pro-state" theories meaning that the state is the ultimate community. The second category, "with-state" theories, means that citizens' independent communities are tolerated and supported by the state. The third category, "anti-state" theories, means that these theories reject the state and want to abolish it, and it them, by independent bottom-up communities. Secondly, a distinction can be made according to the valuations of the theories, whether the theories are interested in material values and aiming at economical and social well-being; or if they emphasize democratic ideals and democracy itself; or whether they emphasize spiritual valuations and place most emphasis on cultural and religious well-being.

The left part of the table represents theories that are nowadays considered peripheral and which, in most cases, view the state as the only form of community. Individuals are expected live in a state-community and all actions against the state are illegal. On the right side of the table, there are other theories, which have clearly expressed their negative attitude toward the state. They emphasize the independent roles of the communities and would like to abolish public bureaucracies.

Table 15. *Theories behind Community Governance.*

Primary aim	Pro-state theories	With-state theories	Anti-state theories
Material valuations, Economical and social well-being	Communism; Nazism; Fascism	Social capital; Partnership; Empowerment; Sociological communitarianism	Corporatism; Anarcho- capitalism; Libertarianism
Democratic valuations, democratic well-being	(Hegel)	Liberalism; Participation; Third Way	Anarchism; Anarcho- syndicalism
Spiritual valuations, Cultural and religious well-being	Asian communitarianism	Philosophical communitarianism; Catholicism; Conservatism	Liberatory education

Community Governance consists of theories, which are in the middle of the table. They all advance the financial, social, democratic, religious and cultural well-being of the citizens. Social capital is a concept of national economists, which connects the social to the capital. The state maintains the social capital of the civil society. The Italian experience of the 1980s, and numerous researchers thereafter, has illustrated that when there are informal networks, connections and trust in the society, it will result in an increase in the Gross Domestic Product. It is needed to empower entrepreneurs to establish new businesses and keep their businesses running. Trust is a cultural and non-governmental phenomenon as it has evolved gradually throughout a long political and economical history.

The state is a partner to the communities. Instead of seeing just nothingness outside the public administration, public administrators should see that there is social and intellectual capital, trust, and communal needs, which exist independently from the public welfare state. Partnership is a web of governmental organizations, corporations and third-sector associations. Partnership creates a community of equal bodies, which maintain their original tasks but still take responsibility for the entirety. Partnership signifies collaboration and networking on an equal basis, but within the interests of the government. Compulsory competitive tendering may result in a waste of energy and a waste of time. When social interactions are based on collaboration, i.e. partnership, every partner is expected to benefit—a win-win situation is possible. Partnership can create a new collaborative culture in a locality, which can involve and empower excluded groups. Partnership can improve the delivery of public services at the local and regional levels. Local partnership provides an opportunity to learn since it can act as a forum for innovation and experimentation.

Severe deficiencies in the local infrastructure are beyond the competence of local partnership. In many cases, projects are too short-term and do not have sufficient financial resources. Therefore, continuous support is needed for local regions to be able to help themselves. Clearly, the conclusion is that these types of bottom-up activities need top-down financial support and supervision.

Contemporary social work theories emphasize the empowerment of citizens and their bottom-up communities to revive their capacities. Social work has for a century been based on theoretical knowledge of the community's capacity to support individuals.

Sociological communitarians claim that traditional values have deteriorated, but high morality is important. High morality and values are not invented or negotiated. As a branch of liberalism, communitarianism allows organizational hybrids in the welfare production. Citizens should, and are encouraged, to personally participate in the decision-making processes of public democratic organizations or in the implementation of the decisions. Responsibility must be upheld together with rights. Old-fashioned responsibilities should be revived, people should participate in the decision-making processes as the sociological communitarians have stated. The state should promote the participation of its citizens in general democratic forums, elections, boards, town hall meetings, etc.

The Third Way is a new political slogan, but actually it was used a century ago for the first time. The New Left has rejected state socialism and welcomes a multitude of solutions where people can partake in the decision-making process in civil society. Citizens are expected to take responsibility for their own sake to improve their own well-being. There must be an active civil society with networks, collaboration, communication and trust between various organizations and the people. This mutual trust between citizens, entrepreneurs, companies, authorities and third-sector authorities is a prerequisite for a vital economy. Mutual trust is a form of capital and it can be destroyed, which immediately results in economic and social decline. The government can try to improve it, but it is partly independent of public actions. Collaboration is viewed as more important than competition.

Community Governance advocates the collaboration of the public and private sectors as equal partners. The public administrative structure is viewed as valuable in and of itself because privatizing all public activities is not wise. The Third Way is a label of renewal for the Left parties, and it involves rejecting old socialistic solutions, socialism, but also simultaneously rejecting ultimate capitalism. The New Left accepts privatization, but not unlimited capitalism. It accepts small-scale entrepreneurship, privatization and most market-oriented modes of operations, but

opposes global capitalism and promotes global ecological issues, as well as family and social issues on the micro-level and traditional heritage. The Third Way includes philosophical tones that demand respect for traditional values, good manners and personal responsibilities. Approaches in Community Governance have many forms and titles, being more or less synonymous with each other. The Third Way is a fashionable political term, since the New Left was forced to change its utopias due to the collapse of communism in Russia. They had to accept the market economy and the efficient public services. The community-oriented message of the New Left states that the development of public services should not rely merely on privatization and competition, but on partnership and collaboration also. The results of privatization and other market-oriented modes of operation are impressive; the socialists cannot deny it. The European New Left governments privatize state-owned companies and other public property as eagerly as the conservatives did. Privatization was not an answer to all problems. The most important example comes from social welfare and healthcare where the malfunctions of unnecessary market-oriented, purchaser-provider divisions and competitive tendering are serious.

The philosophical communitarians would like parents to take care of the moral upbringing of their own children, neighbors to take care of each other, parents to take part in educational decision-making and religious movements to take care of oppressed people. High morality and responsibility, together with rights, are their primary aims. Families, neighborhood, history, traditions and religions are the foundation of the culture, which forms the community. The Catholic principle of subsidiarity proposes that a Catholic person should resist both self-interested pursuits and reliance on the activities of public authorities. It emphasizes the role of the church and the role of citizen communities. The communitarians have specifically described the problems of ultimate rationalism and individualism and provide remedies for them. Communitarianism emphasizes traditional values, and citizens' collective action. It is a major attack against individualism, rationalism, and modernism.

Conservatism favors free markets, but it also prefers self-organization, to central control because conservatists believe it is impossible for the markets or public administration to control social life. Moral community is required for the coherence of individual and social lives, and a traditional way of life is a necessity. Conservatives are confident that the moral and social future will resemble the past more than the present.

Community Governance proposes some new issues, but for the most part it reflects a remix of old social theories and approaches. Liberalism comprises a family of theories with partly contradictory arguments. If communitarians criticize specific

liberal doctrines, it does not follow that they reject, or fail to appreciate, the main ideas and institutions of liberalism. The central difference between the attitudes of neo-liberalism and Community Governance are in two contradictory words: competition and collaboration. The former acquires its motivation from self-interest, competing and striving for individual benefits; the latter acquires its energy from collective interests. The former aims at efficiency whereas the latter aims at well-being. Today's neo-Aristotelian communitarians are not anti-liberal, if liberalism signifies a strong commitment to political freedom, social justice, constitutional rights, the rule of law, full citizenship, and special concern for the poor and the oppressed.

The debate over community versus individuality has been inherited from the philosophers of Antiquity. The Communitarians, especially, have made the question of balance between individual and social responsibilities, between autonomy and the common good, a visible issue. Individuals have rights, but they also have responsibilities, in a society that is well-founded, attentive to its members and profoundly democratic. The sociological or philosophical communitarian objectives are primarily to revive traditions, family values, social bonds and togetherness. Some philosophical communitarian aims are expressed in romantic ways. They emphasize the religious "child's" faith. Asian Communitarians wish to maintain obedience to the elderly and to the leader. Since it is impossible to turn the clock back to the time that prevailed decades or centuries ago, realistic aims are to build modern communities with lasting values.

Contemporary political borderlines no longer follow the socialistic–capitalistic boundaries. Old, community-oriented ideologies and theories are renewed, re-labeled, reprinted and recycled and are being globally exported and imported in postmodern times. The European socialists and the American Republican compassionate conservatives copied ideas from each other. The Labour in Britain and the Social Democrats in Germany and Finland have similar thoughts, which the Clinton administration already withheld. Bush's campaign had no difficulty in copying ideas from Clinton and just re-labeling them. European conservatives have adopted the ideas of social awareness, empowerment of citizens and other communitarian tones from Britain's Labour party. Socialists no longer dream of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but are content with the mixture of bureaucratic, market-oriented and community-oriented policies. Conservatives are also concerned about social problems. Solutions to social problems are sought from community empowerment, partnership, participation, voluntary work, community policing, zero tolerance, personal responsibility, workfare, religious commitment and other Community Governance reforms. These are parallel and overlapping, and perhaps sometimes contradictory. During these "postmodern" times, all the major ideologies have

been mixed – there are no single, rational, or “modern” solutions. There are many pragmatic policies where ideas have been copied from opposing parties in the past and they have been relabeled and recycled.

New political boundaries associated with the well-being of many communities have ended up being related to non-rational issues, such as religious, cultural and racial issues. The enemy keeps the community together. Global injustice has created radical communities whose members have decided to fight with weapons against Western values. Their reaction is to protect their traditional values, religion, and culture against other values and moral decline. The terror attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001 revealed a global confrontation between the secular West and Islamic fundamentalism.

Globalization is, however, a threat to most communitarian philosophers, since it threatens local cultures, ways of living, traditions and habits. Information technology spreads global influence onto the screens of our computers forcing communities to experience it. ATTAC represents a new form of resistance against globalization and limitless capitalism. Then again, globalization offers new opportunities for everyone to participate in communities, for example to take part in the construction of such communities as Wikipedia or other blogs.

Many international and global organizations have advocated for nations and local communities to empower local, bottom-up communities. The World Health Organization, the European Union and many other organizations advocate for the participation of citizens, collaboration and other bottom-up community actions to improve the situation of the least benefited. Community Governance’s modes of operations are closely linked with the European Union’s efforts to tackle social exclusion. To reduce social exclusion and to improve well-being through community and the empowerment of citizens is a widely supported policy. The social dimension of the European Union was first emphasized during Jacques Delor’s commission in the 1980s and 1990s. These EU themes are more or less adapted to national public policies in member countries. The EU’s main concern is the relative poverty of some regions and the unemployment and social exclusion connected with those regions. Structural funds locally enforce collaboration between municipalities, third-sector associations and companies to determine how to improve local welfare. Exclusion requires radical actions, evolving local communities is difficult. However, the institutional interaction of policy-making bodies at the various levels of European governance leads to the re-definition of national and regional identities within the European context, where the multiple levels of governance in Europe are not necessarily viewed as being in opposition with one another.

4.2. Possible problems of Community Governance

Table 16 summarizes the potential benefits and problems of Community Governance. The Nordic welfare state represents a fulfillment of Hegel's community ideal, since it encompasses everything and encloses everything under its protection. The individual cannot escape and does not even wish to capsule herself/himself outside the state community. "Hegelians" would argue that withdrawing the government is impossible because without the state there would be mere "nothingness". The only functional community that can actually provide welfare services is the welfare state, which is organized in a bureaucratic way to produce well-being equal to all of the citizens. They would say that such communities as relatives and families, which indeed have taken care of the most vulnerable before the welfare state period, cannot again be responsible for the most vulnerable people. This would be like turning the clock back. As we know, there is an abundance of spontaneous community formation taking place outside the Hegelian "state-machinery": thousands of associations.

Many political leaders, theorists and populists believe that empowerment is a vital key to solving human dilemmas of powerlessness, which the welfare activities of the public sector did not solve. People could be empowered to take care of themselves, i.e. to empower people to manage better by themselves. Freire's contribution argues that a human being or a community is not a helpless victim under the control of public, top-down administration, but capable of improving their own situation, bottom-up, and are moreover responsible for it. Empowerment can be radical and revolutionary, a potential risk to contemporary government.

An increase in personal responsibility could possibly increase commitment but it requires common understanding as to what it really means when responsibility is left to another member of the community, in many cases to the women in the families. That is the situation with elderly care. Social care activities are predominantly women's activities. Community Governance must not mean setting all public welfare services on the shoulders of voluntary women. The withdrawal of public tasks must be controlled, and the scope of tasks that the voluntary sector is capable of doing, must be limited.

Workfare refers to the idea that the authorities compel people to seek jobs. Furthermore, it encompasses the notion that all members of a community are responsible for creating jobs; including the unemployed who must try to actively improve their own life situation. Improving one's own life situation is easier in a community where people are compelled to help themselves and to take responsibility through social control. The outcomes of forced empowerment have been surprisingly good in the USA, but then again there are people who are not capable of working enough or they are not able to make a living due to poor wages.

Table 16. *Potential Benefits and Problems of Community Governance.*

Concept	Possible benefits	Possible problems
Government withdrawal	Spontaneous community formation	Nothingness
Empowerment	Increases awareness of personal capabilities and the capabilities of communities	Radical, anti-state, revolutionary
Personal responsibility	Personal commitment; Awareness of the community's efforts	Some people do not understand it; Tasks are left to the women in families
Workfare	Improves employment; Employment prevents social exclusion; Decreases public social welfare	All people are not capable of working; Open vacancies available only in prosperous times; Low salaries maintain poverty; People are no longer eligible for welfare and statistics become distorted
Compulsory voluntary work	Voluntary work is an honor; Improves the majority's awareness of the problems of the weaker strata	Lack of committed people; Needs financial support from public authorities or a possible tax reduction
Community policing, Neighborhood watch groups, Zero tolerance	Improves safety; Integrates social work into policing; Citizens collaborate with police; Improves awareness of crime	Social care expertise of the police; People do not commit themselves for longer periods of time; Racial minorities suffer; Punishments too harsh; Does not solve the reasons for the problems
Partnership	Creates networks and communities; Improves employment; Prevents social exclusion	Takes a long time to develop trust; Efficiency difficult to measure; Envy among authorities
Participatory projects	People decide upon their own issues; People contribute directly to the public authorities; New participatory forums created	Issues are too complex for open forums; Professional public authorities are more efficient; A majority of the people are not interested; People not allowed to make financial decisions
Town hall meetings, Neighborhood councils, Internet-based communities	Lively debates; Plurality of different opinions	Only the most active people take part; Do not reflect the opinion of the entire population; Difficult to organize; Legally unbinding, unofficial; All opinions are not taken seriously
Faith based organizations High morality	Benefit peoples' religious commitment; Traditional values remain a part of people's lives; More efficient delivery of welfare	Proselytization of oppressed citizens; Secularization of faith-based organizations; Outdated values; Different interpretations of the right values

National services and other forms of “compulsory” voluntary work can be added to the curriculum in the educational system, but the problem is that people do not truly commit themselves to voluntary work for a long period of time. Tax reductions could be rendered to those who have given financial assistance to voluntary civic activities. The problem here is that these types of actions also need public assistance.

Community policing has proven to be quite a well-working system. One of its shortcomings lies in the fact that duties that would otherwise fall under the jurisdiction of social workers, schools, other authorities, or even families are transferred to the public police force. The police alone are perhaps not the best experts in solving social problems; they need other experts as well. Neighborhood watch-groups seem to provide a functioning system in addition to police work, but it requires the citizens’ commitment to continue. Zero tolerance has proven efficient in New York City, but many claim that police control most often targets African Americans, or other minorities and immigrants. Moreover, the reasons for problems are not solved by “blaming, shaming and jailing” the suspected because it merely removes criminals from the streets and prisons are becoming overpopulated as it is.

Partnership is a rather broad concept: a web or a network of collaborative actions including the local government, the private sector, the third sector and citizens. Putting them together takes time before any results can be seen. The primus motor of partnership is in many cases the public sector, which benefits most from collaboration. The aim is to work together and form a consensus of needed measures to benefit all involved. International and national governments and ministries have created the partnership initiative. Experiences have indicated that partnership projects can arouse envy among public authorities especially in cases where projects have found a more efficient way to organize the well-being of people.

Participation is important but often people simply do not want to bother. They are encouraged to make decisions, but the problem lies in them not being allowed to make decisions. Some issues are too complex to be solved at the small democracy level. Perhaps the welfare state has “over-organized” the issues of the ordinary people and they have lost their initiative; perhaps they are just content with the way things are. Town hall meetings, neighborhood councils or various new Internet-based forms of community are widely used and although people are able to take part in these forms of community rather easily, only the active strata of the society take part in them, i.e. they do not reflect the opinions of all citizens. Furthermore, these forms of community are in many cases unofficial, the opinions stemming from them are unbinding and therefore they are not taken seriously.

Many hope that faith-based organizations and higher morality will provide a solution to the multitude of social challenges. Many people have deep religious commitments,

but the moral assumptions of people may change and they may be indifferent to “salvation”. People also hold various interpretations as to what the “right” faith is and this can also cause problems.

4.3. Community Governance completes bureaucratic and market-oriented governances

The final conclusion is that Community Governance completes bureaucratic and market-oriented governances. It does not replace them. Table 17 summarizes the three types of governance.

Table 17. *Bureaucracy, Market-oriented Governance and Community Governance.*

	Bureaucratic governance	Market-oriented governance	Community Governance
Primary philosophical base	Law	Individual will	Community membership
Norms	Written laws	Free agreement; Competition	Virtuosity, high morality, emotion
Motivation	Hierarchy, obedience	Markets, competition	Culture, tradition, ethnicity
State's role	Guarantees equality and citizens' equality	Regulates markets and guarantees competition	Partner to empower citizens to support themselves
Required competence for civil servants	Formal education	Agreed competence between merchant and client	Membership
Citizen's role	Subordinate	Client	Member
Citizens' channel of influence	Elections, legal process	Buying, selling, choosing, complaining	Public hearings, commenting, communication
Citizens' primary interest	Legality, equality	Efficiency	Emotional well-being
Typical organization	Public hierarchies	Public companies; Management by Results	Neighborhoods, associations, informal networks, faith-based organizations
Direction of influence	Top-down	Business-to-customer	Bottom-up
Possible disadvantages	Inefficiency	Creates unnecessary competition and demands; Profit maximization	Unreliability; Indifference; Racist, exclusive, radical

The implementation of tasks can be rendered to a public bureaucracy, a market-oriented operator or a community. The philosophical background in bureaucratic governance is the law; market-oriented governance is based on individual will and Community Governance is based on community membership. The normative bases of bureaucracy are written laws and overall reliability of the system, but bureaucracy's disadvantages are rigidity and economic inefficiency. The advantages of market-oriented modes of governance are freedom of agreements, economic efficiency, and responsibility to clients. Then again, its disadvantages are unnecessary competition and the creation of unnecessary needs for the clients. Other disadvantages include greediness or profit maximization, since service providers must receive their income from the markets. Community-oriented governance implements tasks in a way that respects the community's traditions and improves the emotional and cultural awareness of its members. The aim is to empower community members in which case they must take responsibility for themselves to improve their life situation. The disadvantages of Community Governance involve the possibility that the community may become too close-knit and form prejudices towards some of its members or towards other communities. A culturally coherent community may function unreliably; for example, the government may set rational tasks for the community to perform, but they may not be tasks that the community has set as their primary goals. Emotional togetherness is the aim, not necessarily legalism or the economically efficient provision of services.

There are many forms of communities. The public sector has an interest in forming vital communities or collaborating with existing communities. At best, the community flourishes independently, and the public sector does not need to undertake a dominant, watch-dog role. There are forms of social work, employment activities, empowerment, and partnership programs from which the unemployed, socially excluded or otherwise oppressed individuals may benefit. Patients or citizens must be aware of their needs to gain support from their own community.

Requirements for competence vary. Public bureaucracies demand a formal education for civil servants. In market-oriented governance, these requirements are agreed upon between the buyer and the seller. In communities, competences are accepted based on culture, tradition, or membership.

The "spontaneous community" is an ideal type of a bottom-up community, which forms without the interference of the public authorities. The basic assumption is that the mission of this type of community, such as civic associations, neighborhoods, clubs, clans, etc., is morally, culturally, and legally acceptable. In a supported community, the public sector renders direct or indirect incentives to community development. These incentives may be in the form of small-scale economical support

or specialist consultation. The public sector's control of the community's activity is less significant, but still important. Formal communities have certain public goals. These types of communities, such as municipalities, churches, semi-public associations, etc. fulfill publicly set, legal goals. In this model, funding is provided through taxation. Tax-based funding also involves accountability both financially and performance-wise.

Community Governance also has vicious effects. Community is not merely a rational unit; a functioning community is also an emotional unit. If a citizen feels that she/he would like to be a member, the decisions do not have to be rational. This can be a potential risk for authorities. Communitarian, bottom-up initiatives may be contradictory to the interests of formal communities, or politicians may feel that the bottom-up actions challenge traditional political structures. In Finland, for example, there have been reports that the LEADER partnership projects have sometimes caused envy among municipal officials.

Community as a concept is applied in many ways, and in some countries there are only regretful memories of state-centralistic forms of community. The grand ideological slogans of the Third Way and partnership, or compassionate conservatism, seem to be short-living because people have realized that the content of these slogans hold very little true substance. Still, emotional narratives are tempting. The bottom-up-type projects are officially supported by the European Union's social funds. Social work, public healthcare work and city planning all constantly rely on the community. Small communities are vital and their importance is growing.

Everyone is familiar with the negative aspects of bureaucracy. The most significant problem with market-oriented governance is the fact that it creates unnecessary demands and eventually makes services more expensive than before. Internally challenging and non-collaborative result-units are a serious problem, especially in the public administration's Management by Results system. Competition leads to a waste of resources and time, uncertainty concerning the actual provision of services, bankruptcies and more bureaucracy. The purchaser-provider division and competitive tendering has been turned to collaboration, at least in the rhetoric of the strategies for social welfare and healthcare.

Community Governance maintains the need of a strong state. The role of the public sector is to empower bottom-up activity. The state plays a commanding role because anarchistic spontaneous empowerment of communities would seriously challenge legitimate administration eventually. The tendency is still to develop local, bottom-up activities in a cautious and controlled way. One can describe the process as a bottom-up process controlled by the central government; meaning that spontaneous, bottom-up development is permitted within a certain limit.

The will of public policy cannot automatically initiate creativity and entrepreneurship, which are considered to be results of bottom-up empowerment. There are circumstances where the communities flourish and evolve by themselves, but the environment can also be hostile to the development of community-spirit. Spontaneous communities can work well in surroundings where everything is in order, whereas in socially deprived areas, there is a lack of community spirit. Apparently, to prompt citizen involvement in most suburbs requires a boost, or support by the public sector. The situation may be different in different suburbs: those who have everything also have social capital and they do not need aid in maintaining it. Then again, those who would most need it, do not have it, and they probably are indifferent to it or do not possess the capacity to obtain it. However, community spirit, participation, involvement or social capital (whichever term we choose to use) can be supported and aided, as social workers have known for a century. The increased or improved empowerment of citizens is not taken from somewhere else.

The public sector definitely plays an active role in the development of community spirit. The authorities have not been aware of the capacities of citizen communities. Those communities that possess social and economical problems definitely need a boost and support from the outside. Then again, social problems can be an unwanted result of failed public policy. A low rate in participation, low social control, and feelings of displacement can be a result of the activities created by the public sector, which originally had good intentions, e.g. failed urban city planning or failed economic policy, etc. Therefore, the duty of the public sector is to rebuild communities and facilitate the re-creation of social capital.

Community Governance is not an antithesis to bureaucracy or something that opposes market-oriented governance. Its legalistic principles are interminably valid, and public-sector services must be implemented as economically and efficiently as possible. Contemporary authors of communitarian ideology respect family values, traditions, and good manners, which are a part of civic culture. Recent administrative reforms place trust in neutral bureaucratic principles, efficiency techniques, market-oriented modes of operation, and citizen empowerment, as well as other Community Governance methods.

The important difference between market-oriented reforms and community-oriented reforms is that market-orientation is connected to rational administrative governance systems in its attempt to develop them to operate with maximum efficiency. Community Governance seeks improvement in communities and in traditional values, which cannot be measured with certainty or interpreted in financial terms.

Social problems, both locally and globally, are immense. Community Governance cannot provide answers to all of them. Bureaucratic administrative structures, market-oriented modes of operation and Community Governance can function simultaneously, but we should be aware that all these forms provide answers to different questions.

REFERENCES

- Abse, T. 1996. Italian workers and Italian Fascism. In: R. Bessel. (ed.) *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 40-80.
- Alanen, A. 1976. *Santeri Alkio*. Porvoo, Helsinki: WSOY.
- All the Power of a Small Village 2003. The Village Action Association of Finland 5/2003 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.maaseutuplus.net/files/download/ebookPDFEnglanti.pdf>.
- Allardyce, G. 1979. What Fascism Is Not: Thoughts on the Deflation of a Concept. *The American Historical Review* 84 (2), 367–388.
- Alliance90/The Greens 2002. *The Future is Green*. Alliance Program and Principles [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.gruene-partei.de>.
- Anttonen, A. 1989. *Valtiollisesta yhteisölliseen sosiaalipolitiikkaan*. Helsinki: Sosiaaliturvan Keskusliitto.
- Anttonen, A. & Sipilä, J. 2000. *Suomalaista sosiaalipolitiikkaa*. Tampere: Osuskunta Vastapaino.
- Arens, E. 2001. Republican Futures. *Policy Review*, April/May 2001, Issue 106, 13-24.
- Aristotle 1991. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translation, Volume Two*. Ed. J. Barnes. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Ashley, D. 1994. Postmodernism and Antifoundationalism. In: D.R. Dickens & A. Fontana (ed.) *Postmodernism and Social Inquiry*. London: UCL Press, 53–75.
- St. Augustine 2005. *City of God* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120115.htm>.
- Bakunin, M. 1992a. Three Lectures to Swiss Members. In: R. Cutler (ed.) *The Basic Bakunin*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 39–66.
- Bakunin, M. 1992b. The Tactics of Revolutionary Socialism. In: R. Cutler (ed.) *The Basic Bakunin*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 135–159.
- Bauman, Z. 1976. *Socialism: The Active Utopia*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Bauman, Z. 1992a. *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. 1992b. *Thinking Sociologically*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bauman, Z. 1996. On Communitarians and Human Freedom: Or, How to Square the Circle. *Theory, Culture & Society* 13 (2), 79–90.
- Beck, U. 1986. *Risikogesellschaft. Auf der Weg in der andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Beck, U. 2000. *The Brave New World of Work*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bell, D. 2002. Communitarianism [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/communitarianism/>.
- Bellah, R. 1998. Community Properly Understood: A Defence of “Democratic Communitarianism”. In: *The Essential Communitarian Reader*, 15–19. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bellefeuille, G. & Hemingway, D. (2005). The New Politics of Community-based governance Requires a Fundamental Shift in the Nature and Character of the Administrative Bureaucracy. *Children and Youth Services Review* 27 (5), 491–498.
- Benhabib, S. 1992. *Situating the Self. Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. New York: Routledge.

- Beresford, P. 2001. Service Users, Social Policy and the Future of Welfare. *Critical Social Policy* 21(4), 494–512.
- Bevir, M. & O'Brien, D. 2001. New Labour and the Public Sector in Britain. *Public Administration Review* 61 (5), 535–547.
- Bevir, M. & Rhodes, R. 2003. Changing Patterns of Governance in Britain. *Public Administration* 81 (1), 41–94.
- Bevir, M. & Rhodes, R. & Weller, P. 2003. Comparative Governance: Prospects and Lessons. *Public Administration* 81 (1), 191–209.
- Biegel, D. & Barbara S. & Elizabeth G. 1984. *Building Support Networks for the Elderly*. Beverly Hills etc.: Sage Publications.
- Blair, T. 1999. Speech to Socialist International Conference, Paris 8.11.1999 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.labour.org.uk/lp/new/labour>.
- Blair, T. & Cunnigham, J. 1999. Modernising Government. [27.02.2006][WWW document] <http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm43/4310/4310.htm>.
- Blair, T. & Schröder, G. 1999. The Third Way / Die Neu Mitte. A Joint Declaration by Tony Blair and Gerhard Schröder, London, 8th June 1999 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.labour.org.uk/lp/new/labour/labour.www_main.main?p_language=us&p_cornerid=67416&p_currcornerid=78&p_full=1/.
- Boje, D. & Gephart, R. & Thatchenkery, T.J. 1996. *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory*. Thousand Oaks etc: Sage Publications.
- Brännström, I. 1993. *Community Participation and Social Pattering in Cardiovascular Disease Intervention*. Umeå University Medical Dissertations, No. 383. Umeå: University of Umeå.
- Brudney, J. & Hebert T. & Wright, D 1999. Reinventing Government in the American States: Measuring and Explaining Administrative Reform. *Public Administration Review* 59 (1), 19–30.
- Brown, J. 2001. As Clinton Exits, 'Third Way' Faces Setbacks. *Christian Science Monitor* 93 (28), 2.
- Broughton, C. 2001. Work Programs and Welfare Recipients: An Ethnography of Work-Based Welfare Reform. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* Vol. 45, 17–41.
- Brudney, J. & Wright, D. 2002. Revisiting Administrative Reform in the American States: The Status of Reinventing Government During the 1990s. *Public Administration Review* 62 (3), 353–361.
- Burleigh, M. 2000. *The Third Reich: A New History*. London: Macmillan.
- Butler, A. 2000. The Third Way Project in Britain: The Role of the Prime Minister's Policy Unit. *Politics* 20 (3), 153–159.
- Byrne, D. 1999. *Social Exclusion*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Caiden, G. 1991. *Administrative reform comes of age*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.
- Calton, J. & Kurland, N. 1996. A theory of a stakeholder enabling, giving voice to an emerging postmodern praxis of organizational discourse. In: D.M. Boje & R.P. Gephart & T. Thatchenkery (ed.) *Postmodern management and organization theory*. Thousand Oaks etc: Sage Publications, 154–177.
- CDU 2006a. Principles and programme of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany. Adopted by the 5th Party Conference Hamburg, 21st to 23rd February 1994 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.cdu.de/>.

- CDU 2006b. Wertekonferenz. Merkel eröffnet Programdebatte der CDU. [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.cdu.de/index_11909.htm .
- The Center for Libertarian Studies 2002. Murray N. Rothbard: The Legacy of Liberty [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.libertarian-studies.org/mnr.asp> .
- Chait, J. 2001. Formula Won. *The New Republic*, January 22, 17–19.
- Chomsky, N. 2002. The Passion of Free Market: Exporting American Values Through the New World Trade Organization. [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.zmag.org> .
- Cnaan, R. & S. Boddie 2002. Charitable Choice and Faith-based Welfare: A Call for Social Work. *Social Work* 47 (3), 224–235.
- Cochran, C. 1989. The Thin Theory of Community: The Communitarian and Their Critics. *Political Studies* XXXII, 422–435.
- Coleman, J. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, Supplement S95–S120.
- Conservatism 2003. Conservatism FAQ [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: URL <HTTP://www.conservatism.com> .
- Corporation for National Service 2000. About Us: The Corporation for National Service [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.nationalservice.org/about/thecorporation.html> .
- Courtois, S. (ed.) 2000. *Kommunismen musta kirja: Rikokset, terrori, sorto*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Cutler, R. 1992. Introduction. In: R. Cutler (ed.) *The Basic Bakunin*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 15–29.
- Democratic National Platform 1996. Today's Democratic Party: Meeting America's Challenges, Protecting America's Values [WWW document] [21.7.1997]. Available: www.democrats.org/hq/--resources/platform/index.html .
- The Democratic national platform 2000. Prosperity, Progress and Peace [WWW document] [30.11.2000]. Available: <http://www.democrats.org/pdfs/2000platform.pdf> .
- Department of Justice 2002. Task Force for Faith Based & Community Initiatives [WWW document] [20.12.2002]. Available: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/faith-based/about.html> .
- Driver, S. & Martell, L. 1999. Left, Right and the Third Way. *Policy & Politics* 28 (2), 147–161.
- Durkheim, É. 1968, original 1897. *Suicide*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Durst, S. & Newell, C. 1999. Better, Faster, Stronger. *Government Reinvention in the 1990s*. *American Review of the Public Administration* 29 (1), 61–76.
- Dwyer, P. 1998. Conditional Citizens? Welfare Rights and Responsibilities in the Late 1990's. *Critical Social Policy* 18 (57), 493–417.
- Easterbrook, G. 2001. What Went Right: Modest Gain. *The New Republic*, January 22, 12–15.
- Economist 2000. Preparing America for Compassionate Conservatism. 356 (8181), 23–25.
- Engels, F. 2002, originally 1847. *The Principles of Communism* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/11/prin-com.htm> .
- The Enterprise Foundation 2005. [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.enterprisefoundation.org/> .

- Esping-Andersen, G. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Etzioni, A. 1988. *The Moral Dimension: Toward a New Economics*. New York: Free Press.
- Etzioni, A. 1993. *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda*. New York: Crown Publishers Inc.
- Etzioni, A. 1996. *The New Golden Rule. Community and morality in a democratic society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Etzioni, A. 1999. *The Limits of Privacy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Etzioni, A. (ed.) 1998. *The Essential Communitarian Reader*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- European Commission 1993. *European Social Policy: Options for the Union*. DGV, COM 93 551.
- European Commission 1994. *European Social Policy – A Way forward for the Union White Paper*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Commission 1995a. *European Strategy for Encouraging Local Development and Employment Strategies*. COM 95 273 Final.
- European Commission 1995b. *The Future of Social Protection: A Framework for European Debate*. Brussels: European Commission COM 95 466 Final.
- European Commission 1998. *Communication from the commission to the council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Sustainable Urban Development in the European union: A Framework for Action*. COM1998 605 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/communic/pdf/caud/caud_en.pdf.
- European Commission 2000. *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and to the Committee of the Regions. Social Policy Agenda*. COM2000 379 Final [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/general/com00-379/com379_en.pdf.
- European Commission 2002. *Joint Report on Social Inclusion*. Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Evers, A. 2006. *Current strands in debating user involvement in social services*. [WWW document] [1.11.2006] Available: http://www.coe.int/t/e/social_cohesion/social_policies/04.activities/1._access_to_social_rights/4._social_services/02_Current%20strands%20in%20debating%20user%20involvement%20in%20social%20services%20-%20report%20Evers.asp.
- Falk, R. 1999. *Predatory Globalization, A Critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Feste, C. & Anderson, R. 1995. *Empowerment: from Philosophy to Practise*. *Patient Education and Counselling* 26, 139–144.
- Fole, P & Martin, S. 2000. *A New deal for the Community? Public Participation in Regeneration and Local Service Delivery*. *Policy and Politics* 28 (4), 479–491.
- Fox, C. & Miller, H. 1995. *Postmodern Public Administration, Toward Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, etc: Sage Publications.
- Froland, C., Pancoast, D., Chapman N. & Kimboko, P. 1981. *Helping Networks and Human Services*. Beverly Hills etc.: Sage Publications.
- Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

- Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press.
- Freire, P. 1975. *Pedagogik för förtryckta*. Stockholm: Gummessons.
- Freire, P. 1977. *Utbildning för befrielse*. Stockholm: Gummessons.
- Gates, C. 1999. Community governance. *Futures* 31 (5), 519–525.
- Geddes, M. 1998. *Local Partnership: A Successful Strategy for Social Cohesion*. European Research Report. Dublin: European Foundation.
- Geddes, M. & Martin, S. 2000. The Policy and Politics of Best Value: Currents, Crosscurrents and Undercurrents in the New Regime. *Policy & Politics* 28 (3), 379–395.
- Gephart, R. 1996. Management, Social Issues, and the Postmodern Era. In: D. Boje, R. Gephart, & T. Thatchenkery (ed.) *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory*. Thousand Oaks etc: Sage Publications, 21–44.
- Gianakis, G. & Davis, G. 1998. Reinventing or Repackaging Public Services? Case of Community-oriented Policing. *Public Administration Review* 58 (6), 485–498.
- Giddens, A. 1998. *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. 1999. *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Giddens, A. 2001. *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gore, A. 1993. *A Report of the National Performance Review. From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that works Better and Costs Less*. [WWW document][27.02.2006] Available: <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/nprprt/annrpt/redtpe93/>.
- Greenberg, A. 2000. The Church and the Revitalization of Politics and Community. *Political Science Quarterly*, 3, Fall 2000, 377–394.
- Griffiths, R. 1988. *Community Care: Agenda for Action*. London: HMSO.
- McGuire, M., Rubin, B. & Agranoff, R. & Richards, C. 1994. Building Development Capacity in Nonmetropolitan Communities. *Public Administration Review* 54 (5), 426–433.
- Haatanen, K. 1997. Yhteisöllinen kysymys. In: J. Simpura & R. Väärälä (ed.) *Yläpolitiikkaa vai alapolitiikkaa? Ehkäisevä sosiaali- ja terveystalitiikka etsii suuntiaan*. Julkaisuja 1997:25. Helsinki: Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö, 34–53.
- Haatanen, K. 1997. Kommunitarismi, identiteetti ja uusi yksilöllisyys. *Tiede ja Esitys* 2, 97–110.
- Haatanen, K. 2000. Yhteisöllisyys, liberalismi ja kohtalo. In: *Sosiaalipolitiikan lukemisto*. Helsinki: Palmenia, 273–303.
- Habermas, J. 1989. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Volume Two: Lifeworld and System: Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hadley, R. & Hatch, S. 1981. *Social Welfare and Failure of the Social State*. London: Allen & Urwin.
- Harpold, J. 2000. A Medical Model for Community Policing. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 69 (6), June 2000.
- Hartley, J. 2002. Leading Communities: Capabilities and Cultures. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 23 (8), 419–429.
- Hofstede, G. 1984. Culture's Consequences. *International Differences in Work-related Values. Cross-cultural Research and Methodology Series*, vol. 5. Newbury Park etc: Sage Publications.

- Häikiö, L. 2000. Kuntien paikallisagendat ja kestävä kehityksen ohjelmat: Tavoitteet, prosessi ja sisältö sekä kestävä yhdyskuntakehitys -teeman huomioiminen. Suomen ympäristö 449. Helsinki: Ympäristöministeriö.
- Heaney, T. 2000. Issues in Freirean Pedagogy. Chicago: National-Louis University [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://nlu04.nl.edu/ace/Resources/Documents/FreireIssues.html#Glossary> .
- Hegel, G.W.F. 1999. Wissenschaft der Logik. Erster Band, Zweytes Buch. In: Hauptwerke in sechs Bänden, Band 3, #237–#409. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Heidegger, M. 1996. Being and Time. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hellsten, K. 1998. Sosiaalisen pääoman käsitteestä. Sosiaalinen pääoma. Helsinki: Government Institute for Economic Research, 29–35.
- Hellsten, S. 1998. Kommunitarismi, yhteisöllinen etiikka ja politiikka. In: P. Mäkelä, T. Vehkavaara & T. Vuorio (ed.) Filosofisia iskuja. Filosofisia tutkimuksia Tampereen Yliopistosta, vol. 65, 51–58.
- Heikkilä-Horn, M. & Miettinen, J. 2000. Kaakkois-Aasia, Historia ja kulttuuri. Helsinki: Otava.
- Helander, V. 1998. Kolmas sektori. Saarijärvi: Gaudeamus.
- Hizb ut Tahrir 2002. The System of Islam [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.hizb-ut-tahrir.org/english/english.html> .
- Hjerpe, R. 1998. Esipuhe, in Sosiaalinen pääoma, 5. Helsinki: Government Institute for Economic Research.
- Hjerpe, R. 1998. Sosiaalinen pääoma taloudellisena ilmiönä. In Sosiaalinen pääoma, 13–28. Helsinki: Government Institute for Economic Research.
- Hoikka, P. 1994. Vapaakuntakokeilun seuranta. Loppuraportti. Itsehallintoprojektin julkaisuja 3. Helsinki: Sisäasiainministeriö.
- Holmila, M. (ed.) 1997. Yhteisö ja interventio. Alkoholihaittojen paikallinen ennaltaehkäisy. Stakesin tutkimuksia 73. Helsinki: Stakes.
- Hood, C. 1991. A Public Administration for All Seasons? Public Administration 69 (2), 3–19.
- Hood, C. 1996. Exploring Variations in Public Management Reform. In: A. Bekke, J. Perry & T. Toonen (ed.) Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective. Indianapolis: Indianapolis University Press, 268–287.
- Haglund, B. 1985. Community Diagnosis and Intervention. A Cross-sectional Study as a Tool for the Community Diagnosis Process With Special Reference to Cardiovascular Risk Factors. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Ham, C. 1998. Retracing the Oregon Trail: the Experience of Rationing and the Oregon Health Plan. British Medical Journal 316 (7149), 1965–1969.
- Hudelson, R. 1999. Modern Political Philosophy. Armonk, New York, London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hyyryläinen, T. & Luostarinen, S. 1997. Luova kumppanuus. Paikallisen kumppanuuden alkuvaiheet Suomessa 1997. Julkaisuja 58 Mikkeli: Helsingin yliopiston maaseudun tutkimus- ja koulutuskeskus.
- Hyyryläinen, T. & Kangaspunta, K. 1999. Paikallinen kumppanuuspääoma. Julkaisuja 63 Mikkeli: Helsingin yliopiston Maaseudun tutkimus- ja koulutuskeskus.

- Inglehart, R. 1971. The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies. *American social science review* 65 (4), 991–1017.
- Inglehart, R. 1977. *Silent revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. 2000. Globalization and Postmodern Values. *The Washington Quarterly* 23 (1), 215–228.
- Institute of Global Communications 2002. Agenda 21 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.igc.org/habitat/agenda21/a21-28.htm> .
- Industrial Workers of the World 2002. [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.iww.org/index.shtml> .
- Jann, W. 1997. Public Management Reform in Germany: a Revolution Without a Theory? In: W. Kickert (ed.) *Public Management and Administrative Reform in Western Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 83–102.
- Jann, W. 2003. State, Administration and Governance in Germany. *Public Administration* 81 (1), 95–190.
- Jones, K. & Bird, K. 2000. 'Partnership' as Strategy: Public-private Relations in Education Action Zones. *British Educational Research Journal* 26 (4), 491–506.
- Jäntti, M. 1998. Sosiaalinen pääoma ja taloustiede. In: *Sosiaalinen pääoma*. Helsinki: Government institute for economic research, 103–105.
- Kajanoja, J. 1999. Sosiaalisen pääoman merkitys. *Social Capital*. Snellman-instituutti, B-sarja 42. Kuopio: Snellmann-instituutti.
- Kamensky, J. 1999. National Partnership for Reinventing Government Formally National Performance Review: A Brief History [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.npr.gov/whoweare/history2.html> .
- Karger, H. 1991. The Radical Right and the Welfare State in the United States. In: H. Glennerster & J. Midgley (ed.) *The Radical Right and the Welfare State*. Hartfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 63–78.
- Katajamäki, H. 1996. Paikallisen kumppanuuden yhteisö. *Työpoliittinen tutkimus* 163. Helsinki: Työministeriö.
- Katajamäki, H. 1998. Beginning of Local Partnership in Finland: Evaluation, Interpretation and Impressions. *Publications* 76. Vaasa: Research Institute at the University of Vaasa.
- Keskustan periaatteet 1996. Periaateohjelma. Hyväksytty Keskustan puoluekokouksessa Kouvolassa 16.6.1996 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.keskusta.fi/tietopankki/?action=show_document&action_param=209 .
- Kiander, J. 1998. Sosiaalinen pääoma ja talouspolitiikka. In: *Sosiaalinen pääoma*. Helsinki: Government Institute for Economic Research, 93–101.
- Kilambi, S. 2000. Mass Attac. *New Internationalist*, Jan/Feb 2000 issue 320, 21.
- Kokko, S. 2000. The Process of Developing Health for All Policy in Finland, 1981–1995. In: *Exploring Health Policy Development on Europe*, 27–40. Copenhagen: WHO.
- Kopperi, M. 2000. *Vastuu hyvinvoinnista*. Helsinki: Kunnallisan kehittämissäätiö.
- Koskiahho, B., Nurmi, J. & Virtanen, P. 1999. *Kansalaisen sosiaalipolitiikka*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Kotkanvirta, J. 1998. Hegel, yksilöllisyys ja yhteisöllisyys. In: J. Kotkanvirta & A. Laitinen Yhteisö (ed.) *SoPhi, Yhteiskuntatieteiden, valtio-opin ja filosofian julkaisuja* 16. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 101–121.

- Kropotkin, P. 1974. *Fields, Factories and Workshops Tomorrow*. George Allen & Urwin.
- Kropotkin, P. 1995. *The Conquest of Bread and Other Writings*. Ed. M. Shatz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumppanuus 2000. Kumppanuusaapinen [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.kumppanuus.org/aap1.htm> .
- Lach, J. 1999. The Price of Success. *American Demographics*, 21 (8), 20-21.
- Lafferty, W. 1999. *Implementing LA21 in Europe: New Initiatives for Sustainable Communities*. Oslo: ProSus.
- Laitinen, A. 1998. Yhteisöllisyys Charles Taylorin moraaliteoriassa. In: J. Kotkanvirta & A. Laitinen (ed.) *Yhteisö*. SoPhi, Yhteiskuntatieteiden, valtio-opin ja filosofian julkaisuja 16. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 177–198.
- Lehmusto, A. 1994. *Esseitä liberalismien kommunitarisen kritiikin teemoista*. Department of Social Policy, University of Jyväskylä. Working Papers, No. 90.
- Lehtinen, P. & Valtonen, H. 1997. Ennaltaehkäisevää etsimässä. Kuntaprojektin tutkimuksia. Loppuraportti. *Julkaisuja 1997: 17*. Helsinki: Sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden ministeriö.
- Lehtonen, H. 1990. *Yhteisö*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Leino, H. 1999. Yhteisöllisyyden muuttuva muoto: Kommunitarismikeskustelu 1990–luvun Saksassa. *Civil Society Papers 1*, Tampereen yliopisto, Sosiaalipolitiikan laitos, Asumisen ja ympäristön tutkimuksen yksikkö.
- Lenkowsky, L. & Perry, J. 2000. Reinventing Government: The Case of National Service. *Public Administration Review* 60 (4), 298–307.
- Lens, V. 2002. TANF: What Went Wrong and What to Do Next. *Social Work* 47 (3), 279–290.
- DeLeon, L. 1997. Administrative Reform and Democratic Accountability. In: W. Kickert (ed.) *Public Management and Administrative Reform in Western Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 237–252.
- Leonard, P. 1997. *Postmodern Welfare: Reconstructing an Emancipatory Project*. London etc: Sage Publications.
- Lowndes, V. & Skelcher, C. 1998. The Dynamics of Multi-organizational Partnerships: An Analysis of Changing Modes of Governance. *Public Administration* 76 (2), 313–333.
- Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L. & Stoker, G. 2001. Trends in Public Participation: Part 2 – Citizens' Perspectives. *Public Administration* 79 (2), 445–455.
- Lundström, T. & Svedberg, L. 2003. The Voluntary Sector in a Social Democratic Welfare State – the Case of Sweden. *Journal of Social Policy* 32 (2), 217–238.
- Lutz, M. 2000. On the Connecting of the Socio-economics with Communitarianism. *Journal of Socio-economics* 29 (4), 341–347.
- Lyotard, J-F. 1997. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. 1984. *After Virtue*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mahmoodian, M. 1997. *Social action. Variations, Dimensions and Dilemmas*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Mahoney, D. 2001. Can Compassionate Conservatism Govern? *The Public Interest* 36 (142), 124–128.
- Mangen, S. 1991. Social Policy, the Radical Right and the German Welfare State. In: H. Glennerster & J. Midgley (ed.) *The Radical Right and the Welfare State*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 100–123.

- Marx, K. & Engels, F. 2002. Manifesto of the Communist Party [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/index.htm> .
- McArthur, A. 1995. The Active Involvement of Local Residents in Strategic Community Partnerships. *Policy and Politics* 23 (1), 61–71.
- Mattila, J. 2003. Participatory e-Governance – A New Solution to an Old Problem. In: *Governing Networks*, EGPA yearbook. Amsterdam etc.: IOS Press, 161–169.
- McInnes, D. & Barnes, R. 2000. England: a Healthier Nation. In: *Exploring Health Policy Development in Europe*. Copenhagen: WHO, 209–235.
- Medieval Sourcebook 2005. Gelatius I on Spiritual and Temporal Power, 494 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/gelasius1.html>.
- Meyers, B. 2002. Introducing Anarcho-syndicalism [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.anarchosyndicalism.org/theory/intro_meyers.htm .
- Mihm, J.C. 2000. Reinventing Government – Status of NPR Recommendations at 10 Federal Agencies. FDCH Government Account Reports 09/21/2000. Washington D.C.: eMediaMillWorks, Inc.
- Mikkola, M. 1996. Yhdyskuntatyö hyvinvointivaltion ja kansalaisyhteiskunnan välittäjänä. In: A-L. Matthies, U. Kotakari & M. Nylund (ed.) *Välittävät verkostot*. Helsinki: Vastapaino, 59–71.
- Milbank, D. 2001. Needed: Catchword for Bush Ideology. *The Washington Post*. [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A10634-2001Jan31.html> .
- Ministry of the Interior 2000. Participation Project [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.intermin.fi/eng/curr1.html> .
- Modern Local Government In Touch with the People 1998. [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.local-regions.detr.gov.uk/lgwp/1.htm> .
- Modernising Government 1999. Presented to the Parliament by the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Cabinet Office by Command of Her Majesty, March 1999. Cm 4310. London: The Stationery Office.
- Nalbandian, J. 1999. Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers. *Public Administration Review* 59 (3), 187–197.
- National Performance Review 1993. *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that works Better and Cost Less*.
- Navarro, V. 1999. It There a Third Way? A Response to Giddens’s Third Way. *International Journal of Health Services*, 29 (4), 667–677.
- Newman, J. 2001a. New Labour and the Politics of Governance. Paper presented in the EGPA conference, Vaasa 5-8th September 2001.
- Newman, J. 2001b. *Modernising Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*. London: Sage.
- Nguyen, M. 2002. Welfare Reauthorization: President Bush’s Agenda. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* IX (2), 489–497.
- Niemi-Iilahti, A. 1999a. Global Partnership for Sustainable Development: The Finnish Portrait of Local Agenda 21 Implementation in 1990–1999. *Finnish Local Government Studies Kunnallistieteellinen aikakauskirja* 3, 239–249.
- Niemi-Iilahti, A. 1999b. Kansalaisten ja hallinnon vuorovaikutus: Helsingin paikallisagendaprosessin arviointia. *City of Helsinki Urban Facts: Research Series* 11.

- Nietzsche, F. 1969. Moraalin alkuperästä. Helsinki: Otava.
- Nietzsche, F. 1969. Thus Spoke Zarathustra. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Noor, F. 2002. The Caliphate: Coming Soon to a Country Near You? The Globalisation of Islamic Discourse and Its Impact in Malaysia and Beyond [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www2.ucsc.edu/globalinterns/cpa-paers/noor.pdf/> .
- NPR 1998. Federal Support for Communities Initiative A Multi-Agency Reinvention Laboratory A working Draft April 8 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.npr.gov/initiati/fedsupt.html> .
- Nummela, J. 1998. Sosiaalinen pääoma ja julkinen hallinto. In: Sosiaalinen pääoma, 71–75. Helsinki: Government Institute for Economic Research.
- Nylund, M. 1996. Suomalaisia oma-apuryhmiä. In: A-L. Matthies, U. Kotakari & M. Nylund (ed.) Välittävät verkostot. Helsinki: Vastapaino, 193–205.
- OECD 1998. OECD Economic Surveys, Germany. Paris: OECD.
- OECD 2000. OECD Economic Surveys, United States. Paris: OECD.
- Olasky, M. 1992. The Tragedy of American Community. Washington D.C.: Regnery Gateway.
- Olasky, M. 2000. Compassionate Conservatism. What It Is, What It Does, and How It Can Transform America. New York, etc: The Free Press.
- Osallisuushanke 2000a. Osallisuushankkeen kuntaprojektit valittu [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.intermin.fi/suom/osallisuus/valitut.html> .
- Osallisuushanke 2000b. Asettamispäätös. [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.intermin.fi/suom/osallisuus/asettam-uusi.html> .
- Osallisuushanke 2000c. Osallisuushankkeen jatkoon valitut. [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.intermin.fi/suom/osallisuus/jatko2000.html> .
- Osallisuustoimikunnan mietintö 1981. Komiteanmietintö 1981:54. Helsinki: Valtion Painatuskeskus.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. 1992. Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. Reading, Massachusetts etc: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Owen, D. 1995. Nietzsche, Politics and Modernity. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Payne, M. 1991. Modern Social Work Theory. Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Penttilä, R., Tapaninen, J. & Jutila, J. 1994. Ultimatum isänmaalle: Nuorsuomalainen näkemys Suomen mahdollisuuksista. Helsinki: Otava.
- Perttilä, K., Winell, K., Haverinen, R., Lehto, J. & Mikkola, T. 1995. Seitsemän kuntaa terveyttä edistämässä. Aiheita 29/1995. Stakes.
- Peters, B.G. 1996. The Future of Governing: Four Emerging Models. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Peterson, N. & Speer, P. 2000. Linking Organizational Characteristics to Psychological Empowerment: Contextual Issues in Empowerment Theory. Administration in Social Work 24 (4), 39–58.
- Pietarinen, J. & Poutanen, S. 1998. Etiikan teorioita. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Pius XI 2002. Quadragesimo Anno, On Reconstruction of the Social Order - 15 May 1931 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.catholic-forum.com/saints/pope0259o.htm> .
- Poskiparta, M., Kettunen, T. & Liimatainen, L. 2000. Questioning and Advising in Health Counselling: Results from a Study of Finnish Nurse Counsellors. Health Education Journal 59, 69–89.

- Proudhon, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Putnam, R. 1993. *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. 1995. *Bowling Alone: American's Declining Social Capital*. *Journal of Democracy* 6 (1), 65–78.
- Ragin, C. 1994. *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. Thousand Oaks etc.: Pine Forge Press.
- Rahkonen, K. 2000. Mitä on tapahtumassa sosiaalipolitiikassa ja hyvinvointivaltiolle? In: *Sosiaalipolitiikan lukemisto*. Helsinki: Palmenia, 65–88.
- Ramonet, I. 1997. *Disarming the Markets*. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, September 1997 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://mondediplo.com/1997/12/leader?var_s=ramonet .
- Rand, A. 1964. *The Virtue of Selfishness*. New York: Signet.
- Rand, A. 1967. *Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal*. New York: Signet.
- Rank, M. & Hirschl, T. 2002. *Welfare Use as a Life Course Event: Toward a New Understanding of the U.S. Safety Net*. *Social Work* 47 (3), 237–248.
- Raunio, K. 2000. *Sosiaalityö murroksessa*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Rawls, J. 1973. *Theory of Justice*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Reimavuo, S., M. Händelin, & Reimavuo, L. 1999. *Paikallisten kumppanuushankkeiden arviointi*. Loppuraportti 30.4.1999. Helsinki: Edita.
- Riihinen, O. 1996. *Hallittavuuden ongelma myöhäismodernissa yhteiskunnassa*. In: *Sosiaalipolitiikan teoreettisia lähtökohtia*, 69–94. Helsinki: Kela.
- Rocker, R. 2002. *Anarchosyndicalism* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.spunk.org/library/writers/rocker/sp001495/rocker_as1.html .
- Rohe, W. 2001. *Community Policing and Planning*. *Journal of American Planning Association* 67 (1), 78.
- Rokeach, M. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (ed.). 1979. *Understanding the Nature of Human Values: Individual and Societal*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rothbard, M. 2002a. *The Anatomy of the State* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.mises.org/easaran/chap3.asp> .
- Rothbard, M. 2002b. *Power and Market, Government and Economy*. Sheed Andrews and McMeel, Inc, Kansas City [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.mises.org/scholar.asp#Murray%20N>.
- Rothschild-Whitt, J. 1979. *The Collectivistic Organization: An Alternative to Rational-Bureaucratic Models*. *American Sociological Review* 44 (4), 509–527.
- Rubin, H. 1993. *Understanding the Ethos of Community-based Development: Ethnographic Description for Public Administrators*. *Public Administration Review* 53 (5), 428–437.
- Rutishauser, P. 2002. *Die "neue" Wohlfart. Propagierung und Förderung von Selbsthilfetätigkeiten aufgrund von subsidiarität und/oder Solidarität?* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://socio.ch/health/t_prutis1.html .
- Ryynänen, O-P., Myllykangas, M., Kinnunen, J., Isomäki, V-P. & Takala, J. 1999. *Terveysten ja sairauksien valinnat*. Helsinki: Suomen Kuntaliitto.
- Saastamoinen, K. 1999. *Olemmeko me kaikki nyt liberalisteja? Tieteessä tapahtuu* 7, 5–8.
- Salmikangas, A-K. 1998. *Osallisuus suomalaisessa yhteiskunnassa – kokemuksia osallisuushankkeista*. Helsinki: Sisäasiainministeriö.

- Saltman, R. & Figueras, J. 1997. European Health Care Reform – Analysis of Current Strategies. WHO Regional Publications, European Series, No. 72. Copenhagen: WHO.
- Sandel, M. 1984. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Savas, E.S. 1982. *Privatizing the Public Sector: How to Shrink Government*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publisher.
- Schwerin, E. 1995. *Mediation, Citizen Empowerment, and Transformational Politics*. Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger.
- Self, P. 1988. *Political Theories of Modern Government, Its Role and Reform*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Selznick, P. 1998a. Foundations of Communitarian Liberalism. In: *The Essential Communitarian Reader*, 3–13. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Selznick, P. 1998b. Social Justice: A Communitarian Perspective. In: *The Essential Communitarian Reader*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 61–71.
- Shatz, M. (ed.) 1995. Introduction. In: *Kropotkin: Conquest of Bread and Other Writings*, vii–xxiii. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sihto, M. 1997. Terveyspoliittisen ohjelman vastaanotto – Tutkimus Suomen Terveyttä kaikille vuoteen 2000-ohjelman toimeenpanosta terveydenhuollossa. *Tutkimuksia* 74. Helsinki: Stakes.
- Social Democratic Party Programme 1999. *The Principles of Social Democracy. Adopted by the 38th Party Congress in Turku 1999. Towards a World of Justice* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://62.44.193.103/cgi-bin/iisi3.pl?cid=sdp&mid=160&sid=170> .
- Solomon, B. 1976. *Black Empowerment: Social Work in Oppressed Communities*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spithoven, A. 2002. The Third Way: the Dutch Experience. *Economy and Society* 31 (3), 333–367.
- SPD 2002. Grundsatzprogramm der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands. Beschlossen vom Programm-Parteitag der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands am 20. Dezember 1989 in Berlin, geändert auf dem Parteitag in Leipzig am 17.04.1998 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.spd.de/servlet/PB/menu/1009375/index.html> .
- Stillman, R. 2003. Twenty-first Century Unites States Governance: Statecraft as Reform Craft and the Peculiar Governing Paradox It Perpetuates. *Public Administration* 81 (1), 19–40.
- Stoesz, D. & Midgley, J. 1991. The Radical Right and the Welfare State. In: H. Glennerster & J. Midgley (ed.) *The Radical Right and the Welfare State, an International Assessment*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 24–42.
- Ståhlberg, K. 1979. *Närdemokrati – en framtidsvy*. Ekenäs: ETA.
- STM 1988. WHO:n Euroopan alueen TK-2000 toimintaohjelman tavoitteet. Valtion painatuskeskus, sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö.
- STM 1993. Terveyttä kaikille vuoteen 2000. Uudistettu yhteistyöohjelma. Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriön julkaisuja 1993:2.
- STM 1986. Terveyttä kaikille vuoteen 2000. Suomen terveyspolitiikan pitkän aikavälin tavoite- ja toimintaohjelma. Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus.
- STM 2000. Aktiivinen sosiaalipolitiikka –työryhmän muistio. Työryhmämuistioita 1999:20. Helsinki: Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö.

- Ståhlberg, K. 1998. Utvecklingspolitiken I finländska kommuner. Vad, var och av vem? In: K. Klausen & K. Ståhlberg (ed.) *New Public Management i Norden. Nye organisations- og ledelsesformer i den decentrale velfærdsstat*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, 50–68.
- De Swaan, A. 1988. In *Care of the State*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Schwartz, S. 1992. Universals in the Content and Structures of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In: M. Zanna (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 25. San Diego: Academic Press, 1–65.
- Takala, J-P. 1980. *Santeri Alkion yhteiskunnallinen ajattelu*. Tutkijaliiton julkaisusarja 11. Helsinki.
- Taylor, C. 1979. *Hegel and Modern Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Man*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. 1995. *Autenttisuuden etiikka*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Taylor, M. 2000. *Modernising Government: The Tension Between Central Targets and Local Initiative*. *New Economy* 7 (1), 3–7.
- St. Thomas Aquinas 2005. *Of God and His Creatures* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.nd.edu/Departments/Maritain/etext/gc3_130.htm .
- Thomas, J. 1999. *Bringing the Public into Administration: The Struggle Continues*. *Public Administration Review* 59 (1), 83–88.
- Tid för omsorg 1982. *Slutrapporten för projektet "Omsorgen i samhället"*. Sekretariatet för framtidsstudier. Stockholm: LiberFörlag.
- Tobin, J. 1978. *A Proposal for International Monetary Reform*. *Eastern Economic Journal* 43–4, 153–159.
- de Tocqueville, A. 2001. *Democracy in America*. The University of Virginia [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://xroads.virginia.edu/~HYPER/DETOC/oc_idx.html .
- Toikko, T. 2001. *Sosiaalityön amerikkalainen oppi*. Seinäjoki: Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulu.
- Toikko, T. 2005. *Sosiaalityön ideat*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Työreformi 1998. *Keskustan työreformi 30.11.1998* [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.keskusta.fi/tietopankki/?ref_gid= .
- Työriinoja, R. 1998. *Pyhiin yhteisö*. In: J. Kotkanvirta & A. Laitinen (ed.) *SoPhi, Yhteiskuntatieteiden, valtio-opin ja filosofian julkaisuja 16*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 65–81.
- Tönnies, F. 1887. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*. Berlin: Curtius.
- Tönnies, F. 1965. *Einführung in die Soziologie*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke Verlag.
- Tönnies, F. 1974. *On Social Ideas and Ideologies*. Ed. E.G. Jakoby. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Töttö, P. 1996. *Ferdinand Tönnies – Gemeinschaft ja Gesellschaft*. In: J. Gronow, A. Noro & P. Töttö (ed.) *Sosiologian klassikot*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 154–172.
- Uusitalo, H. 1991. *Tiede, tutkimus ja tutkielma*. Juva: WSOY.
- Uusitalo, L. 1997. *Europe: Seeking for Balance Between Markets and Communities*. *Helsingin kaupparkeakoulun julkaisuja D-242*. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration.

- Walker, R. 1999. The Americanization of British Welfare: A Case Study of Policy Transfer. *International Journal of Health Services* 29 (4), 679–697.
- Walzer, M. 1987. *Interpretation and Social Criticism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Ward, P. 1995. User Participation in Social Work: The Example of Social Action With Young People. In: G. Jakobsson (ed.) *Social Work in an International Perspective*. SSKH Meddelanden 36. Helsingfors: Helsingfors Universitet, 54–72.
- Vasabladet 2001. Aho vill införa föräldraplikt. 30.8.2001.
- Weisbrod, B. 1996. Bourgeois Society in Germany. In: R. Bessel (ed.) *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany: Comparison and Contrasts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 23–39.
- Whisker, J. 1983. Italian Fascism: An interpretation. *The Journal of Historical Review* 4 (1) [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v04/v04p--5_Whisker.html.
- White House 2002. Fact Sheet: Compassionate Conservatism [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/04/print/20020430.html>.
- Whiteley, P. 2000. Economic Growth and Social Capital. *Political Studies* 48, 443–466.
- WHO 1986. *Intersectoral Action for Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- WHO 2000. Health21. The Health for All Policy Framework for the WHO European Region [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.who.dk/cpa/h21/h21long.htm>.
- WHO 2000b. *Exploring Health Policy Development in Europe*. Copenhagen: WHO.
- WHO 2002. Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion, 21 November 1986 [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www.who.int/hpr/archive/docs/ottawa.html>.
- Vigoda, E. & Colembiewski, T. 2001. Citizenship Behavior and the Spirit of the New Managerialism. A Theoretical Framework and Challenge of Governance. *American Review of Public Administration* 31(3), 273–295.
- Williams, N. 2000. Modernising government: Policy Networks, Competition and the Quest for Efficiency. *Political Quarterly* 71 (4), 412–421.
- Vivarelli, R. 1991. Interpretations of the Origins of Fascism. *The Journal of Modern History* 63 (1), 29–43.
- Wollmann, H. 2000. Local Government Modernization in Germany: Between Incrementalism and Reform Waves. *Public Administration* 78 (4), 915–936.
- Woodcock, G. 1972. *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Väärälä, R. & Simpura, J. 1997. Ehkäisevä sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden tutkimus – vastaus vai kysymys? In: J. Simpura & R. Väärälä (ed.) *Yläpolitiikkaa vai alapolitiikkaa? Ehkäisevä sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden tutkimus etsii suuntiaan*. Julkaisuja 1997:25. Helsinki: Sosiaali- ja terveysministeriö, 1–32.
- The World Bank 2005. What Is Social Capital? [WWW document] [3.3.2006]. Available: <http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/poverty/scapital/whatsc.htm>.
- Yamey, G. 2002. WHO's Management: Struggling to Transform a "Fossilized Bureaucracy". *British Medical Journal* 325 (7373), 1170–1173.

SEINÄJOEN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULUN JULKAISUSARJA

A. TUTKIMUKSIA

1. Timo Toikko. Sosiaalityön amerikkalainen oppi. Yhdysvaltalaisen caseworkin kehitys ja sen yhteys suomalaiseen tapauskohtaiseen sosiaalityöhön. 2001.
2. Jouni Björkman. Risk Assessment Methods in System Approach to Fire Safety. 2005.
3. Minna Kivipelto. Sosiaalityön kriittinen arviointi. Sosiaalityön kriittisen arvioinnin perustelut, teoriat ja menetelmät. 2006.

B. RAPORTEJA JA SELVITYKSIÄ

1. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulusta soveltavan osaamisen korkeakoulu – tutkimus- ja kehitystoiminnan ohjelma. 1998.
2. Elina Varamäki - Ritva Lintilä - Taru Hautala - Eija Taipalus. Pk-yritysten ja ammattikorkeakoulun yhteinen tulevaisuus: prosessin kuvaus, tuotokset ja toimintaehdotukset. 1998.
3. Elina Varamäki - Tarja Heikkilä - Eija Taipalus. Ammattikorkeakoulusta työelämään: Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulusta 1996-1997 valmistuneiden sijoittuminen. 1999.
4. Petri Kahila. Tietoteollisen koulutuksen tilanne- ja tarveselvitys Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulussa: väliraportti. 1999.
5. Elina Varamäki. Pk-yritysten tuleva elinkaari - säilyykö Etelä-Pohjanmaa yrittäjämaakuntana? 1999.
6. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulun laatu järjestelmän auditointi 1998–1999. Itsearviointiraportti ja keskeiset tulokset. 2000.
7. Heikki Ylihärtilä. Puurakentaminen rakennusinsinöörien koulutuksessa. 2000.
8. Juha Ruuska. Kulttuuri- ja sisältötuotannon koulutusselvitys. 2000.
9. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulusta soveltavan osaamisen korkeakoulu. Tutkimus- ja kehitystoiminnan ohjelma 2001. 2001.
10. Minna Kivipelto (toim.). Sosionomin asiantuntijuus. Esimerkkejä kriminaalihuolto-, vankila- ja projektityöstä. 2001.

11. Elina Varamäki - Tarja Heikkilä - Eija Taipalus. Ammattikorkeakoulusta työelämään. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulusta 1998–2000 valmistuneiden sijoittuminen. 2002.
12. Varmola T., Kitinoja H. & Peltola A. (ed.) Quality and new challenges of higher education. International Conference 25.-26. September, 2002. Seinäjoki Finland. Proceedings. 2002.
13. Susanna Tauriainen & Arja Ala-Kauppara. Kivennäisaineet kasvavien nautojen ruokinnassa. 2003.
14. Päivi Laitinen & Sanna Välsä. Staphylococcus aureus -bakteerien aiheuttaman utaretulehduksen ennaltaehkäisy ja hoito lypsykarjatililla. 2003.
15. Riikka Ahmaniemi & Marjut Setälä. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulu – Alueellinen kehittäjä, toimija ja näkijä. 2003.
16. Hannu Saari & Mika Oijennus. Toiminnanohjaus kehityskohteena pk-yrityksessä. 2004.
17. Leena Niemi. Sosiaalisen tarkastelua. 2004.
18. Marko Järvenpää (toim.) Muutoksen kärjessä. Kalevi Karjanlahti 60 vuotta. 2004.
19. Suvi Torkki (toim.). Kohti käyttäjäkeskeistä muotoilua. Muotoilijakoulutuksen painotuksia SeAMK:ssa. 2005.
20. Timo Toikko (toim.). Sosiaalialan kehittämistyön lähtökohta. 2005.
21. Elina Varamäki & Tarja Heikkilä & Eija Taipalus. Ammattikorkeakoulusta työelämään. Seinäjoen ammattikorkeakoulusta v. 2001–2003 valmistuneiden sijoittuminen opiskelun jälkeen. 2005.
22. Tuija Pitkälampi, Sari Pajuniemi & Hanne Vuorenmaa (ed.). Food Choices and Healthy Eating. Focusing on Vegetables, Fruits and Berries. International Conference September 2nd – 3rd 2005. Kauhaajoki, Finland. Proceedings. 2005.
23. Katariina Perttunen. Kokemuksellinen hyvinvointi Seinäjoen kolmella asuinalueella. Raportti pilottihankkeen tuloksista. 2005.
24. Mervi Lehtola. Alueellinen hyvinvointitiedon malli – asiantuntijat puhujina. Hankkeen loppuraportti. 2005.
25. Timo Suutari, Kari Salo & Sami Kurki. Seinäjoen teknologia- ja innovaatiokeskus Frami vuorovaikutusta ja innovatiivisuutta edistävänä ympäristönä. 2005.
26. Päivi Laine. Pk-yritysten verkkosivustot – vuorovaikutteisuus ja kansainvälistyminen. 2006.

27. Erno Tornikoski, Elina Varamäki, Marko Kohtamäki, Erkki Petäjä, Tarja Heikkilä, Kirsti Sorama. Asiantuntijapalveluyritysten yrittäjien näkemys kasvun mahdollisuuksista ja kasvun seurauksista Etelä- ja Keski-Pohjanmaalla –Pro Advisor –hankkeen esiselvitystutkimus. 2006.

C. OPPIMATERIAALEJA

1. Ville-Pekka Mäkeläinen. Basics of business to business marketing. 1999.
2. Lea Knuuttila. Mihin työohjausta tarvitaan? Oppimateriaalia sosiaali-alan opiskelijoiden työnohjauskurssille. 2001.
3. Mirva Kuni & Petteri Männistö & Markus Välimaa. Leikkauspelot ja niiden hoitaminen. 2002.

D. OPINNÄYTTEITÄ

1. Hanna Halmesmäki – Merja Halmesmäki. Työvoiman osaamistarvekartoitus Etelä-Pohjanmaan metalli- ja puualan yrityksissä. 1999.
2. Tiina Kankaanpää – Maija Luoma-aho – Heli Sinisalo. Kymmenen metrin kävelytestin suoritusohjeet CD-rom levyllä: aivoverenkierto-häiriöön sairastuneen kävelyn mittaaminen. 2000.
3. Laura Elo. Arvojen rooli yritysmaailmassa. 2001.
4. Nina Anttila. Päälle käyvää – vaatemallisto ikääntyvälle naiselle. 2002.
5. Jaana Jeminen. Matkalla muotoiluyrittäjyyteen. 2002.
6. Päivi Akkanen. Lypsääkö meillä tulevaisuudessa robotti? 2002.
7. Johanna Kivioja. E-learningin alkutaival ja tulevaisuus Suomessa. 2002.
8. Heli Kuntola – Hannele Raukola. Naisen kokemuksia minäkuvan muuttumisesta rinnanpoistoleikkauksen jälkeen. 2003.
9. Jenni Pietarila. Meno-paluu –lauluillan tuottaminen. Produktion tuottajan käsikirja. 2003.
10. Johanna Hautamäki. Asiantuntijapalvelun tuotteistaminen case: ´Avaimet markkinointiin, kehittyvän yrityksen asiakasohjelma -pilotti projekti´. 2003.
11. Sanna-Mari Petäjäistö. Teollinen tuotemuotoiluprosessi – Sohvapöydän ja sen oheistuotteiden suunnittelu. 2004.

12. Susanna Patrikainen. Nuorekkaita asukokonaisuuksia Mode LaRose Oy:lle. Vaatemallien suunnittelu teolliseen mallistoon. 2004.
13. Tanja Rajala. Suonikohjuleikkaukseen tulevan potilaan ja hänen perheensä ohjaus päiväkirurgisessa yksikössä. 2004.
14. Marjo Lapiolahti. Maksuvalmiuslaskelmien toteutuminen sukupolvenvaihdostiloilla. 2004.
15. Marjo Taittonen. Tutkimusmatka syrjäytymisen maailmaan. 2004.
16. Minna Hakala. Maidon koostumus ja laatutekijät. 2004.
17. Anne Uusitalo. Tuomarniemen ympäristöohjelma. 2004.
18. Maarit Hoffrén. Vaihtelua kasviksilla. Kasvisruokalistan kehittäminen opiskelijaravintola Risetiin. 2004.
19. Sami Karppinen. Tuomarniemen hengessä. Arkeista antologiaksi. 2005.
20. Elina Syrjänen – Anne-Mari Uschanoff. Messut – ideasta toimintaan. Messutoteutus osana yrityksen markkinointiviestintää. 2005.
21. Ari Sivula. Metahakemiston ja LDAP-hakemiston asennus, konfigurointi ja ohjelmointi Seinäjoen koulutuskuntayhtymälle. 2006.
22. Johanna Väliniemi. Suorat kaaret – kattaustekstiilien suunnittelu yhteistyössä tekstiiliteollisuuden kanssa. 2006.



SEINÄJOKI UNIVERSITY OF
APPLIED SCIENCES LIBRARY

Keskuskatu 34, 60100 Seinäjoki
Puh. 020 124 5040, fax 020 124 5041
E-mail seamk.kirjasto@seamk.fi

ISBN 952-5336-74-3 (PDF)
ISSN 1456-1735