

Wired community: neighbourhoods, networks and communities of interest

Denise Meredyth

Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology

Paper prepared for Building the E-Nation - A Social Science Symposium, April 2003, Sydney

1. Introduction

The idea of the 'information society' has taken hold in sociological and political analysis. Information technology, it is argued, is forming new virtual and actual networks that make up communities, both local and global. Computer networks are capable of transcending national boundaries, as information and communications is shared globally; they are also capable of redefining them, as they mark out new locations and regions, a new sense of place (Fitzpatrick 2000). Municipal websites and wired communities can create identification with a local area, even as they enrich and recreate its cultural resources, opening communication between people previously separated into isolated households and cultural enclaves (Tsangarousianou et al 1998; Smith and Kollock 1999; Doheny-Farina 1996).

The relationship between governments and citizens will also be altered by computer networks and by the creation of electronic government and online social services, it is argued (Fountain 2001, Barry 2001, Castells 1996). By 2005 (according to the Blair government), British citizens should be able to access all government services online. Governments, at local, regional and national levels, have given considerable attention to the problem of how to meet rising expectations that the public sector will match the online services provided commercially (Wilcox and Pearl 2002, p. 8). The actual delivery of online social services is lagging some way behind the predictions. Electronic government requires co-ordination between separate agencies, from housing to education to employment and community services, within an overall information policy framework. It also requires some confidence that people will be able to use these online resources; the problem is that the heaviest users of social services are those least likely to be equipped with accessible computers and Internet connections, with information technology skills and with the ability to locate resources online (Perri 6 and Jupp 2001). The question is how far governments committed to the model of the information society can afford to subsidise increased access to technology in low income communities, and how far they can leave the problem to the market to solve, hoping that as computers become more affordable, consumers will choose to buy them and integrate them into their lives (DiMaggio and Hargattai 2001, Servon and Nelson 2001, McNair 2000, Loader 1998).

Stubbornly, however, the problem of the digital divide has remained; as information and services are provided in ways that require increasingly fast and sophisticated tools and navigational skills, those on low incomes, in isolated areas and with less education are less able to access the resources, services and information they need. For this reason, online services cannot replace the need for face-to-face interaction between service providers and consumers (Pleace and Quilgars 2002, Wilcox et al 2002, Pearl and Scanlon 2002).

Governments attracted to the cost savings associated with electronic government have yet to work out the extent to which this is a problem for which they can take responsibility (Compaigne 2001, Hallawell 2001).

Meanwhile, within the last few years, a strain of experimental community technology enterprises has emerged. These have gone beyond the enthusiasm for bridging the digital divide by establishing telecentres, information kiosks and getting computers into schools, libraries and shopping centres. These new projects involve more ambitious schemes to give residents of low-income and socially deprived neighbourhoods access to free computer and Internet connections in the home, and to connect them to a 'wired community'. That is, these residents are to have access, through the server, to local electronic information systems, educational resources and (potentially) employment opportunities (see e.g. Wellman et al 2001, 1996; Cohill and Kavanagh 2000; Denison et al 2002; Gurstein 2000).

In many respects, wired community initiatives can be regarded as at the forefront of policy responses to the digital divide, in the developed and underdeveloped countries (Norris 2001, Meredyth, Ewing and Thomas 2003). As many have argued, the problem of uneven access to computers and connectivity cannot be solved by giving people access to hardware and software, whether just in public places or in the home. The problem is how to persuade and enable people to make use of the information and communication resources that are now available in most well resourced workplaces and homes. This is seen as a problem of developing relevant local content, culturally appropriate and accessible to non-English speakers and to those with low literacy levels. It is also seen as a problem of how people outside the formal education system can develop the generic skills needed to navigate within new information and communication systems, making full use of creative skills, problem-solving, discriminatory abilities and critical acumen (Bowie 2000). Digital divide commentators have put the case for local interventions that might enable people to learn informally, to teach one another and to set up new businesses, developing their own local knowledge and cultural understandings into economically viable resources that bring jobs and investment into the neighbourhood. In this way, community technology ventures can offer more than mere access or mere technical training—community technology can be used as 'leverage' to improve lives (Pinkett 2002: 1).

Wired community organisers tend to take their cue from discussions of the digital divide, but they also call on the broader debates on neighbourhood renewal, community building and the information society. Success stories of how not for profits and community-based organisations have helped to build community in impoverished inner city neighbourhoods are highly attractive to governments committed to 'community revitalisation' and to finding alternatives to welfare dependency. Wired community ventures promote an ethos of active local involvement, combined with self-reliance and self-help. The most positive stories emerging from them are of hardworking (often immigrant) families stuck in public housing estates, keen to seek opportunities to retrain themselves and help their children to stay in school and find a way to a good job and a better place to live. Once, perhaps, it was schooling that was regarded as the ladder out of poverty; now it is information.

In this paper, I discuss three broadly comparable wired community initiatives, in Melbourne, Boston and across England. While their histories, organisational circumstances and initial effect vary, they have a number of features in common. First, each is configured as an initiative run by community groups and not for profit agencies, with support from university researchers and with cash or in-kind assistance from regional or national governments and from the private sector, especially from technology companies. Each appeals to ‘whole of government’ thinking, linking reform initiatives in local government, housing departments, education bureaucracies and information policy agencies. Each depends on substantial investment, while aiming to develop a self-sustaining local enterprise, with the potential to solve long-standing social welfare problems. My interest is in the terms in which the organisers, funders and supporters understand the transformative potential of wired community initiatives. Focusing on the political vocabulary used in project plans and progress reports, I draw out the ways in which community networks, social partnership and community-building work as a governmental technology. I argue that we should be moderate, though, in claiming that such examples indicate the politically transformative effects of the social use of technology. To pursue this proposition, we turn to the first of our case studies, the ‘e-ACE’ initiative at Atherton Gardens in Melbourne.

2. An Australian wired community venture: e-ACE

The e-ACE project, or ‘Reach for the Clouds’ as it was originally named by its organisers, stemmed from the activity of InfoXchange, a Melbourne-based not for profit community technology enterprise.¹ InfoXchange has had a strong record of providing Internet services, data bases and web design to community groups; it also developed Green PC, a successful venture to work with long-term unemployed people to recondition donated personal computers that would otherwise be landfill, reselling the equipment at cost to the community sector, or donating them to low income people.² Out of this scheme developed the plan to give all residents of a local high-rise housing estate PCs and to convince the Victorian Office of Housing to rewire the four tower blocks of the Atherton Gardens complex in Fitzroy, an estate consisting of 800 apartments, largely occupied by low income people, primarily unemployed and predominantly immigrants from Vietnam, China and at least 30 other countries of origin. The aim, according to the original outlines of the project, was to bridge the digital divide, to build skills and employment prospects, to promote social cohesion and community-building and ultimately, to establish a resident-owned and resident-run wired community (InfoXchange 1999, 2000; Meredyth et al 2002).

This plan, first developed in 1999, was eventually successful. Following concerted lobbying from InfoXchange, in tandem with community groups and local government, and with support from private sector partners including Microsoft, the Victorian state government provided substantial funding towards the rewiring of the buildings (see Ewing et al 2003). The rollout of computers and cabling continued throughout 2002 and the e-ACE network will shortly be launched.³ It will contain content provided by local social services and businesses, including information on housing, health and social welfare services, as well as local activities and community resources. Residents who have received computers – about 400 of them so far – have also completed training courses.

¹ See <http://www.infoxchange.net.au/index.html>

² See <http://www.greenpc.com.au/>

³ See <http://www.atherton.org.au/>

They will have access, in their homes, to a reconditioned machine, software, email and a subsidised Internet connection, as well as access to the e-ACE intranet and to a common training room on the estate, where classes are being held throughout the week. InfoXchange is still seeking further funding to expand its training provisions.

Meanwhile, a team of researchers from the Institute for Social Research (myself, Julian Thomas, Scott Ewing, Liza Hopkins, Ali Jarman and David Hayward) are tracking the progress and social impact of the project, with support from the ARC. Most of the proponents, partners and supporters of the e-ACE initiative have been interviewed, as part of a continuing analysis of the rationales and expectations involved in this social partnership enterprise. An initial interview-based survey of the residents has also been carried out, where possible in the native language of the main groups on the estate; this will be repeated in a year's time. The results, it is hoped, will show the extent to which the e-ACE network has made a difference to residents' technology skills, attitudes to computers and the Internet, employment and education prospects, access to news, information on social services and their ability to stay in touch with friends and family. We have also asked a range of questions about patterns of community contact in and around the estate, about the extent of residents' contact with neighbours, friends and family, about the degree to which they know and trust their neighbours and are involved in decision-making on the estate, and about their attitudes to Atherton Gardens as a place to live.

Our initial results indicate that residents have high employment, education and training needs, that they are eager for educational opportunities and see the e-ACE network as a way to obtain these for themselves and their children and that they are keen to learn how to use computers to find work (ISR 2003a, 2003b; Meredyth and Ewing 2003). Although residents are generally positive about the Atherton Gardens estate and the community resources available to them, and although many appear to be well connected and active in local groups and activities, they feel insecure on the estate, and few trust their neighbours. The general profile is one of significant social and economic disadvantage and some social isolation. Security on the estate is a problem, and Atherton Gardens has long been perceived as a focus for drug trading and domestic and other forms of violence. The e-ACE network is one of a number of initiatives currently focused on these problems, within an array of neighbourhood renewal and community-building programs run by various bodies but coordinated by the state government (see Ewing 2003).

The Atherton Gardens case study offers, then, an example of a current Australian effort to establish a wired community as a way of 'retooling' community. Following the pattern of neoliberal government through community, it is not a government-led initiative. Government agencies have however provided funding, tied to performance measures and outcomes, assessed by university research. The agents responsible for the venture are from the community, not for profit and voluntary sectors, with cash and in kind support from private companies. In order to be credible and sustainable, the organisers need to involve the tenants themselves, as individuals and households willing to be part of the network and training activities, and as a body that can be consulted and that can take ownership of the content provided by the network and, eventually, of the running of the network itself. Sustaining these partnerships and engendering involvement across the range of people living on the estate involves a considerable challenge.

Even at this early stage of the project, it is clear that the organisers and funders have very different and sometimes competing conceptions of the purpose and significance of the project and of what would constitute success (Hopkins et al 2003). For InfoXchange, the main point of the project is to give computer and Internet access to people who have been caught on the wrong side of the digital divide. What people do with the technology and information resources once they have access to them is up to them, though the hope is that the residents will be able and interested enough to get involved in sharing their skills and making the network into an enterprise that opens education and employment opportunities, including the possibilities of making the network pay for itself, as residents develop and promote their skills, either as IT technicians in some cases or as translators, for example. This is the model of the resident-owned and resident-run network, and it has been highly attractive to funders, since it can be pitched in terms of community-building and neighbourhood renewal, thus meeting funding priorities (see Ewing 2003, Ewing et al 2003).

The government funders have their own concerns, nevertheless. From the point of view of the Office of Housing, for instance, or the local government partner the City of Yarra, the project is attractive in that it offers a way to get information to housing estate residents, including information about social services and activities of these agencies (Hopkins et al 2003). At the same time, it offers a way to seek information on the profile, needs and requirements of the tenants themselves. The e-ACE project tallies with many of the institutional goals of these agencies, especially since it is a local enterprise, involving self-help and participation from tenants and community-groups, with a strong focus on capacity building and skills, rather than dependency on welfare services. Some of our interviewees recalled, though, that the project initially looked like a risky bet: it was unclear whether government agencies would be able to maintain a clear distance as sponsors, if the project was a failure, or was seen to lead to undesirable social outcomes, such as online gambling.

Interestingly, the most cautious and sceptical assessments of the project have come from within the community and not for profit sector partners. One interviewee, for instance, regarded InfoXchange's scheme as a 'top-down' initiative, insufficiently grounded in community-based decision making and participation, and liable to failure for that reason. From the perspective of community workers confronting the effects of intergenerational poverty, illiteracy, lack of English and alienation, in an environment where a broken lift, violence in the corridor and discarded needles on the stairs pose immediate problems, giving residents free computers and expecting them to use the technology might seem quixotic: as one interviewee put it, it can seem like a 'space age' idea for a 'stone age' context (Hopkins 2003). Certainly the complex social and cultural composition of the residents themselves is likely to defeat any expectation that the 'community' will use the network to knit itself together into a cohesive social body stocking up social capital (cf. Wellman et al 2001)

While many of the residents are extremely enthusiastic about the e-ACE initiative, and eager to make use of computers and the Internet, especially with their children, they are not noticeably keen to get more involved in decision-making on the estate. The emerging pattern is one in which existing groups on the estate, primarily language groups, are likely to have more to do with one another, both online and face to face, as the network establishes itself and as training activities take off. Whether this will lead to greater trust and co-operation on the estate remains to be seen. Although terms such as community

building and social capital have been effective in engendering support for the project, these may not be the main terms in which its social and economic effects are calculated in the end.

Unanimity and organic evolution is hardly to be expected in a venture as complex as this. Nevertheless, the example is already serving to show that the process of translation between the concerns of interest groups is often faulty and hard to fix. This is not a simple case where technology use, expertise and social entrepreneurialism provides a relay between governmental objectives and communities of interest. It is a complex instance of the labour of negotiation involved in social administration.

If our broader purpose is to understand the relationship between new technologies, political rationalities and the mechanisms of neoliberal government, the Atherton Gardens experiment might seem like a good case for claiming that technology has a transformational role. At first glance, it looks like we are seeing a smooth relay of reciprocal change: government seeks to 'retool' communities, while government is re-engineered, using new technologies to act more effectively at a distance.

A closer look at the work on the ground, though, moderates this account of transformation. The problems associated with public housing, local government and social welfare have hardly been altered by either the technology itself or the governmental technology of social partnership. It is still remarkably difficult for either government agencies or community agencies to obtain accurate information about who currently lives in the Atherton Gardens housing estate, about what they live on or what their needs are. It is still hard for tenants to get accurate information from agencies about what they are entitled to and what they are supposed to do in order to get social support. Use of online information systems and data retrieval may make these exchanges of information faster, but they may not be more accurate or more flexible. Much still depends on the mundane labour of planning and negotiation, advocacy and arbitration.

3. Technology, community and government

The Atherton Gardens experiment can be understood within a small but growing literature on the relationship between new technologies and governmentality (see Barry 2002, 2001; Barry and Slater 2002; Rose 1999; Henman 2002; Dean 1999). As people use computers to seek information and services, it is argued, they come to think of themselves as free, identifying their own interests and forming communities of interest. This is regulated and trained freedom though, exercised under the pastoral influence of educators, welfare workers and experts, who work at a local level to persuade and incite people to commit themselves to the goals of governmental programs.

The key to neoliberal governance, according to this literature, is the way in which it reworks and returns to the problem of how the states can maintain the liberal settlements that separated political rule from the private domains of markets and civil society, each a domain with internal dynamics of liberty and choice, protected from the direct exercise of political authority. Liberal governance is the art of managing the productive conflict between authority and freedom. States, driven by their own concerns with territory, security, prosperity and public order, have sought to monitor

and manage civil, economic and social dynamics. At the same time, they consistently encounter practical limits to their capacity to know and intervene, since direct intervention threatens to be self-defeating, damaging the state's claim to be neutral about the exercise of liberties on which market, social and civil dynamics depend. The solution to this problem has been the invention of a neutral and detached role for the state, which has operated through social institutions (schools, hospitals, clinics, the family, the media) and through the disciplines and forms of subjectification set up by autonomous professionals. Doctors, teachers, psychologists, accountants and urban planners and so on provided neutral ways to educate and persuade people to change their behaviour, internalise norms and change their aspirations, in accordance with models of collective solidarity. This is the basis of the twentieth century mode of liberal government through the social, as Foucaultian scholars have described it (Foucault 1991; Donzelot; Burchell et al 1991, Hindess 1993, Rose 1996).

More recently, it has been argued, we have seen a hybridisation of liberal governmentality, as the social is broken up and as functions of government are devolved to private agencies and local concerns (Barry et al 1996; Rose 1999, 1996; Dean). We are living within, it is argued, a transition to a new and hybrid form of advanced liberal governmentality. States no longer govern nations through the intermediary role of experts employed within public institutions. They operate at more of a distance, devolving responsibility to communities, individuals, households and consumers. Internationalised economies work through relays linking the localised risk calculations of companies, agencies and individuals (O'Malley 2000, Baker 2000, Miller and Rose 1990). Government has also been localised; rather than governing political communities, states govern *through* communities (Rose 2001). Advanced liberal governmentality, in this reading, seeks to further detach authority from political rule. Government has been 'destatised'. Responsibility and authority have been delegated to individuals, interest groups and private concerns. Prosperity and public order depend on how people use their liberty: 'individuals must be empowered in order to realise their potential, though their commitment to play a part in the "self-sustaining community"' (Schofield 668). The vocabulary of community sutures civil society to the realm of government.

Within the British, Australian and Canadian literature on advanced liberal governmentality, there has been considerable concentration on the ways in which liberal government has fused market fundamentalism and a popular communitarian emphasis on consultation, participation and local involvement, using the political vocabulary of choice and mutual obligation (Rose 2001). State-provided education, public health, policing, transport and other services are being eroded, it is argued, in the name of responsiveness to the choice-making citizen and the consumer (Yeatman 1998). As social services are devolved to local councils, there is an increasing imperative to collaborate with communities. Community is conceived as already existing, even as it is being built, 'imagined' and brought into being 'as a moral space of voluntarism situated between the state and the market' (Marinetti 2003; cf. Bowring 2000). Rising expectations of community participation and involvement have been managed through a process that actually reinforces strong central control and targeting of service provision. A similar pattern has been identified in the US, in the policy emphasis on active citizenship and neighbourhood revitalisation from the 1980s on; as public sector services were wound back and devolved to local community-based initiatives to reform deprived inner city areas, government agencies

were deeply implicated in top-down social administration processes supposed to build active citizenship (Cruikshank 1993).

There is of course a healthy debate on this line of analysis. One difficulty, for analysts, is to understand the relationship between the state, politics and governance in this new configuration (Hindess 1998, Hunter 1998, Minson 1998a). Another is to understand how the figures of the citizen and the consumer work within the political rationalities of modern liberal democracy: how is the political tradition of liberalism to be understood, and how does it relate to that of democracy? (Hindess 1993, 1996). To what extent should the communitarian appeal to civic 'participation' be allowed to trump the traditions of liberal settlement that gave the state the role of arbiter between rival interests, faiths and civil associations? (Minson 1998b, 2001; Hunter and Meredyth 2000).

These questions are too large to canvass here, although our account will touch on the problem of how to describe the role of the political rhetoric of choice, interests, participation and community, in experimental social enterprises using new technologies. The problem in working out where wired community projects fit within community development is to describe the relationship between technology (computers, networks, data) and political technologies and rationalities. While the former may be comparatively new, the latter have a long history. It is always tempting to speak in the language of transformation and rapid change when discussing the social use of information and communication technologies. It is tempting too to subscribe to the current enthusiasm for community building, as if this were a new enterprise and artefact (cf. Minson 1993). But perhaps we should be wary of claiming that these technologies transform the social, the political and governmental to the extent often claimed.

Community development is a 'managerial technology'; it brings the local institutional environment into accordance with regional and national objectives. It acts to identify and form interest groups and to shape the sense of place and locality; it brings into being a network of public and private agencies, co-ordinating the endeavours of education, crime prevention, health care and economic growth. As a field, it is continually troubled by the question of how to identify and articulate the authentic voice of community, especially where community workers suspect themselves of making arbitrary assumptions about who speaks for the community and about how groups work within it. But despite the labour that goes into describing and mapping community, the term is best seen as a "key construct in the formation of a managerial process" (Schofield 664). Community can be described as an "assemblage of artefacts – political rationales, expert discourses, administrative technologies and bodies". These are the "empirical resources" used in setting up urban regeneration schemes (Schofield 2002 p. 663).

Government, however, is perpetually reflexive about how far to monitor and intervene in these processes; hence the constant reinvention of social and economic indicators, including social capital measures (see e.g. Winter et al 2000; cf. Foley and Edwards 1997). Audits of the outcomes from community-based social services would be too heavy-handed and self-defeating; it is therefore necessary to use experts, volunteers, social entrepreneurs as intermediaries, who are able to translate official targets and objectives into unofficial aims and aspirations which the community can 'own'. So in community-based projects, creative professionals have found ways to enlist local people to tell their own stories and

articulate their own hopes and needs. Written up and re-presented by advocates and community workers, the story becomes evidence of consultation and community participation. As Schofield puts it, '[w]hat started out as a demonstration to others that residents have been listened to ends up being played back to residents themselves in a kind of reflective loop' (Schofield 2002, p. 673)

4. International wired community experiments

The Atherton Gardens wired community experiment is still unique in Australia, though comparable ventures are being planned. It has much in common, though, with at least two international initiatives, in the US and the UK. In these cases, too, organisers have sought to give low income and isolated people access to computers and connectivity, on the assumption that they will be better able to become smooth operators in a world of online services and information. And in these cases, as with the e-ACE example, sophisticated plans and schema for transforming communities have been articulated by activists, entrepreneurs and philanthropists, and sold on to private sector partners and government sponsors. In each case, the enthusiasm for community and participation has waned, as organisers have met indifference or grappled with gritty reality of holding social partnerships together. Neither of these examples is one where technology use transforms community into a new hybrid form of political life.

The first instance, from the US, is the Camfield Estates/MIT Creating Community Connections Project.⁴ This is a community technology and community building project based in Boston. MIT has established a community network giving computers and high speed Internet connections to all families living in a housing development in South End/Roxbury. The families, of whom there are a little more than a hundred, are primarily African-American and are on low to moderate incomes. The scheme offers them some training and access to a community technology centre on the estate and to a community-based web system (C3), which compiles information on the 'commercial, associational and institutional assets' within the community. Co-designed by MIT and the residents, C3 offers online access to profiles of all residents, to a database on local businesses and community organisations, to geographic information system (GIS) maps, discussion forums, news and announcements, email lists and chat rooms. C3 is conceived as an online resource for building social capital. It is designed 'to create connections in the community between residents, local associations and institutions (e.g. libraries, schools, etc.) and neighbourhood businesses' (Pinkett 2002 p. 2).⁵

Randall Pinkett, the charismatic MIT-based architect of the Camfield Estates project, presents it as a continuation of nineteenth century efforts to 'revitalise America's distressed communities and fight the war on poverty' (Pinkett 2002 p. 1). American communities are riven by the gap between rich and poor, bisected by racial and ethnic difference. On the Camfield Estate, where households are generally headed by single, Black/African-American mothers, there is the chance to make community members active agents of change. Using computers and online resources, they can be encouraged to find resources in the local area, to share skills and help one another to build up local assets of knowledge, skill and information. Once they have the information about these resources,

⁴ See <http://www.camfieldestates.net/> and <http://web.media.mit.edu/~rpinkett/papers/camfield-mit.html>

⁵ C3 uses ArsDigita Community System, an open-source software platform. See Pinkett 2002.

they can begin to leverage their own creative skills and problem-solving abilities, reselling them as commercial assets. Rather than being passive consumers, they can become producers of information and content (Pinkett 2002, p. 12). The university has a role in this; it is part of the (self-generating) community, but also part of the (self-regulating) market in skill exchange and services.

Pinkett contends that community technology has transformed the estate; the infrastructure has brought about a “cultural shift, or re-orientation” towards both technology use and community connection. He offers some inspiring examples of how residents moved from indifference and suspicion of technology to enthusiasm and community connectedness. His central story is that of “Edna Jackson”, a formidable resident who initially opposed the project, but who was converted to computer use and the Internet when someone showed her how to use the computers to stay in touch with her family, and to investigate her health problems (Pinkett 2002b p.1). On the day when she made a comment to an online chat room for cancer survivors, and was validated by the others, “everything changed”; she had a “renewed faith in her capacity to learn” and experienced a “metacognitive shift”. She found a ‘community of interest ‘ and made global ties with a community that “reached out to her”, giving her better quality of life.

This is the most positive story of personal transformation. It matches the earliest hopes of the MIT organisers – like InfoXchange in the Australian case, they hoped to see the enterprise owned and run by community leaders and committed individuals (Pinkett 2000). In the event, it took much labour and persuasion at the ‘grassroots’ to get families on the estate involved. Out of 80 eligible families, 59 eventually agreed to be given a computer and to use the network (Pinkett 2002 p. 9). Twenty-six per cent were not involved; reasons given included having too many responsibilities, having health conditions or simply not being interested (Pinkett 2002 p. 9).

For the organisers, this has presented something of a problem, since their conception of the community network goes well beyond technology access to a model where social capital and cohesion is built up through technology use – computer use and the compiling of data and models should bring awareness of skills, abilities and resources in the community; in turn the exchange of resources should build trust, promote a sense of obligation and extend both the strong and weak ties within the community (cf. Putnam, Granovetter, Hopkins 2002). Instead, however, it appears that online exchanges tend to either replace existing face to face interactions in the community or to extend them, rather than ‘reconfigure’ them. This has meant that, in the few years of its operation, the Camfield Estates experiment has not shown a pattern of improvement in community interaction and local activity, or measurable increases in trust and social capital; the relationship between community technology and community building remains unclear (Pinkett 2002b). Pinkett concludes that “community building for the sake of community building will never be enough (much like access for the sake of access is never enough)”. Nevertheless, he is unshaken in his commitment to motivate community members, to “get people to want to integrate both technology and community building into their daily lives” (Pinkett 2002b).

We can see a similar pattern of reforming aspiration and disappointment in our third example, that of the Wired Up Communities scheme developed in England by the national English Department for Education and Skills.⁶ The scheme differs from both the

⁶ See <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/wired/index.shtml>

Australian and the American example in being initiated and funded by government. Ten million pounds sterling has been given to seed-fund public-private partnerships designed to give residents in disadvantaged communities high-speed access to the Internet, from their homes. According to the education department, the initiative is designed to test 'how new technology can help break down barriers which people face in getting and keeping a job'. Individual Internet access in the home can 'transform opportunities', developing 'new ways of accessing learning, work and leisure services'.⁷

The Wired Up Communities scheme has now been in development for two years. Following a pilot project in a wired community in Kensington, Liverpool, DfES put out a call inviting socially disadvantaged communities to organise themselves into public-private partnerships with technology companies and not for profit agencies and to propose an experiment in wiring a community. There are seven initiatives now in place, using a variety of means to link computers in people's homes to the Internet and local networks of schools and social services; the technical models include the use of both reconditioned and new PCs and of set top boxes and televisions; connectivity is being achieved through standard telephone lines, through broadband and through satellite TV.⁸ The local initiatives now in place include the Newham estate in East London, perhaps the closest in circumstances to our two previous examples.⁹ Once again, it features a resident population that is multiethnic, low-income and largely unemployed. Each of these households has been pledged a set top box and cable connection to Internet services. However, construction of this particular wired community experiment has fallen well behind schedule, in part because of difficulties in sustaining the partnership between the community agencies involved, the tenants themselves and the private technology company responsible to developing and installing the network.

These difficulties are characteristic; few of the funded wired-up communities projects across the UK have lived up to the expectations of organisers and the criteria of the funder. In the first concerted evaluation of the whole initiative, by a team from Leeds Metropolitan University, the problem appears, in part, to lie in the model of public-private partnership used (Devins et al 2003). A number of the initiative lost their private partner when, in the wake of the dotcom boom, small technology companies collapsed and went into receivership. Others found that the private sector partners were primarily interested in the opportunity for technological innovation, and were unable to grapple with the social context of the community technology venture or with the needs of local residents. Another important disappointment has been the lack of evidence that computer access in the home has been directly linked, via skill-building, to improved employment prospects. Although the computers are available and are being used, educational initiatives have been patchy. Residents tend to say they want educational opportunities, especially for their children, but they do not necessarily want to be involved in communal education activities; they prefer to pursue private concerns.

It is of course too early to tell what the longer-term costs and benefits of providing these computer networks will be. It may be that, as advocates and organisers claim, there is a causal chain between access to technology in the home, informal learning and experimentation and the pursuit of educational and employment opportunities, linked in turn to increased prosperity and thus to social cohesion. The problem, in evaluating short

⁷ See <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/wired/over.shtml>

⁸ See 'Wired up communities' <http://www.makingthenetwork.org/common/wuc.htm>. Accessed 28/02/2003

⁹ See <http://www.newham.net/welcome.htm>

and medium term benefits, lies in tracking change and in demonstrating that it stems from the use of information and communication technologies. Already, there are cogent arguments, in Britain, against raising expectations about the social impact of wired communities too high, and investing too heavily in ventures with such uncertain outcomes (Wilcox et al 2002, Pleace and Quilgars 2002, Pearl and Scanlon 2002). A recent review of the relationship between public housing and community technology, published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, warns again 'blundering in' to invest in community technology for low income populations, especially where there is no clear strategy (Wilcox, Greenop and Mackie 2002). Often, it is argued, such initiatives cast up old problems with which the community sector has been working for decades. Organisers need to anticipate the thorny issue of how the resident community is going to be involved in the initiative, who speaks for which group and how decision-making is going to happen in often difficult and divisive issues, where there is no single community voice.

Together, then, these three wired community case studies help us to understand the complexity of the relationship between technology, community and governing aspirations. Each also offers reasons to avoid simple conceptions of community and mechanist understandings of the social impact of technology. Instead, they show how technology use is incorporated within the messy process of advocacy, investment and evaluation that now make up neoliberal ways of governing through community. While keyboards, screens, cables and data exchanges change some of the ways in which these processes happens, they are more likely to add to the everyday difficulties of managing life on and around a housing estate than to translate it into a new political reality.

6. Community as managerial technology

Wired community initiatives appear to be prime examples of the emergence of the information society. In current commentary, information is credited with the potential to transform not just the fortunes of families, but the roles, rights and expectations of citizens. If local organisation and community groups help local residents to become information sharers and information seekers, it is predicted, then communities and citizens will be less reliant on government agencies, and better able to demand more of them. As government adjusts to new expectations, it will find new ways to use and work with local communities. The Internet offers not only integrated information systems, but also communicative networks able to link individuals to special interest groups and in turn to services. As social services are increasingly provided online, in response to electronic government imperatives, the information exchange is expected to be reciprocal. Citizens and consumers will demand more transparency and accountability, while government agencies will be better able to get information on the needs and priorities of clients. This will not be just a two-way exchange, but a civic and governmental circuit between consumers, community groups and social service providers (public, private and not for profit). Citizens will be self-educating consumers of services, becoming effective advocates and lobbyists as they develop technical, communicative and problem-solving abilities (Wilcox and Pearl 2002, p. 2).

These wired community case studies suggest that we should be cautious about such expectations, even as they exemplify the ambitiousness of advanced liberal strategies for integrating new technologies into tactics for governing through community. We are seeing the sophistication, adaptation and improvisation of these tactics. But we are also seeing limits to political aspiration and technical experimentation. Those building wired

communities keep coming up against the problem of how far they should aim to be discovering community, reviving it, or creating it anew. This can be circular and interminable: the MIT scholars comment for example that 'In order to use technology for communication and other social purposes, users must have an audience or critical mass of community members to connect with. For example, in order to send an e-mail, you have to know someone who has access to e-mail. Similarly, to build community online there has to be a community online to build' (Pinkett 2002, p. 16.).

We can see here a prime case of Schofield's conception of community-building as a managerial technology. Camfield Estates exemplifies the 'reflexive circuit', one that 'takes as its starting point the perceived needs of the community, which, we are told, must be discovered before they can be acted upon'. Aspects of life in the local area are listed, condensed and represented in diagrammatic schema and databases. The community is formed at the same time as it is represented. The image of the community network is an effective one: it enables needs and interests to be channelled, organised, grouped in 'communities of interest' and then notionally connected to decision-making:

Black lines feed into red boxes and more blobs which stand for public, voluntary, private and statutory agencies. Together these institutions come together as a partnership which converts the community's needs into an agreed development plan.

Life in the local area can be inscribed as a portable model; in turn, the model can be reapplied elsewhere as a diagnosis of weak or strong links, or of disconnections calling for inventive solutions (Schofield p. 675)

Metaphors about the creation of human-technical hybrids are attractive. They can help to clarify the ways in which political thought is linked to the technical processes of governing through community, translating broad reformatory ambitions into freely made choices, aspirations and alliances between interests. There is a literal overlap between how computer networks operate and the ways in which human relations on a particular site are summarised, organised and schematised in diagrams on white boards, butchers' paper, overhead transparencies and PowerPoint displays. The imagery of circuits and wiring has infused the language and techniques of community development (though whether this is a recent phenomenon is doubtful). By the same token, the conception of the organic community returns relentlessly in the way we think about the social use of technology. For this reason, those running community networks continually seek to be able to connect to the authentic community life, always and already assumed to have existed before the network was established,

It is easy to be carried away, though, by the metaphor, thinking of community technology schemes as cold, neutral, efficient ways of schematising and misrepresenting authentic community life. In practice, more human error, argument and effort is involved. Constructing these artefacts requires onerous work in persuasion, negotiation and arbitration. It involves research into the composition of the community, extensive consultation, negotiation with existing residents' association, eliciting and encouraging new groups to form, raising enthusiasm and moderating expectations, and anticipating risks and disasters ranging from people selling donated computers at local pawn shops to partnerships falling through and funders losing their faith that there were be any demonstrable outcomes from their investment. Along the way, the politics of the local community are likely to be fissiparous. It will never be clear whether the initiative can be

said to come from the community and be owned by it; organisers are always likely to be vulnerable to the accusation that they have imposed the scheme on to residents and failed to consult adequately. The composition of the residents is likely to shift and change; different interest groups will coalesce.

In describing the current enthusiasm for wired community experimentation, we have to avoid celebrating either the organic political community (ignoring its technical and artefactual character) or technicist fantasies (ignoring their faulty and social character). Instead, we have to describe the place and purchase of such conceptions within the mundane daily workings and adaptations of the social use of technology within social administration. This means detailing the process of information seeking and intervention: faulty efforts to assemble information, to organise and co-ordinate actions, bringing actors and groups to the point where they can articulate their interests coherently. It is in these painstaking processes that technology and political thought meet and make community.

References

- Baker, T. (2000) 'Insuring morality', *Economy and Society* vol. 29 no 4, pp. 559-577.
- Barry, A. (2002) 'The anti-political economy', *Economy and Society* vol. 31 no 2, pp. 268-284.
- Barry, A. (2001) *Political machines: governing a technological society*. London: Athlone Press.
- Barry, A. and Slater, D. (2002) 'Introduction: the technological economy'. *Economy and Society* vol. 31 no 2 pp. 175-193.
- Barry, A., Osborne, T., Rose, N. (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bowie, N.A. (2000) 'The digital divide: making knowledge available in a global context'. In OECD (ed) *Learning to Bridge the Digital Divide*. Paris: OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
- Bowring, F. (2000) 'Social exclusion: limitations of the debate'. *Critical Social Policy* vol 20 no 3, pp. 307-330.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C. et al., eds. (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Brighton, Harvester Wheatsheaf. Hampton, J. (1986). *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, M. (1996) *The Information Age: economy, society and culture. Vol 1: The Network Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Cohill, A.M., Kavanagh, A.L. (eds) (2000) *Community Networks. Lessons from Blacksburg, Virginia*. Norwood, M.A.: Artech House Inc.
- Compaigne, B. (ed) (2001) *Digital Divide: facing a crisis or creating a myth?* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cruikshank, B 1993 'Revolutions within: self-government and self-esteem' *Economy and Society* 22(3) 227-244
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage: London.
- Dean, M. (2002) 'Liberal government and authoritarianism', *Economy and Society* vol. 31 no 1, pp. 37-61.
- Denison, T., Hardy, G., Johanson, G., Stillman, L. and Schauder, D. (2002) 'Community networks: identities, taxonomies and evaluations', *Electronic Networking 2002 -- Building Community*. Monash University, Caulfield.
- Devins, D., Darlow, A., Petrie, A. and Burden, T. (2003) *Connecting Communities to the Internet: Evaluation of the Wired Up Communities Programme*. London: Department for Education and Skills. Research Report RR389.
- DiMaggio, P. and Hargattai, E. (2001) 'From the 'digital divide' to 'digital inequality': studying Internet use as penetration increases'. Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies Working Paper 15, Summer 2001.
- Doheny-Farina, S. (1996) *The Wired Neighbourhood*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Donzelot, J. (1997) *The Policing of Families*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Etzioni, A. (1997) *The New Golden Rule: community and morality in a democratic society*. London: Profile.
- Ewing, S. (2003) 'Virtual Renewal: can a network build community?'. Paper prepared for the e-Nation conference.
- Ewing, S., Hayward, D., Hopkins, L., Thomas, J. (2003 in press) 'The new social policy and the digital age: a case study of a wired high rise public housing estate' *Just Policy*.
- Fitzpatrick, T. (2000) 'Critical cyberpolicy: network technologies, massless citizens, virtual rights'. *Critical Social Policy*, vol. 20, no 3, pp. 375-407
- Foley, M.W. and Edwards, B. (1997) 'Escape from politics? Social theory and the social capital debates'. *American Behavioral Scientist* vol. 40 no 1, pp. 550-561.
- Foucault, M. (1991) 'Governmentality', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: studies in governmentality*. London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Fountain, J.E. (2001) *Building the Virtual State: information technology and institutional change*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute.
- Granovetter, M. (1973) 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 6: 1360-1380.
- Gurstein, M. (ed) (2000) *Community Informatics*. London: Idea Group Publishing.
- Hallawell, S. (2001) *Beyond Access: ICT and social inclusion*. London: Fabian Society
- Henman, P. (2002) 'Transformations in risk government: technology and the fragmentation of the social'. Unpublished paper.
- Hindess, B. 1993. "Liberalism, socialism and democracy: variations on a governmental theme." *Economy and Society* 22:300-313.
- Hindess, Barry. 1996. *Discourses of Power. From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Hindess, B. (1998) 'Neo-liberalism and the national economy', in M. Dean and B. Hindess (eds) *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, pp. 210-26.
- Hopkins, L. (2002.) 'Social capital in multiethnic communities: a case study from three inner urban high rise public housing estates'. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. In submission.
- Hopkins, L., Ewing, S., Meredyth, D. and Thomas, J. (2003 forthcoming) 'Machinery and community', *Southern Review* 36 (1)
- Hunter, Ian. 1998. "Uncivil society: liberal government and the deconfessionalisation of politics." Pp. 242-264 in *Governing Australia. Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*, edited by M. Dean and B. Hindess. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, I. and Meredyth, D. (2000) 'Popular education and popular sovereignty'. In *American Behavioral Scientist* vol. 43 no. 9 (special issue Meredyth, D. and Minson, J. (eds) *Citizenship and Cultural Policy: statecraft, markets and community*), pp. 1462-1486.
- InfoXchange (1999) *Project Initiation Document. Reach for the Clouds. A Project to Establish a Residents' Computer Network at the Atherton Gardens Estate, Brunswick St. Fitzroy*, paper developed for Multimedia Victoria, Melbourne.
- InfoXchange (2000) *Bridging the Digital Divide*, Melbourne.
- Institute for Social Research (2003a) Industry Report 1: Introducing Reach for the Clouds. Melbourne: Institute for Social Research.
- Institute for Social Research (2003b) Industry Report 2: Reach for the Clouds: Initial findings and working hypotheses.
- Loader, B. (ed) (1998) *Cyberspace Divide*. London: Routledge.
- Marinetti, M. (2003) 'Who wants to be an active citizen? The politics and practice of community involvement'. *Sociology* vol. 37 no 1, pp. 103-121.
- McNair, S. (2000) 'The emerging policy agenda' In OECD (ed) *Learning to Bridge the Digital Divide*. Paris: OECD.
- Meredyth, D. and Ewing, S. (2003) 'Social capital and wired communities: a case study'. Paper presented to the 8th Australian Institute for Family Studies conference, Melbourne 12-14 February 2003. See <http://www.aifs.org.au/institute/afrc8/meredyth.pdf>
- Meredyth, D., Hopkins, L, Ewing, S. and Thomas, J. (2002) 'Measuring social capital in a networked housing estate. *First Monday* 7 (10).
- Meredyth, D., Ewing, S. and Thomas, J. (2003 in press) 'Divided opinion on the digital divide'. *Southern Review* 36 (1).
- Meredyth, D., Hopkins, L, Ewing, S. and Thomas, J. (2003) 'Wired High Rise: Using technology to combat social isolation on an inner city public housing estate' in Stewart Marshall, Xinghuo Yu,

- and Wal Taylor (eds) *Using Community Informatics to Transform Regions*. Idea Group Publishing (in press).
- Miller, P. and Rose, N. (1990) 'Governing economic life', *Economy and Society* vol 19 no 1, pp. 1-31.
- Minson, J.P. (1993) 'The participatory imperative', in *Questions of Conduct: sexual harassment, citizenship, government*. London: Macmillan, pp. 190-219.
- Minson, J. (1998a). 'Ethics in the service of the state'. In M. Dean & B. Hindess (Eds.), *Governing Australia: Studies in contemporary rationalities of government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Minson, Jeffrey. (1998b). "Aesthetics and the demands of participation." *Political Theory Newsletter*.
- Norris, P. (2001) *Digital Divide: Civic engagement, information poverty and the internet in democratic societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, P. (2000) 'Uncertain subjects: risks, liberalism and contract', *Economy and Society* vol. 29 no 4, pp. 460-484.
- Pearl, M and Scanlon, M. (2002) *Remote Control: housing associations and e-governance*. The Policy Press.
- Perri 6 with Jupp, B. (2001) *Divided by Information? The 'digital divide' and the implications of the new meritocracy*. London: Demos.
- Pinkett, R. (2000) 'Bridging the digital divide: sociocultural constructionism and an asset-based approach to community technology and community-building'. Paper presented to the 81st annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), New Orleans LA, April 24-28, 2000.
- Pinkett, R. (2002) 'Integrating community technology and community building: early results from the Camfield Estates –MIT Creating Community Connections Project'. Paper presented to the Directions and Implications of Advanced Computing Symposium (DIAC-2002) May 16-19 2002.
- Pinkett, R. (2002b) 'Towards social and cultural resonance with technology: case studies from the creating community connections project'. Unpublished paper.
- Pleace, N. and Quilgars, D. (2002) *Housing .support.org.uk: social housing, social care and electronic service delivery*. London: the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rose, N. (2001) "Governing communities'. In D. Meredyth and J. Minson (eds) *Citizenship and Cultural Policy*. London: Sage.
- Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (1996) 'Governing "advanced" liberal democracies', in A. Barry, T. Osborne, and N. Rose (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason*. London: UCL press.
- Rose, N. (1996) 'The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government'. *Economy and Society* vol. 25 no 3, pp. 327-356.
- Schofield. B. (2002) 'Partners in power: governing the self-sustaining community'. *Sociology*, vol. 36 no. 1, pp. 663-84.
- Servon, L. and Nelson, M.K. (2001) 'Community technology centers: narrowing the digital divide in low-income, urban communities'. *Journal of Urban Studies* vol. 23, no 3-4, pp. 279-290.
- Smith, M. A. and Kollock, P. (eds) (1999) *Communities in Cyberspace*. London: Routledge.
- Tsangarousianou, R., Tambini, D., and Bryan, C. (eds) (1998) *Cyberdemocracy. Technology, cities and civic networks*. London: Routledge.
- Wellman, B., Quan, A., Witte, J. and Hampton, K. (2001) 'Does the Internet increase, decrease or supplement social capital?', *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45 (3): 436-455.
- Wellman, B., Salaff, J., Dimitrova, D. and Garton, L. (1996) 'Computer networks as social networks: collaborative work, telework, and virtual community', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22: 213-238.
- Wilcox, D. and Pearl, M. (2002) 'Civic and community technology' *The Journal of the Communications Network* vol 1 part 1 April-June pp. 1-9.
- Wilcox, D., Greenop, D. and Mackie, D. (2002) *Making the net work for residents and their landlords: a guide to using information and communication technologies in housing associations*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Winter, I. (2000) *Social Capital and Public Policy in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Yeatman, Anna. 1998. "Interpreting contemporary contractualism." Pp. 227-241 in *Governing Australia. Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*, edited by M. Dean and B. Hindess. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.