

Network Society and the Politics of Community

Dr Gabrielle Gwyther

Post Doctoral Research Fellow

Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre

(Room 1.1.72, Bankstown Campus)

University of Western Sydney

Locked Bag 1797

Penrith South DC NSW 1797

Ph: 02 9772 6761

Mob: 0411 673 712

Email: g.gwyther@uws.edu.au

Network Society and the Politics of Community

Abstract:

This paper draws on the structure of Wellman's (1979) 'Community Question' to examine the rise and implications of the 'politics of community', particularly as it pertains to social space and geographic place. The 'Community Question' incorporates three perspectives that have underpinned community research and theories since the industrial revolution: Community Lost, Community Saved and Community Liberated. Where both the Lost and Saved paradigms commence their examination of community from the position of geographical propinquity, the Liberated paradigm examines community from a perspective of social ties and networks in social space. Communication enhancing technology has changed the structure and nature of social ties in contemporary society, allowing certain individuals and groups greater movement and control over their networks and mobility, while conversely causing the stasis and exclusion of others. With reference to the 'new mobilities paradigm' the second part of this paper examines the implications for two cases of sedentarist government strategies which have been captured by the 'politics of community': the Building Stronger Communities (2007) policy of the NSW Department of Housing and the development of 'Masterplanned Communities' by Landcom, the NSW Government's land agency.

Introduction

Since the early 1990s the notion of ‘community’ has become an increasingly discernible element of certain government policies and political rhetoric (Mowbray 2005). Community is a value ridden notion. It is overlaid with normative intentions and is often used to conjure up feelings of security in a seemingly insecure world (Bauman 2001). At a time when governments either will not or cannot find ways of managing some of society’s more intractable social problems, the application of the ‘community solution’ enables the replacement of specific policy outcomes with more nebulous ones – nebulous because, as Everingham (2003: 3) notes, “the word itself is quite empty of any meaning in particular”. More importantly, however, the hegemonic appeal to a specific ideal of ‘community’ privileges certain groups within society by supporting a particular notion of social consensus. This social consensus is formed around employment, home ownership, private education and other consumerist activities of the flourishing, mobile classes of the global economy. Perversely, the moral values of individual effort and self-sufficiency form the basis of this group’s *community* identity. A consequence of the appeal to this community ideal is the exclusion of certain ‘others’ (Young 1990).

In the first instance, this paper draws on the structure of Wellman’s (1979) ‘Community Question’ to examine the rise and implications of the *community turn* in social policy, particularly as it pertains to social space and place. The ‘Community Question’ incorporates three perspectives that have underpinned theories of community in the West since the rise of industrialism and urbanisation: ‘community lost’, the earliest and still the most pervasive sociological perspective which has most recently been revived through neo-communitarian and social capital discourses; ‘community saved’, an optimistic, empirically based response to the Lost perspective, particularly during the 1950s and 60s; and ‘community liberated’, a view which developed out of “the analytic juxtaposition of the Lost and Saved arguments” (Wellman 1979: 1206).

Where both the Lost and Saved paradigms commence their examination of community from the position of geographical propinquity, the Liberated paradigm examines community from a perspective of social ties and networks in social space. Communication and transport technology has changed the structure and nature of social ties in contemporary society, allowing certain individuals and groups greater movement and control over their mobility, while conversely causing the stasis and exclusion of others. Furthermore, new mobilities have encouraged the replacement of ‘public sociability’ with ‘private intimacy’ (Wellman 1999) in a process of the domestication of community.

Drawing on the ‘new mobilities paradigm’, Sheller and Urry (2006) note that mobility has become a resource which is unequally distributed locally and globally. Moreover, new mobilities heighten the process of socio-spatial differentiation. For instance, the lack of social ties at the local level associated with the Liberated community, “weakens local commitment and encourages people to vote with their feet, leaving when conditions are bad rather than staying to improve things” (Wellman 1999: 27). The complexities inherent in a society characterised by hyper-mobility have implications for ‘sedentary’ government policies which treat ‘stability, meaning and places’ as normal, while treating ‘distance, change and placelessness’ as abnormal (Sheller and Urry 2006: 208).

With reference to the ‘new mobilities paradigm’, the second part of this paper examines two cases of sedentary government policies in New South Wales which have been heavily influenced by the ‘politics of community’: the Community Regeneration Strategy of the NSW

Department of Housing, and the program of 'Master Planned Communities' under the NSW Government's land development agency, Landcom.

Community Lost

Resting on the assumption that strong primary ties naturally occur in "densely knit, self-contained solidarities", the 'community lost' perspective suggests that the contractual arrangements supporting the division of labour and urban life in modern society have weakened communal solidarities and authentic community (Wellman 1979: 1204). This perspective has its intellectual roots in Durkheim's (1949) explanation of the shift from mechanical to organic solidarity whereby social solidarity in industrial society is maintained not by the uniform characteristics produced by geographic propinquity – the basis of mechanical solidarity - but by the very differences produced by the industrial division of labour which necessitate a system of interdependence.

Community Lost, neo-Communitarianism and Social Capital

The emergence in the 1990s of two related community discourses, neo-Communitarianism and social capital, are powerful contemporary expressions of the Lost perspective. The contemporary 'politics of community' has been significantly informed by these discourses. Neo-communitarianism argues that primary aspects of an individual's identification and behaviour are derived from communal attachments (Mason 2000). The U.S. based Responsive Communitarianism views the central failing of modern society as the weakening of traditional and associational ties. Thus, "authentic community" has been replaced by "partial or distorted communities" marked by alienation (Etzioni 1996: 1). This explanation is rhetorically contextualised against the back drop of a perceived 'crisis of values' in the English speaking world, as exhibited by "rising crime, the dismemberment of the family, drug abuse and corruption in politics" (Etzioni cited Anderson and Davey 1995: 21).

Neo-communitarianism conflates morality with community by promoting the idea of a 'moral infrastructure' based on four social institutions: the family, school, local community, and above this the 'community of communities'. Everingham (2003) notes that a particular set of values underpin the moral infrastructure, involving individual self-reliance within the privatised, nuclear family. Communitarians emphasise the responsibilities of community members rather than their rights, and much of this finds application in crime prevention schemes (Henderson and Salmon 1998). The demolition and privatisation of troubled public housing estates in Australia, for instance the Villawood Estate in the late 1990s (Arthurson 2004) and currently the Gordon Estate in Dubbo can be considered crime prevention schemes which significantly preferences individual responsibility over rights.

Social Capital as Policy Prescription

The emergence of the social capital discourse parallels the rise of communitarianism. Spies-Butcher (2002: 174) argues that social capital actually inherited much of its power "from communitarian and civic republican debates...". Drawing on Coleman (1990) and Putnam's (2000) functionalist perspectives on social capital, the link between neo-communitarianism and social capital rests in the idea of 'public good' - incorporating ideas of trust, reciprocity and civil participation supported by social norms.

Under the influence of the prevailing neo-liberal agenda of the 1990s, a particular communitarian view of social capital, emphasising civil engagement and a normative view of community, became the prominent account (Spies-Butcher 2002, Fine 2001). This influenced

the conceptual development of social capital and the way it was adopted into government policy.

In the aftermath of neo-liberal welfare reform, privatisation of public assets and user-pays, social capital has become a policy metaphor for ‘local community’ and ‘self-help’ (Forrest and Kearns 2001: 2138). It is a powerful discourse, adopted at all levels from global institutions such as the World Bank, the first of the major NGOs to embrace and promote the concept, to national Governments (see for instance Blair 1998), government departments (see for instance Productivity Commission 2003), conservative think-tanks, ‘grass roots’ social enterprises and non profit organisations (Lyons 2000). The Australian Government’s ‘McClure Report’ into welfare reform, for instance, notes that:

By building their social capital (through stronger networks, trust and shared values), communities can offer individuals more opportunities for economic and social participation (McClure 2000: 45).

Consequently, assisting individuals and communities to create ‘social capital’ as the way out of their disadvantage entered the policy lexicon.

The adoption of a communitarian form of social capital into policy discourse reflects society’s ongoing concern for forms of solidarity seemingly lost to the competitive, contractual, global arrangements of late capitalism. The manifestation of community which social policy is promoting, however, is one in which social cohesion draws on a qualified value system of individual responsibility, self sufficiency and a commitment to the economy through productive toil. Apart from its exclusionary tendencies, there is an internal contradiction at play here with the potential for the subjugation of the much valued individual to the economic success of the group.

Community Saved

The ‘community saved’ perspective was a positive, albeit relatively weak response to the pessimistic picture of social disorganisation, isolation, insecurity, breakdown and anomie suggested by proponents of the Lost perspective. Based on empirical evidence drawn from localised urban studies during the 1960s, the Saved argument contends that primary ties based on propinquity have not “withered away in urban settings”, but have continued to flourish in the city due to the “inherent gregariousness of human nature” (Tsai and Sigleman 1982: 580). Young and Willmott (1962), for instance, found that the vibrant working class metropolitan borough of Bethnal Green was bound together by kinship, population stability and a neighbourhood based communitarian ethos which provided aid and support. Interestingly, Frankenberg (1966: 181) later pointed out that much of the solidarity which emerged from Young and Willmott’s study arose from “the shared poverty and lack of social and geographical mobility of its inhabitants”. This experience of community is more recently reflected in research into the regeneration of the Minto public housing estate in Sydney’s south-west (see Minto Resident Action Group 2005).

Both the Lost and Saved perspectives rest on the sedentary idea of community as bounded solidarities founded on geographic rather than on social propinquity. According to Wellman (1979: 1206), both perspectives, confined by arguments of “solidary sentiments and territorial cohesiveness” tend to neglect primary relationships and solidary ties within *overall* social networks of urban life. Social policies which derive their conceptions of community from the

lost / found dichotomy tend to position community as a fixed and definable attribute of a given geographical area.

Community Liberated

Deriving from network analysis the Community Liberated perspective abandons the local area as the starting point and instead inquires directly into the structure and network of primary ties (Wellman 1979, Tsai and Sigleman 1982). While affirming the prevalence and importance of intimate relationships, the Liberated perspective argues that “most ties are *not* now organised into densely knit, tightly bounded solidarities” (Wellman 1979: 1206). Rather, solidarities are replaced with *differentiated networks*. Where existing kinship systems and neighbourly relations present as densely knit, tightly bounded networks these apparent solidarities are more likely to be clusters in an otherwise sparsely knit, loosely bounded network. Hence, rather than community being ‘lost’ through the development of urban life, community is ‘liberated’ from being restricted to interpersonal affiliations based on geographic propinquity alone.

The Liberated perspective gives rise to the notion of the ‘community of interest’ whereby identity, social ties and networks are formed on the basis of certain common interests drawn from occupation, leisure pursuits, culture, religion and ethnicity, values and ideology, and lifestyle and consumption (Webber 1963, Gwyther 2005). Where status and lifestyle are the basis of a community of interest, this can be expressed in the coalescence of space and place, for instance in the master planned community or gated estate (Gwyther 2005). Three interrelated aspects which give viability to the notion of the Liberated community and the ‘community of interest’ are the production of social space, the principle of homophily, and the paradigm of the new mobilities.

Social Space

In presenting a theory on ‘community without propinquity’, Webber (1963: 43) opened the way for considering *social space* in the formation of community arguing: “Never before have men been able to maintain intimate and continuing contact with others across thousand of miles; never has intimacy been so independent of spatial propinquity”. Although place-independent communities have always existed, particularly for the elite who had access to exclusive modes of mobility, communicative and transport technology has brought the ‘liberated’ community to the masses.

Social space is the multiple locations which give rise to the production of social relations, including the loci of discourse construction and of lifestyle and cultural reproduction, as well as the social exercise of space within the physical setting and within cyberspace. For Lefebvre (1991: 11) social space is not the “passive locus of social relations” but is a social product, perceived, defined, given meaning and engaged by social groups generally identified by their socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Social space then, is neither imagined nor unreal, but the outcome of past actions which suggest and permit fresh actions, while excluding or prohibiting others.

The Homophily Principle

The ‘community of interest’ reduces the determining significance of *place* in community formation and sustainability (Webber 1963). Although facilitated by technology, ‘communities of interest’ are generally communities founded on homophily, or the tendency for individuals to associate and bond with others who have similar interests as themselves. Shared interests can be based in occupation, cultural or leisure pursuits, or common characteristics in regard to

values, education and lifestyle (Gwyther 2005). McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook (2001: 415) argue that the homophily principle

structures network ties of every type, including marriage, friendship, work, advice, support, information transfer, exchange, co-membership, and other types of relationship. The result is that people's personal networks are homogeneous with regard to many socio-demographic, behavioural, and intrapersonal characteristics.

Yet the concept of the 'balanced' heterogeneous community remains a dominant theme in place-based planning rhetoric. The idea of the 'balanced community' (Gans 1961) is underpinned by the town planning principle of 'social mix'. With little research support, proponents argue that 'social mix' in regard to age, cultures, housing tenure and income, enriches the lives of inhabitants, promotes tolerance of social and cultural differences, 'elevates' lower-class values through contact with more affluent residents, has a broadening influence on children's education particularly in regard to other cultures, and lessens stigma and isolation associated with living in certain troubled areas (see for instance Sarkissian 1976).

However, as Gans (1972) argues, it is doubtful that population heterogeneity can be legislated or planned for. Even if it could, "it is questionable whether a heterogeneous and balanced community would result in the envisaged way of life. Many other societal conditions would have to alter before such a way of life were possible, notably the present degree of economic and social inequality that now exists in the typical metropolitan population" (Gans 1972: 142). Yet the principle of social mix is integral to addressing 'social exclusion' within social housing estates both within Australia and the United Kingdom (Arthurson 2005).

The major strategy for injecting social mix here is through a process of 'community regeneration' in which public housing is turned over to the private sector, thus introducing a significant proportion of private tenure. This process disrupts existing social ties and displaces the original population. As Lilley (2005) suggests, housing authorities assume that a functional community is lacking in estates marked for regeneration, and that in order to be a legitimate member of the community, social housing tenants need to adopt the manner and characteristics of residential areas marked by privatism in regard to housing, self reliance, and other aspects of social and economic life. The doctrine of social mix contradicts the process of community formation which rests on the mutual understanding and common attributes of a homogenous group.

New Mobilities

The 'new mobilities paradigm' views the control over and access to *mobility* as a resource that is unequally distributed locally and globally. New technologies enhance some groups' mobility while increasing the immobility of others (Sheller and Urry 2006). Mobility has implications for community formation and maintenance. According to Cass, Shove and Urry (2005) since the 1950s, with the uptake of new communicative technologies following World War II (in particular the car and telecommunications), social networks have become increasingly widespread, less coherent and less likely to overlap.

The Community Liberated perspective reveals the way in which access to mobilities enables communities to form independently of place and encourages agents to form social networks on the basis of common interests, while the 'new mobilities paradigm' emphasizes the disparate access to mobilities resources and outcomes. Mobilities technology has made the spatialities of social life more complex and increasingly difficult to predict. In turn this has implications for 'sedentarist' social policies which normalise stability, meaning and place (Sheller and Urry

2006). Yet with the ‘politics of community’ the state preferences a moral community in which members share the values and lifestyle of self-reliance and privatism. A form of ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991), people consider themselves connected under a common way of life, set of values and economic interests and in turn these attributes are endorsed and encouraged, even rewarded by the state, as characteristics of the good citizen.

The ‘Politics of Community’ and Housing Policies – two cases

The next part of this paper examines two instances of government housing policies which privilege a particular, idealised view of community and consequently a particular constituency. The first case examines some of the implications of the community turn on lower income groups in public housing estates through the policies of the NSW Department of Housing. The second examines Landcom’s program of master-planning communities targeted towards middle and higher income, home owners. Both sets of policies have implications for individuals who have limited access to mobilities and economic resources.

The NSW Department of Housing

The Department of Housing’s ‘community regeneration’ strategy is a logical consequence of the infusion of moral underclass discourse into the concept of social exclusion. The UK sociologist Ruth Levitas (2004) has tracked the development of three ‘models’ of discourses of social exclusion which shadow the shift in explanations of the causes of poverty and policy solutions in recent years.

Prior to the 1990s, Levitas argues, social exclusion discourse was essentially redistributive (RED) and reflected concerns for citizen’s rights and inequality – both remnants of T H Marshall’s *social citizenship* tradition. However, during the 1990s a ‘social integrationist discourse’ (SID) with an emphasis on labour market participation, and a ‘moral underclass discourse’ (MUD) concerned with the morality and behaviour of individuals, entered the social exclusion lexicon. The emergence of SID and MUD occurred at the time that neo-liberalism and communitarianism were prominent political discourses. Neither SID nor MUD address structural inequalities, and MUD in particular “presents the socially excluded as morally distinct from the rest of society” (Levitas 2004: 44).

Reflecting changes in attitude to the socially excluded in the UK, the Department of Housing’s conception of social exclusion shifted from its original social integrationist understanding to one increasingly influenced by the moral underclass discourse. This is exemplified in the categorising of public housing tenants as “good” or “bad”, as made last year by the former NSW Minister for Housing Cherie Burton, when explaining the advantages of the Department’s Community Regeneration Strategy:

So what this is about is building better housing for our people that are the good tenants and making sure that our bad tenants start to take some respect and responsibility for where they live, or then public housing won’t be an option to them. (Cherie Burton cited Hall 2006)

An important element of the Department’s Community Regeneration Strategy is the reconfiguring of tract housing to incorporate ‘social mix’ through the substantial and in some instances *total* introduction of private tenure. The belief here is that social mix achieved through tenure diversification creates a ‘balanced’ community with the expectation of ‘normalising’ residents of public housing through their propinquity to the moral citizenry. Perversely, where social ties, reciprocity and shared values are generally considered exemplars

of the existence of community, particularly from a social capital perspective, under the influence of moral underclass discourse such characteristics in public housing estates are discounted and become problematised.

In preferencing moral and cultural explanations for social exclusion over structural explanations of inequalities, the regeneration strategy disrupts the existing sense of community, identity, ties and social support in an attempt to establish a specific, normative manifestation of community.

In January 2007 the Minister for Housing announced a master plan for the troubled Gordon Estate in the central west town of Dubbo which would “completely renew the community as privately owned homes” (Cherie Burton cited Housing NSW 2007: 1). The mostly Aboriginal community was to be dispersed and only ‘good’ tenants would be rehoused (Hall 2006). A number of media reports and documentaries into the regeneration of the Gordon community have highlighted the pain associated with relocating, and the isolation, alienation and displacement felt by Gordon residents, many of whom have been rehoused in more affluent, predominately ‘white’ suburbs (Tilley 2007, Eastwood 2006). Where in Gordon the streets were lively, communal places, in the private neighbourhoods the streets seemed empty.

This sentiment reflects the experience of former public housing residents of the ‘regenerated’ Minto estate in Sydney’s south-west. The Minto Renewal Project was announced in 2002 and over 200 families have since been rehoused, many in private housing estates. On completion the project anticipates a 30% public housing / 70% private tenure mix (Woods Bagot 2006). One Minto resident has described her relocation experience:

It’s so quiet where we are in ‘private’. There’s no life, no one around. No one talks to you. I miss the kids who lived around me. Seeing how they were going, having them call in. Having my neighbours call in. There’s no community in private. No one talks to you. That’s what I miss. (Former Resident cited Minto Resident Action Group 2005: 99)

Both Gordon and Minto residents have expressed how they feel looked on with contempt by their new home-owning neighbours who are hyper-vigilant to any minor transgressions of their public housing neighbours. The vigilance of government bureaucracy coupled with that of home-owning neighbours makes, as one former public housing tenant of south-west Sydney explained to me recently “the most watched people.... You’re always being watched”.

Concerned about the effect the new settlers might have on their property values the home owning residents of Dubbo’s more affluent areas have taken to lobbying their Members of Parliament. Andrew Stoner is recorded in the NSW Hansard declaring:

Indeed, there has been a relative panic in towns surrounding Dubbo, such as Narromine, Parkes, Forbes and Peak Hill, and in other parts of the city of Dubbo. People are worried that families with problems are being forcibly moved into their neighbourhood (NSW Legislative Assembly Hansard 2006).

Stigma of place has been replaced by the stigma of tenure, of being a ‘houso’. It is a stigma which must be suffered in isolation. For many residents of Gordon and Minto a better house in a more affluent, private neighbourhood has not made up for the grief associated with the loss of their ‘home’ and their community (Fried 1963). These neighbourhoods may have a more ‘balanced’ social mix, but this comes at a cost of social integration. More importantly, the preferencing of an idealised face-to-face community “denies difference in the form of temporal and spatial distancing” (Young 1990: 302) that constitutes the mobile society.

Landcom

The second case study involves Landcom's recent agenda of building 'prestigious' master planned communities for the privileged citizenry. Landcom is the NSW Government's corporatised land development agency. It was originally established in 1976 to provide affordable housing for first home buyers on Sydney's urban fringe. As the extensive roll out of brick veneer cottages across Sydney's western suburbs prior to the 1990s suggests, Landcom was successful in achieving its goal of affordable housing provision through its land banking and release program.

Some 32 years later, low income and first home buyers are being squeezed by a crisis in affordable housing, and new housing on Sydney's fringe is marketed to higher income and second and third home buyers. Landcom (2007) now promotes itself as a leader in developing master planned communities - the quintessential vehicle for demonstrating privatism and moral citizenry.

The master planned community (MPC) is the latest manifestation of utopian place-making deriving from the Garden City movement of the late nineteenth century (Gwyther 2005). The MPC is underpinned by utopian expectations that the form of development can produce a better way of life, with particular notions of social status, civility and communalism the social objectives. At a more pragmatic level the MPC involves the adherence by residents to an initial set of developer and later resident determined social norms including notions of civic behaviour, home ownership, pride in one's house and in the estate, and most importantly, abiding by the estate's restrictive covenants and regulations.

The restrictive covenants along with identifying design features and social and physical infrastructure used to distinguish the estate, increase the cost of MPC housing (Gwyther 2005). The promotion of a 'community' privileging self reliance and privatism, along with the higher costs associated with this form of development, can be seen to have exclusionary tendencies. It is no surprise that this is the very quality which many residents of the MPC seek. This home-owning resident of the Garden Gates estate in Mount Annan encapsulates the sentiment:

I knew guys that lived in Mt Annan, but they were actually in housing commission ... That's the older section. But this Garden Gates estate is totally different. It's just new, fresh... I saw some potential for growth and gain. I'm not really class racist... I can get on with the guys down there with the little houses that are falling apart and the paint peeling off the walls and look a little bit grotty from time to time. But that's the way they live and we live differently. (Gwyther 2004: 264-5)

Interestingly, the original Mount Annan development to which this resident refers was built by Landcom under its original program of affordable housing provision. The planned 'infill' estate of Garden Gates was specifically designed and developed by Landcom to differentiate the newer area aesthetically, socially and economically from the adjoining lower income area (Gwyther 2004). The manifestation of community in Garden Gates is both a community of interest founded upon social, ontological and financial security and a site of the coalescence of social space and place.

Conclusion

In recent years there has been a palpable shift in government policy from instituting material solutions to socio-economic problems to social solutions. At issue here is the use of a sedentarist and idealised conception of community as the basis of social policy. The form of

idealised community discussed in the two cases implicitly preferences the notion of the ‘good citizen’: the self sufficient, meaningfully employed, home owning resident. It discounts, even dismisses accounts of community in public housing tract estates, no matter the depth of social ties and community affiliation present. Hence, the ‘politics of community’ continues the neo-liberal shift in responsibility for structural socio-economic issues away from governments to the individual.

More specifically, the notion of social exclusion underpinning social housing policies is infused with a moral underclass discourse which views exclusion as character failure (Arthurson 2004). Rather than creating *plastic* policies which attempt to attenuate if not resolve the complex structural issues underpinning social exclusion, the sedentarist policy of social mix is deployed. The hope here is that at best propinquity will encourage the underclass to acquire some of the characteristics of the ‘good citizen’, and at worst that dispersion will remove the problem from sight.

However, immersing stressed households within a sea of privilege and privatism where they have few or no social ties, little in common with other residents, and limited access to the mobility resources most of us take for granted is likely to heighten the sense of isolation, exclusion and stigma. Conversely, the policy of developing scarce land into enclaves of privilege and privatism intensifies the socio-economic differences between neighbourhoods and their residents. Neither is a model of a ‘balanced community’, no matter how hopeful the intention.

References:

- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: A Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (London, Verso)
- Anderson, P. & Davey, K. (1995) Tough on Crime: An Interview with Amitai Etzioni, *Statesman and Society*, p21, 3 March,
- Arthurson, K. (2004) From Stigma to Demolition: Australian Debates about Housing and Exclusion, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19, 255-270.
- Arthurson, K. (2005) Social Mix and the Cities, *Urban Policy and Research*, 23 (4), 519-523.
- Bauman, Z. (2001) *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, (Cambridge, Polity Press)
- Blair, T. (1998) *The Third Way: New Politics for the New Century*, (London, Fabian Society)
- Cass, N., Shove, E. & Urry, J. (2005) Social Exclusion, Mobility and Access, *The Sociological Review*, 53 (3), 539-555.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press)
- Durkheim, E. (1949) *The Division of Labour in Society*, (New York, Free Press. First Published in 1893)
- Eastwood, N. (2006) *Gordon Estate*, Living Black SBS TV, 17 May, Australia, 17 May 2006)
- Etzioni, A. (1996) The Responsive Community: A Communitarian Perspective: 1995 Presidential Address, *American Sociological Review*, 61 (1), 1-11.
- Everingham, C. (2003) *Social Justice and the Politics of Community*, (Aldershot, Ashgate)
- Fine, B. (2001) *Social Capital Versus Social Theory: Political Economy and Social Science at the turn of the Millennium*, (London, Routledge)
- Forrest, R. & Kearns, A. (2001) Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38 (12), 2125-2143.
- Frankenberg, R. (1966) *Communities in Britain: Social Life in Town and Country*, (Harmondsworth, Penguin)
- Fried, M. (1963) Grieving for a Lost Home. in Duhl, L. J. (Ed.) *The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis*, (New York, Simon Schuster).
- Gans, H. J. (1961) The Balanced Community : Homogeneity or Heterogeneity in Residential Areas? , *American Institute of Planners Journal*, 27 (3), 176-184.
- Gans, H. J. (1972) *People and Plans: Essays on Urban Problems and Solutions*, (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books)

- Gwyther, G. (2004) *Paradise Planned: Community Formation and the Master Planned Estate* (Penrith, University of Western Sydney, Unpublished PhD thesis at <http://library.uws.edu.au/adt-NUWS/public/adt-NUWS20051214.111331/>)
- Gwyther, G. (2005) Paradise Planned: Community Formation and the Master Planned Estate, *Urban Policy and Research*, 23 (1), 57-72.
- Hall, E. (2006) *NSW Government to Move Gordon Estate Population*, The World Today (ABC Radio National, Australia,
- Henderson, P. & Salmon, H. (1998) *Local Governance, Communitarianism and Community Development*, (London, Community Development Foundation)
- Housing NSW (2007) *Gordon Estate Master Plan*, (N. S. W. Department of Housing).
- Landcom (2007) People, Places. www.landcom.com.au Accessed 27 February 2007).
- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, (Oxford, Blackwell)
- Levitas, R. (2004) Let's Hear it for Humpty: Social Exclusion, the Third Way and Cultural Capital, *Cultural Trends*, 13 (2), 41-56.
- Lilley, D. (2005) Evaluating the 'Community Renewal' Response to Social Exclusion on Public Housing Estates, *Australian Planner*, 42 (2), 59-65.
- Lyons, M. (2000) Non-profit Organisations, Social Capital and Social Policy in Australia. in Winter, I. (Ed.) *Social Capital and Public Policy in Australia*, (Melbourne, Australian Institute of Family Studies).
- Mason, A. (2000) *Community, Solidarity and Belonging: Levels of Community and Their Normative Significance*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
- McClure, P. (2000) *Participation Support for a More Equitable Society: The final report of the Federal Government's expert Reference Group on Welfare Reform*.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L. & Cook, J. M. (2001) Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 451-444.
- Minto Resident Action Group (2005) *Leaving Minto: A Study of the Social and Economic Impacts of Public Housing Estate Redevelopment*. Minto RAG and SJSC Research Centre).
- Mowbray, M. (2005) Community Capacity Building or State Opportunism, *Community Development Journal*, 40 (3), 255-264.
- NSW Legislative Assembly Hansard (2006) *Andrew Stoner on the Department of Housing Gordon Estate, Dubbo, Redevelopment*, (Parliament of New South Wales).
- Productivity Commission (2003) *Social Capital: Reviewing the Concept and its Policy Implications*.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, (New York, Simon and Schuster)

- Sarkissian, W. (1976) The Idea of Social Mix in Town Planning: An Historical Review, *Urban Studies*, 13, 231-246.
- Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006) The New Mobilities Paradigm, *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 207-226.
- Spies-Butcher, B. (2002) Tracing the Rational Choice Origins of Social Capital: Is Social Capital a Neo-Liberal 'Trojan Horse'?, *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 37 (2), 173-192.
- Tilley, T. (2007) *Community Breakdown: Breaking Down the Gordon Estate in Dubbo*, Street Stories (Radio National, Australia, 1 April 2007)
- Tsai, Y.-m. & Sigleman, L. (1982) The Community Question: A Perspective from National Survey Data - the case of the USA, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 33 (4), 579-587.
- Webber, M. M. (1963) Order in Diversity: Community Without Propinquity'. in Jr, L. W. (Ed.) *Cities and Space: The Future Use of Urban Land*, (Baltimore, John Hopkins Press).
- Wellman, B. (1979) The Community Question: The Intimate Networks of East Yorkers, *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (5), 1201-1231.
- Wellman, B. (1999) The Network Community: An Introduction. in Wellman, B. (Ed.) *Networks in the Global Village*, (Colorado, Westview Press).
- Woods Bagot (2006) *Minto Renewal Development Control Plan: 26th of April 2006*.
- Young, I. M. (1990) The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference. in Nicholson, L. J. (Ed.) *Feminism / Postmodernism*, (New York, Routledge).
- Young, M. & Willmott, P. (1962) *Family and Kinship in East London*, (Harmondsworth, Penguin)