



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Citation:

Andrews, A (2018) Multiple Deprivation, the Inner City, and the Fracturing of the Welfare State: Glasgow, c. 1968–78. *Twentieth Century British History*, 29 (4). pp. 605-624. ISSN 0955-2359 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/tcbh/hwy010>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/5859/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Multiple deprivation, the inner city, and the fracturing of the welfare state: Glasgow, c. 1968-78

Andrews, A.

Abstract

From 1968, central government established a series of area-based initiatives which operated on the basis of 'positive discrimination' towards the social needs of local residents. Over the course of the next ten years, this area-based positive discrimination became an increasingly important part of social policy in Britain. This article uses Glasgow as a case study to show, firstly, how both local and central government attempted to define the problem of 'multiple deprivation' in the 1970s. Secondly, it shows how social studies were used to locate multiply deprived communities within urban areas, thereby feeding into the identification of the 'inner city' as a policy problem. Finally, this article shows how evidence of the concentration of multiple deprivation and the adoption of area-based strategies contributed to the fracturing of the welfare state, eroding the universalist principles upon which post-war social policy had been based.

Introduction

The 1970s were a period of fundamental challenge for the British welfare state.¹ A succession of economic and fiscal crises over the decade led to cost-cutting reforms, with the introduction of means-testing in particular contributing to the erosion of the universalist principles upon which the post-war 'welfare consensus' had been built.² Changes were also prompted by the perception that the welfare state had failed to effectively solve a raft of structural problems, sparking criticism from across the political spectrum.³ But as this article shows, changing definitions of social need were also critical in reshaping the welfare state in 1970s Britain. In particular, the emergence of 'multiple deprivation' as a category within social policy, linked to the identification

¹ The welfare state is rather broadly defined within this article as 'a society in which government is expected to ensure the provision for all its citizens of not only social security but also a range of other services – including health, education and housing – at a standard well above the barest minimum'; see Rodney Lowe, *The welfare state in Britain since 1945* (Basingstoke, 2nd ed., 1999), 14.

² On the decline of the 'welfare state consensus' over this period, see Lowe, *The welfare state in Britain since 1945*, 305-20; Derek Fraser, *The evolution of the British welfare state* (London, 5th ed., 2017), 269-85.

³ Lowe, *The welfare state in Britain since 1945*, 305-7.

of the 'inner city' as the locus of urban problems, contributed to the increasing fracturing of the welfare state during the decade. By fracturing, I mean the seemingly ever greater focus of social policy on small, predominantly urban neighbourhoods driven by evidence of the concentration of multiple deprivation.⁴ Therefore, while there had always been, as Guy Ortolano has noted, a 'spatial dimension' to the welfare state, developments in the 1970s led to a fundamental shift in what we might loosely term its spatial practice.⁵ This spatial practice reshaped social policy in Britain, contributing to the erosion of foundational universalist principles as outlined by William Beveridge. This was part of a much wider process encompassing the multifarious 'crises' of the 1970s.⁶ To echo Daniel Rodgers's observations of political discourses and ideas in the United States in the 1970s, 'the terms that has dominated post-World War II intellectual life had begun to fracture'.⁷ In the British case, we can see the fracturing of the welfare state as part of a much broader political and social shift in the 1970s which included the rise of 'popular individualism'.⁸

The emergence of the category of multiple deprivation – an often loosely defined concept which refers to the existence of additional deprivations in addition to material poverty – was the result of long-term shifts in definitions of and explanations for social need. From the late nineteenth century, a prevailing explanation for poverty had been based on eugenicist claims that there existed a social 'residuum' or 'underclass'.⁹ Within this explanation, particular urban spaces, especially the 'slums', were pathologized.¹⁰ While this explanation persisted, in the second half of the twentieth century, psychological explanations for the continued existence of poverty in the

⁴ Peter Matthews, 'From area-based initiatives to strategic partnerships: have we lost the meaning of regeneration?' *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 30 (2012), 147-61.

⁵ Guy Ortolano, *Thatcher's Progress* (Cambridge, 2018 forthcoming). I am grateful to Guy Ortolano for allowing me to read and cite his work.

⁶ Lawrence Black, Hugh Pemberton and Pat Thane (eds), *Reassessing 1970s Britain* (Manchester, 2013).

⁷ Daniel Rodgers, *The age of fracture* (Cambridge, MA, 2011), 5.

⁸ Emily Robinson, Camilla Schofield, Florence Sutcliffe-Braithwaite and Natalie Thomlinson, 'Telling stories about post-war Britain: popular individualism and the "crisis" of the 1970s', *Twentieth Century British History* 28 (2017), 268-304.

⁹ John Welshman, *Underclass: a history of the excluded, 1880-2000* (London, 2006), 1-20.

¹⁰ For example, see James Donald, *Imagining the modern city* (Minneapolis, MN, 1999), 31. Also see Alan Mayne, *The imagined slum: newspaper representation in three cities, 1870-1914* (Leicester, 1993); Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: a study in the relationship between classes in Victorian society* (London, 4th edition, 2013).

'affluent society' began to emerge. As Selina Todd has argued, this approach emphasized the apparent 'lack of adjustment' of working-class mothers among other factors and accounted for the persistence of the 'problem family' in the post-war 'affluent society'.¹¹ In the 1960s, however, explanations of social need expanded to reflect the accumulating evidence that poverty had not disappeared and was in fact growing.¹² Following the 'rediscovery of poverty', therefore, explanations began to focus on the ways in which particular groups – the elderly, large families and the long-term sick – had been left behind by the affluent society.¹³ From creation of the Child Poverty Action Group in 1965 and the BBC's 'Wednesday Play' *Cathy Come Home* (1966) to successive government reports on children and young persons, housing, primary school education, and social services, the rediscovery of poverty gradually broadened conceptions beyond narrow material issues.¹⁴ These studies acknowledged that poverty 'essentially... refers to a variety of conditions and not simply a financial condition' which were located through statistics on material living standards.¹⁵ At the same time, academic sociologists adopted the term 'deprivation' to refer to this variety of conditions rather than poverty. The idea that there was a 'cycle of deprivation' caused much debate in the 1970s and 1980s over the question of whether

¹¹ Selina Todd, 'Family welfare and social work in post-war England, c. 1948-c.1970', *English Historical Review* Vol. CXXIX, no. 537 (2014), 362-87. Also see, Welshman, *Underclass*, 67-86; John Welshman, 'Ideology, social science, and public policy: the debate over transmitted deprivation', *Twentieth Century British History*, 16 (2005), 306-41; and John Welshman 'From the cycle of deprivation to troubled families: ethnicity and the underclass concept' in Catherine Cox & Hilary Marland (eds), *Migration, health and ethnicity in the modern world* (Basingstoke, 2013), 174-94. However, these explanations were not generally accepted by many social workers who often preferred to take a 'pragmatic' approach on the cases to which they were referred; see Todd, 'Family welfare and social work', 372-73.

¹² Rodney Lowe, 'The rediscovery of poverty and the creation of the Child Poverty Action Group, 1962-68', *Contemporary Record*, 9 (1995), 602-11.

¹³ Brian Abel-Smith and Peter Townsend, *The poor and the poorest: a new analysis of the Ministry of Labour's Family Expenditure Surveys of 1953-54 and 1960* (London, 1965), 57-67; Ken Coates and Richard Silburn, *Poverty: the forgotten Englishmen* (Nottingham, 4th ed., 1983; first published 1970).

¹⁴ Cmnd. 1191, *Report of the committee on children and young persons* (London, 1960); Cmnd. 2605, *Report of the committee on housing in Greater London* (London, 1965); Central Advisory Council for England, *Children and their primary schools: a report* (London, 1967); and Cmnd. 3703, *Report of the committee on local authority and allied personal social services* (London, 1968).

¹⁵ Abel-Smith and Townsend, *Poor and the poorest*, 63.

deprivation was 'transmitted' from parents to their children.¹⁶ This idea, John Welshman has argued, continued to influence central government policymaking into the twenty-first century.¹⁷ There were other competing understandings of deprivation, however. As this article shows, the concept of 'multiple deprivation' within social science and social policy referred to a condition in which individuals or households experienced numerous, interconnected hardships.¹⁸ These interconnections occurred within households concentrated in deprived neighbourhoods.

As this brief survey of changing explanations for poverty and deprivation indicates, sociological studies were critical in developing new understandings of social need.¹⁹ However, these explanations were not neatly and successively replaced. Rather, they often co-existed, competed with, and even complemented one another. Thus, while behaviour remained a key part of the emerging concept of multiple deprivation, it was increasingly seen as the result of structural and spatialized inequality, rather than individual psychology. Similarly, while the pathologization of urban districts was a marked feature of nineteenth-century poverty discourses, the link between poverty and place persisted.²⁰ In the 1960s these were the twilight areas which had continued to decay while being largely untouched by slum clearance programmes.²¹ From the 1970s, the 'inner city' became the locus of concern.²² The term inner city had been coined in the United States in the 1960s, entering the lexicon of British urban policy over the next decade.²³ This transatlantic exchange of ideas therefore led to the inner city being

¹⁶ Welshman, *Underclass*, 107.

¹⁷ Welshman, *Underclass*, 107-26.

¹⁸ 'Deprivation' in John Scott and Gordon Marshall, *A Dictionary of Sociology* (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1998), 152-3.

¹⁹ In fact, the growth of sociology at the time was important in shaping contemporary understanding of social change in Britain more generally; see Mike Savage, *Identities and social change in Britain since 1940: the politics of method* (Oxford, 2010).

²⁰ Susan MacGregor and Ben Pimlott (eds), *Tackling the inner cities: the 1980s reviewed, prospects for the 1990s* (Oxford, 1990), 1-21.

²¹ Alison Ravetz, *The government of space: town planning in modern society* (London, 1986), 85.

²² Otto Saumarez Smith, 'The inner city crisis and the end of urban modernism in 1970s Britain', *Twentieth Century British History*, 27 (2016), 578-98.

²³ The phrase 'inner city' has its origins in the United States in the mid-1960s where it had been applied to, predominantly black, inner areas of US cities, especially following the Watts riots in Los Angeles, California, in 1965. The phrase came to be applied to British cities after social scientists and politicians noted similarities in the experiences of British and US cities; for example see R. M. Kirwan, *The inner city in the*

conceived as a euphemism for race in political discourses.²⁴ The term has also been seen as synonymous for the urban poor.²⁵ Thus, while the narrative construction of the 'inner city' remains problematic, by focusing on inner urban areas as the spatial locus of multiple deprivation through a process of 'residualization' – the concentration of poorer households within a particular tenure of housing – their real significance becomes clear.²⁶ As evidence of the concentration of multiple deprivation within these areas grew during the 1970s, they became the emphasis for central and local government attention. Over the course of the decade then, social policy progressively focused on these areas and, as a result, the universalist principles upon the welfare state had been founded increasingly fragmented.

This article uses Glasgow to follow the emergence of the category of 'multiple deprivation' in social policy in 1970s Britain.²⁷ The case of Glasgow is important, not least because the city was identified within the national print media as a paragon of poverty.²⁸ But the city also formed

United States (London, 1980); and Peter Hall (ed.), *The inner city in context* (London, 1981), especially chapters 4 and 5.

²⁴ Joan Higgins, Nicholas Deakin, John Edwards and Malcolm Wicks, *Government and urban poverty: inside the policy making process* (Oxford, 1983), 190, as quoted in Daisy Payling, "Socialist Republic of South Yorkshire": grassroots activism and left-wing solidarity in 1980s Sheffield', *Twentieth Century British History*, 25 (2014), 622.

²⁵ Colin Ward, *Welcome, thinner city: urban survival in the 1990s* (London, 1989), 4. The 'thinner city' to which Ward was referring denoted inner urban areas which had lost a significant proportion of their population through government policies of decentralization. This 'thinning out' meant that 'the problems of urban decay and regeneration are problems for the poor minority of city dwellers who get left out of policy decisions'.

²⁶ Ben Jones, 'Slum clearance, privatization and residualization: the practices and politics of council housing in mid-twentieth-century England', *Twentieth Century British History* 21 (2010), 510-39.

²⁷ A similar process occurred within other cities; one prominent example includes the Liverpool Social Area Study, undertaken by the Centre for Environmental Studies on behalf of the Liverpool Inner Area Study consultants and Liverpool District Council: see D. Cullingford, P. Flynn and R. Webber, *Liverpool social area analysis: interim report* (1975); and R. J. Webber, *Liverpool social area study, 1971 data: final report* (1975). This shift towards a spatialized understanding was cemented in Cmnd. 6845. *Policy for the inner cities* (London, 1977) and the Inner Urban Areas Act (1978), but largely began with the establishment of the urban programme in 1968.

²⁸ For example, see 'The Glasgow ghetto', *Economist* (19 April 1975), 18; and Ronald Faux, 'Home is where the hell is', *The Times* (24 February 1982), 8.

the basis of urban and social policy in Scotland and the United Kingdom more generally. While the concept of multiple deprivation was significant in itself for redefining explanations of social need, its importance was also reflected in the emergence of the 'inner city' as the locus of urban deprivation, and the consequent turn towards area-based positive discrimination within social policy. The first section of this article therefore focuses on national social studies and area-based policy initiatives to show how the emerging category of multiple deprivation was initially conceptualized by central government. The second turns to local government social studies, highlighting the importance of space within contemporary understandings of multiple deprivation. The final section builds on this analysis to demonstrate how the emergence of multiple deprivation, primarily located within the 'inner city', led to the fracturing of the welfare state over the course of the 1970s through the increased targeting of government spending.

Defining Multiple Deprivation, 1968-75

From the late 1960s, a series of national social studies and area-based policy initiatives began to adopt and more clearly define the concept of multiple deprivation in order to 'to channel resources to areas of social deprivation'.²⁹ On 22 July 1968, the Labour Home Secretary James Callaghan announced the establishment of the Urban Programme, an *ad hoc* system of urban aid intended to provide assistance to struggling communities.³⁰ The creation of the Urban Programme at a time of strained 'community relations' lent the policy an inherently racialized character.³¹ In his announcement, however, Callaghan articulated broader social and spatial aims for the programme:

[T]here remain areas of severe social deprivation in a number of our cities and towns—often scattered in relatively small pockets. They require special help

²⁹ This project was the largest in Europe; see Glasgow City Archives, Mitchell Library, Glasgow (GCA): SR1/3/7, Urban Deprivation, 1976, p. 47.

³⁰ See John Edwards and Richard Bately, *The politics of positive discrimination: an evaluation of the urban programme 1967-77* (London, 1978).

³¹ In a debate in the House of Commons, the urban programme was linked to race relations legislation; see *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 768, 16 July 1968, 1246-7.

to meet their social needs and to bring their physical services to an adequate level.³²

To alleviate these issues, the Urban Programme established a system of area-based positive discrimination which highlighted the centrality of the category of multiple deprivation in identifying 'social needs'. As such, the interdepartmental circular which formally established the Urban Programme defined 'urban areas of special need' as those

which bear the marks of multiple deprivation, which may show itself, for example, by way of notable deficiencies in the physical environment, particularly in housing; overcrowding of houses; family sizes above the average; persistent unemployment; a high proportion of children in trouble or in need of care; or a combination of these. A substantial degree of immigrant settlement would also be an important factor, though not the only factor in determining the existence of special social need.³³

The establishment of the Urban Programme marked the intersection between race – defined almost exclusively by immigration – and socio-economic status in political conceptions of multiple deprivation. Within this definition, then, race was not necessarily the principal marker of disadvantage, but one of many.

While the category of multiple deprivation within central government policy remained loosely defined, social studies continued to investigate the causes and effects of material deprivation. These built on the findings of the reports which had formed the basis of the rediscovery of poverty in the 1960s. For example, the 1967 report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, published as *Children and their Primary Schools* but popularly known as the Plowden report after the council's chair, Lady Bridget Plowden, linked deprivation to education and childhood development. The Plowden report led to the establishment of five Educational Priority Areas (EPAs) in Birmingham, Liverpool, London, the West Riding of Yorkshire, and

³² *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 769, 22 July 1968, 40.

³³ Joint Circular from the Home Office (225/68), Department of Education and Science (19/68), Ministry of Health (35/68), *Urban Programme* (London, 1968), 1.

Dundee in 1968.³⁴ The EPAs were a pioneering example of targeting state resources to small, deprived urban areas. The intellectual legacy of the Plowden report was continued in 1973 with the publication of the third follow-up survey of the 1958 National Child Development Study (NCDS). Published under the title *Born to Fail?*, the third NCDS survey was cited by policy-makers in Glasgow as having been critical in shaping the definition of multiple deprivation in the city.³⁵ The study was based on 10,504 of the 17,204 children born in the week of 3-9 March 1958 and highlighted the 'striking differences in the lives of British children'.³⁶ Using data collected in 1969, when the children had reached the age of 11, the survey focussed on questions of 'social disadvantage', an evolution of the study's original focus on perinatal death. As John Welshman has shown, the changing focus of the NCDS reflected contemporary social policy priorities owing to the need to acquire funding for each stage of the project.³⁷ By the early 1970s the focus on the supposed 'cycle of deprivation' within the Departments of Education and Science and Health and Social Security, largely driven by the Conservative minister Keith Joseph, was critical in the third follow-up survey being granted funding.³⁸

The influence of *Born to Fail?* in Glasgow was reflected through its evocative findings which highlighted the extent and effects of deprivation on children in Scotland. Unlike other reports compiled in the 1970s, the NCDS did not identify specific areas of deprivation as it was more concerned with the condition of children in general rather than particular social spaces.³⁹ Nevertheless, the NCDS did point to some important national and regional disparities, declaring that:

³⁴ The Plowden report itself focused on England, and the Dundee EPA was an additional project funded separately by the Scottish Office. For more on the Plowden report, see Peter Shapely, *Deprivation, state interventions and urban communities in Britain, 1968-79* (Abingdon, 2018), 118-24.

³⁵ The NCDS was cited as a major influence on local government understandings of deprivation in in GCA: SR3/81/1/2, Note to I. M. Stuart: Strathclyde Regional Council's Deprivation Policies, 3 December 1980, 1.

³⁶ Peter Wedge & Hilary Prosser, *Born to Fail?* (London, 1973).

³⁷ John Welshman, 'Time, money and social science: the British Birth Cohort Surveys of 1946 and 1958', *Social History of Medicine*, 25 (2011), 175-92.

³⁸ Welshman, 'Time, money and social science', 188.

³⁹ Though, inner urban areas were problematized through the lack of access to 'parks, fields or recreation grounds'. See Wedge & Prosser, *Born to fail?*, 29.

One child in 16 was the proportion of disadvantaged of all children in Britain, but in individual regions the prevalence varied. In Southern England there was only one in 47 children. In Wales and in Northern England, on the other hand there was one in every 12.

But the most disturbing proportion was found in Scotland, where one in every 10 children was disadvantaged.

*11% of the eleven-year-old British children lived in Scotland, but 19% of disadvantaged children were found there.*⁴⁰

The emphasis on deprivation in Scotland, italicized in the original report, was significant. Strathclyde, the region in which Glasgow was administratively placed following local government reorganization in 1974, contained half of the population of Scotland, the majority of whom lived in Glasgow.⁴¹ Scotland's deprivation problem was Glasgow's deprivation problem and *vice versa*.

'Disadvantage', the term used to denote childhood deprivation within the NCDS, was manifested throughout the short lives of the study's participants. Even before birth, disadvantaged children were vulnerable, the health of a pregnancy potentially compromised by the age of expectant mothers, who had already had a number of pregnancies, and continued to smoke heavily throughout.⁴² After birth, the effects of deprivation on the body continued, with disadvantaged children found to be shorter on average than 'ordinary' children, and more likely to receive a burn, scald or serious flesh wound.⁴³ They were more likely to be absent from school for long periods, and experienced a higher incidence of what was, at the time, called educational 'subnormality'.⁴⁴ The conditions which the NCDS identified were akin to the problems with which authorities in Glasgow had long been concerned, especially population density. The town plans of the 1940s had set out to clear the densely-populated slum areas of the city, re-housing residents in overspill areas and new towns, as well as high- and low-rise housing developments

⁴⁰ Wedge & Prosser, *Born to fail?*, 17.

⁴¹ GCA: SR1/2/8, Strathclyde Regional Report, 1976, introduction, para. 1.

⁴² Wedge & Prosser, *Born to fail?*, 22; no mention was made of other behaviours such as drinking while pregnant.

⁴³ Wedge & Prosser, *Born to fail?*, 39-42.

⁴⁴ Wedge & Prosser, *Born to fail?*, 40-43.

within the city itself.⁴⁵ Later reports, including the Springburn Study of 1967 and Pearl Jephcott's *Homes in High Flats*, published in 1971, identified a number of problems associated with living at high densities.⁴⁶ Adding to this developing social expertise, the NCDS highlighted overcrowding within the home, a problem expressed through the number of children required to share not just a room, but a bed. While elsewhere the issue of bed sharing was linked to the possibility of sexual assault, the problem of domestic density was articulated in *Born to Fail?* through bed-wetting.⁴⁷ Not only were children from impoverished households found to be more likely to wet the bed, it was stated that 'some of the "dry" disadvantaged would also be found to be sleeping in a wet bed'.⁴⁸ Clearly, evidence of the effects of deprivation on children – on everything from education to health and the body – provided an evocative account of the plight of the disadvantaged. For local authority politicians and policymakers, however, it was the scale of this plight across Glasgow which drove later efforts to intervene in and improve the lives of urban residents.⁴⁹

While the NCDS highlighted the effects of deprivation on childhood development, central government began to use census data to quantify and qualify measures of multiple deprivation for the urban population more broadly. Through these statistical studies, the recently-established Department of the Environment (DoE) sought to understand how different indicators of deprivation interacted within particular urban areas. Over the course of 1974 and 1975, the DoE released a series of thirteen reports known as the Census Indicators of Urban Deprivation (CIUD).⁵⁰ Based on data from the 1971 census, the reports attempted to identify 'the geographical distribution of "worst areas" on the basis of individual variables' and to discover any 'overlap'

⁴⁵ See Robert Bruce, *First planning report to the Highways and Planning Committee* (Glasgow, 1945); Robert Bruce, *Second planning report to the Highways and Planning Committee* (Glasgow, 1946); Patrick Abercrombie & Robert Matthew, *Clyde Valley Regional Plan 1946* (Edinburgh, 1949).

⁴⁶ See GCA: D-AP 1/10, Springburn Study, para. 5.37; and Pearl Jephcott and Hilary Robinson, *Homes in High Flats: some of the human problems involved in multi-storey housing* (Edinburgh, 1971), 126-48.

⁴⁷ This included sexual assault by both adults and other children sleeping in the same bed; see Leif Jerram, *Streetlife: the untold story of Europe's twentieth century* (Oxford, 2011), 321.

⁴⁸ Wedge & Posser, *Born to Fail?* 26.

⁴⁹ GCA: SR3/81/1/2, Note to I. M. Stuart: Strathclyde Regional Council's Deprivation Policies, 3 December 1980, 1.

⁵⁰ Though one of these reports did cover rural areas; see Department of the Environment, *Census Indicators of Urban Deprivation: Working Note 12 (CIUD 12), the rural districts of England and Wales* (London, 1974).

between these areas.⁵¹ This information was then to inform political decisions regarding the siting of area-based interventions. The enumeration districts used in the census formed the basis for a spatial analysis of deprivation, and led to the categorization of small areas of Britain's cities as more or less deprived based on the prevalence of, for example, access to hot water, car ownership, or the number of New Commonwealth migrants.⁵² In a comparison between the conurbations of Great Britain, Clydeside (Glasgow and its contiguous urban area), Tyneside, and Merseyside evidenced the highest levels of deprivation.⁵³ However, the nature of this deprivation differed from one conurbation to another, with the report finding that Clydeside was 'worst' in terms of housing and unemployment.⁵⁴

In addition to pointing towards the scale of deprivation within urban local authority areas, the CIUD reports demonstrated the way in which different and at times disparate indicators interacted with one another. The CIUD therefore adopted a working definition of deprivation which, though based almost exclusively on data which was available in the census, was founded in a concern for what was termed 'a low level of material welfare enjoyed by individuals'.⁵⁵ As such, indicators of urban deprivation were categorized into several broad groups: housing, employment, education, assets, socioeconomic structure, 'special needs', housing tenure, and residential mobility. The category of special needs included

demographic variables, such as the proportion of the population aged 0-14, which on their own are not indicative of the presence of deprived people, but which, when occurring in areas where incomes are low and housing conditions are bad, may be factors that aggravate the condition of deprivation.⁵⁶

While we can therefore see in this study an attempt by central government to understand, through the investigation of demographic and social statistics, the interaction between a number

⁵¹ Department of the Environment, *Census Indicators of Urban Deprivation: Working Note 1 (CIUD 1)*, 1971 *Census: Extraction of Indicators of Urban Deprivation* (London, 1974), 2.

⁵² See DoE, *CIUD 1*.

⁵³ DoE, *Census indicators of urban deprivation: working note 10 (CIUD 10)*, *The conurbations of Great Britain* (London, 1975), 5.

⁵⁴ DoE, *CIUD 10*, 4.

⁵⁵ DoE, *Census indicators of urban deprivation: working note 6 (CIUD 6)*, *Great Britain* (London, 1975), 1.

⁵⁶ DoE, *CIUD 6*, 2.

of different indicators of deprivation, there were limitations. These limitations were reflected in the census itself. Thus, while the CIUD reports acknowledged that the interaction of indicators of deprivation 'aggravate' people's living conditions, the 'lack of suitable cross-tabulations in the Census' meant that it was not possible to locate 'multiple deprivation' using their methodology.⁵⁷ Local authority planners in Glasgow cited the CIUD, along with *Born to Fail?*, as a major influence on their subsequent efforts to identify and locate multiply deprived households and neighbourhoods in the city and wider region.⁵⁸ While the Department of the Environment's study therefore marked a crucial step in defining multiple deprivation as the interaction and aggravation of a number of different demographic and social indicators, local government increasingly took on the role of locating these households within their own boundaries.

Locating Multiple Deprivation, 1976-77

From the early 1970s, the local authorities in Glasgow began to identify specific 'areas of need' in the city through a series of social studies.⁵⁹ These studies provided the basis for local government action in addressing urban problems, using census data to compare the position of Glasgow with other British cities, and comparing conditions within the city itself. As a 1972 review of the city's development plan found, compared with other British cities, Glasgow 'has serious deficiencies', and 'Even within the city's standards [sic] the social, economic and environmental conditions show 13,000 acres to be areas of serious multiple deprivation'.⁶⁰ These studies were instrumental in refining the definition of multiple deprivation and locating it, primarily, within inner urban areas. Another influential report was the West Central Scotland Study (WCSS), commissioned in 1971 to guide a new plan for the region.⁶¹ Along with the inner area studies in England and a

⁵⁷ DoE, *CIUD* 6, 9.

⁵⁸ GCA: SR3/81/1/2, Note to I. M. Stuart: Strathclyde Regional Council's Deprivation Policies, 3 December 1980, 1.

⁵⁹ See R. D. Mansley, *Areas of need in Glasgow: second review of the development plan* (Glasgow, 1972); Strathclyde Regional Council, *Areas of need – the next step* (Glasgow, 1977).

⁶⁰ Mansley, *Areas of need in Glasgow*, 10.

⁶¹ The WCSS encompassed a series of reports compiled by the agencies involved in the West Central Scotland Plan Steering Committee, under the directorship of Urlan Wannop of the University of Strathclyde. These agencies included representatives from the local authorities covered by the proposed plan, the Scottish Office, and the planning consultancy firm Colin Buchanan & Partners. Kenneth Alexander, also of the University of Strathclyde, acted as economic planning consultant. The WCSS was intended to 'prepare and keep up-to-date an advisory, economic and physical plan for West Central Scotland' which was to serve

Belfast planning document, the WCSS fed directly into central government policy and ‘underlined the erosion of the inner area economy and the shortage of private investment which might assist the processes of regeneration’.⁶² To an extent, then, the inner city was an economic aberration. However, this economic ‘erosion’ was linked to other processes of social change.

Glasgow’s large-scale post-war slum clearance and house building programme was seen to have directly contributed to the concentration of multiple deprivation. While a 1974 draft of the report drew attention to ‘an impressive record of achievement [which] has meant an improved living standard and style of life, with a wider range of choice and opportunities’, it also acknowledged ‘another side to the coin’.⁶³ In this assessment, the ‘impressive record of achievement’ represented only a superficial success which masked other changes occurring in the city. As the WCSS explained:

Glasgow’s social and economic structure has also changed with the rapid decline in population. People with high incomes have been more easily able to move out of the city than those with low incomes.⁶⁴

On top of this voluntary migration away from the city, the study contended that slum clearance had seen many residents ‘trapped at a halfway stage’ in council estates towards the city’s outskirts, with still more people left in inner urban ‘slums’.⁶⁵ This understanding of the effects of population change was more complex than a narrative of ‘residualization’ would suggest.⁶⁶ As the

as the successor to Patrick Abercrombie and Robert Matthew’s *Clyde Valley Regional Plan* of 1946. For more on this, see R. J. Smith & Urlan Wannop, *Strategic planning in action: the impact of the Clyde Valley Regional Plan 1946-1982* (Aldershot, 1985). Also see Colin Buchanan & Partners, *West Central Scotland – a programme of action: consultative draft report* (Glasgow, 1974); copies of the seven supplementary reports (on the regional economy; urban growth and change; public expenditure; social issues; the environment; landscape; and air pollution) can be found in the British Library and National Library of Scotland.

⁶² *Policy for the inner cities*, 2 & 21. A report entitled *Belfast: areas of special social need*, likely produced by the local authority in that city, was also cited.

⁶³ Colin Buchanan & Partners, *West Central Scotland*, 1-2.

⁶⁴ Colin Buchanan & Partners, *West Central Scotland*, 12.

⁶⁵ West Central Scotland Study team, *West Central Scotland: supplementary report 4, social issues* (Glasgow, 1974), 7.

⁶⁶ Jones, ‘Slum clearance, privatization and residualization’, 510-39.

study indicated, the concentration of low-income households occurred within the context of population decline and a decaying physical environment.

By focusing on housing, the consultants identified a pattern of ‘concentric belts’ around the city centre, with deprivation more concentrated in the inner areas.⁶⁷ This pattern largely conformed to the concentric zone model popularized by the Chicago School of sociology from the 1920s,⁶⁸ although smaller areas of need were identified within these zones.⁶⁹ The findings of the WCSS can therefore be placed within a larger context of urban social expertise encompassing theoretical developments in Britain and the United States across the twentieth century.⁷⁰ But concerns were ultimately driven by social conditions within Britain’s cities as much as they were by transnational planning ideas. These social conditions were stark; as the report explained:

Many of the people living in these areas are poor, and many suffer from problems of poor housing, health and unemployment which, where they coincide, compound each other... While the benefits of redevelopment and improvement are shared to a greater or lesser extent by the whole community, the disadvantages in terms of uncertainty, personal finance loss, disruption and planning blight bear most heavily on the directly affected areas and their residents.⁷¹

The importance of locating multiple deprivation within the city was therefore shown through the way that the concentration was seen to compound the problem. It was within these areas that the effects of deprivation on urban residents were multiplied to create a sort of exponential hardship.

While the WCSS and associated plan were never implemented, their findings continued to be developed by the local authorities in Glasgow. Following local government reorganization in 1974, the newly-created Strathclyde Regional Council began to draft its statutorily-required Regional Plan. As part of the planning process, a Regional Report was submitted to the Secretary

⁶⁷ WCSS, *Supplementary report 4*, 13.

⁶⁸ See Ernest Burgess, ‘The growth of the city: an introduction to a research project’, in Robert Park, Ernest Burgess & Roderick McKenzie (eds), *The city* (Chicago, 1925), 47-62.

⁶⁹ WCSS, *Supplementary report 4*, 14-15.

⁷⁰ On transatlantic influences on the identification of the ‘inner city’ more broadly, see Mark Clapson, *Anglo-American crossroads: urban research and planning in Britain, 1940-2010* (London, 2014), 123-48.

⁷¹ Colin Buchanan & Partners, *West Central Scotland*, 128.

of State for Scotland setting out the problems faced by, and offering some solutions for, the region. Supported by three supplementary volumes on economic policy, development strategy, and urban deprivation, the Regional Report was credited with focusing local government attention on multiple deprivation across the region.⁷² The Regional Report identified 114 areas across the region in which deprivation was 'physically concentrated'; of these, 52 were located within Glasgow.⁷³ The regional council used this to identify what it termed 'areas of priority treatment', arguing that 'deprivation should be tackled by concentrating resources on a limited number of the worst areas most at risk'.⁷⁴ However, the analysis contained within the Regional Report showed a more complex geographical understanding of multiple deprivation than that contained within the WCSS, as indicated by the eschewing of a concentric zone model. This is significant for two reasons. Firstly, by focusing on those areas of priority treatment identified by the Regional Report, we can see how local government continued to use evidence accumulated through social studies to locate multiple deprivation within their jurisdiction. Secondly, this development highlights the extent to which, by 1976, the idea that deprivation could only be 'tackled' through area-based initiatives had come to dominate social policy.⁷⁵

Early in 1976, Strathclyde Regional Council established an Urban Deprivation Officer Group (UDOG) to further investigate multiple deprivation in Glasgow with the aim of reducing the number of areas of priority treatment.⁷⁶ This reduction in numbers did not reflect a reduction in need, but in resources as the regional council sought a way to best manage its available funding. '[A]fter some 12 months of anguished discussions', UDOG reported back to the council, identifying 45 areas of priority treatment, 24 of which were in Glasgow. In an August version of the report, these 45 areas were sorted into four groups. The groups indicated: i) areas in which projects (e.g. the Community Development Project in Paisley) were already in place; ii) those areas with the 'most severe symptoms of deprivation'; iii) 'areas at risk'; and iv) areas requiring 'early attention'.⁷⁷ However, by October, after the *Multiple Deprivation* report had been submitted to the

⁷² GCA: SR1/3/7, Urban Deprivation, 1976, foreword; GCA: SR3/81/1/2, Note to I. M. Stuart: Strathclyde Regional Council's Deprivation Policies, 3 December 1980, 1.

⁷³ GCA: SR1/2/8, Strathclyde Regional Report 1976, para. 4.4.

⁷⁴ GCA: SR1/2/8, Strathclyde Regional Report 1976, para. 13.2.

⁷⁵ Matthews, 'From area-based initiatives to strategic partnerships', 147-61.

⁷⁶ GCA: SR3/81/1/2, Ronald Young, Boosting people's confidence in themselves – lessons from the Strathclyde experience? March 1988.

⁷⁷ GCA: SR1/2/14, Multiple Deprivation: report from the Policy and Resources Seminar, 30 August 1976, 2.

Scottish Office, this graded system had changed. Instead, there were only two groups: those already receiving aid, and those which were not.⁷⁸ The significance of this shift was reflected in the emergence of the inner city as a primary focus for urban policy.

The development of a spatialized understanding of multiple deprivation had a number of important policy implications, including the foregrounding of area-based positive discrimination in national and local government policymaking. Prior to the publication of the October version of the report, the Scottish Office, along with the Glasgow District and Strathclyde Regional Councils, the Scottish Development Agency, and the Scottish Special Housing Association, had committed their resources to 'the East End project which affects several of the areas listed'.⁷⁹ This east end project, known as GEAR (Glasgow East Area Renewal), became the focus for government intervention in Glasgow's physical and social environment when it was announced in 1976.⁸⁰ Of the areas of which GEAR was composed, only Bridgeton-Dalmarnock was listed in group ii as an area with the 'most severe' levels of deprivation.⁸¹ Two further areas listed, Shettleton and Parkhead, were in the lower category of 'early attention'. Gallowgate and Tollcross, two other areas of the city covered by GEAR were not identified among the 45 areas for priority treatment. It is possible that the timing of the change meant that the majority of the GEAR area was listed as a priority, rather than just two out of six named areas. In prioritizing GEAR, the problems of the inner areas appear to have been set above those of other urban and suburban areas. But the change also reflected contemporary concerns over the prioritization of one struggling area against another.

Urban deprivation in Glasgow was described in terms reflecting contemporary anxieties about the city. The *Multiple Deprivation* report, for example, described how processes of urban change had given rise, within certain areas of the city, to a 'vicious circle of hopelessness'.⁸² This hopelessness was characterized by political alienation, delinquency, truancy, 'other problems of human behaviour' as well as material poverty, factors which were seen as both causes and effects

⁷⁸ National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh (NRS): DD28/36, Multiple Deprivation, October 1976, 3-4

⁷⁹ NRS: DD28/36, Multiple Deprivation, October 1976, 4.

⁸⁰ For a brief overview of GEAR see David Rich, 'The Glasgow Eastern Area Renewal scheme', *Geographical Review*, 71 (1981), 214-18.

⁸¹ GCA: SR1/2/14, Multiple Deprivation: report from the Policy and Resources Seminar, 30 August 1976, 3.

⁸² NRS: DD28/36, Multiple Deprivation, October 1976, 1.

of multiple deprivation.⁸³ To be deprived, then, was to be more than poor, as exemplified through the identification of material poverty as the first of many indicators of multiple deprivation.⁸⁴ To this, the *Multiple Deprivation* report added employment and housing problems as well as 'difficulties arising from the attitudes, nature and scale of provision of public services'.⁸⁵ Moreover, the report argued that there were distinct 'community problems'. These problems included a sense of hopelessness, dependence on outside agencies, and a lack of community leadership.⁸⁶ Some of these issues can be read as residents lacking agency, with the physical distance from government services translating into a more general distance from the agencies of power. This idea was articulated by Peter Walker, Secretary of State for the Environment from October 1970 to November 1972, in his writing on the inner city. In 1977, Walker described how urban activism was a middle-class (or affluent working-class) pursuit.⁸⁷ Thus, 'When some of our more depressed areas were affected by major schemes of reconstruction, or a road programme, few voices were heard'.⁸⁸ This idea of agency extended beyond disputes over road-building and into the ability of urban residents to access the services they needed.

While UDOG's principal task was locating multiple deprivation within a smaller number of areas, their attempt to identify these problem spaces illuminates what multiple deprivation actually *meant*, and highlighted the implications of this for social policy. As UDOG articulated in the *Multiple Deprivation* report, additional hardships were seen as having a multiplier effect:

[T]hese are interconnected problems and often mutually reinforcing strands of a larger complex problem... Because of these interconnections, the

⁸³ NRS: DD28/36, *Multiple Deprivation*, October 1976, 1.

⁸⁴ GCA: SR1/2/14, *Multiple Deprivation*, 30 August 1976, 5.

⁸⁵ GCA: SR1/2/14, *Multiple Deprivation*, 30 August 1976, 6.

⁸⁶ GCA: SR1/2/14, *Multiple Deprivation*, 30 August 1976, 6-7.

⁸⁷ Such urban activism has received much recent historiographical treatment; for an overview see Christopher Klemek, *The transatlantic collapse of urban renewal: postwar urbanism from New York to Berlin* (Chicago, 2012).

⁸⁸ Walker, *The ascent of Britain*, 127.

temptation to propose solutions to one strand without taking full account of repercussions across the board should, at all costs, be avoided.⁸⁹

It was therefore not enough to deal with each indicator as it appeared; in order to alleviate multiple deprivation, government agencies were forced to intervene in a number of ways at once. This understanding of multiple deprivation and the appropriate policy responses to it therefore underscored approaches centred on area-based positive discrimination.

The Fracturing of the Welfare State, 1976-78

Successive central and local government reports and social studies located multiple deprivation within the inner areas of Britain's cities. Over the course of the 1970s, this led the fracturing of the welfare state and the consequent erosion of universalism in social policy. Across Britain, from the establishment of the Urban Programme in 1968, social policy had increasingly been based on principles of area-based positive discrimination. This fracturing progressed over the next ten years, culminating in the central government White Paper *Policy for the Inner Cities* in 1977 and Inner Urban Areas Act of 1978. We can see the effects of the shift through the policies and initiatives adopted by central and local government to prioritize the needs of particular urban neighbourhoods. The significance of the shift was also revealed through discussions within local authorities in Glasgow on the efficacy of prioritizing small urban districts, potentially to the detriment of other, outlying neighbourhoods.

In 1976, with only a few houses built, the most recent of Scotland's new towns was cancelled and around £120 million in financial resources were re-directed to the east end of Glasgow.⁹⁰ The Secretary of State for Scotland, Bruce Millan, announced the decision to halt the construction of the new town at Stonehouse in May 1976.⁹¹ This was prompted, *inter alia*, by concerns over the effects of population decentralization in Glasgow, first outlined in the draft

⁸⁹ GCA: SR1/2/14, Multiple Deprivation, 30 August 1976, 4-5.

⁹⁰ Stonehouse was the sixth New Town designated in Scotland. As with Cumbernauld, East Kilbride, Glenrothes, Irvine and Livingstone, Stonehouse was intended to house the overspill population from Glasgow but was cancelled three years after its designation in 1973 with only a few houses built.

⁹¹ *Parliamentary Debates* (Commons), 911, 12 May 1976, 194.

West Central Scotland Plan in 1974.⁹² In particular, the effects of this depopulation on inner areas of the city were understood as having increased and geographically-concentrated social need. As a later brochure for the GEAR project stated:

Since 1961 the population of GEAR has declined by 61% from 115,000 to 45,000. The effect of this decline on the community and the vitality of the area has been dramatic, particularly as outward migration has tended to involve the younger and more able, leaving a high proportion of dependents – the unemployed, the handicapped, and the elderly. Dereliction in the Inner Area is present on a scale unmatched by any other inner-city area in Britain. Male unemployment exceeds 20% and a high percentage of households have low incomes.⁹³

As this brief description of social change in the area indicates, the effects of residualization in inner urban areas were seen to have been magnified by urban decay and economic decline as measured by falling employment. The decision to focus resources in this area was therefore prompted by the concentration of a number of problems linked to multiple deprivation.

The targeting of Glasgow's east end for additional investment was commended for its active intervention in an area of multiple deprivation. As an article published in *Roof*, the magazine of the housing charity, Shelter, claimed in July 1976, the east end of Glasgow contained 'The highest, although not the only' concentration of deprived households in the city.⁹⁴ This assertion was complemented, in the magazine, with evocative images of multiple deprivation in the city. With the heading 'The face of urban deprivation', the article included, among others, images of a child seated near a partially-demolished tenement building; a child's doll, the face of which had been removed, lying in rubble outside someone's house; and a poster asking people not to drop litter, ironically displayed on a wall marked by graffiti. While these photographs were important in terms of evoking a particular image of everyday life in the area, the article is significant in highlighting the benefits of the fracturing of the welfare state. For the author, 'the

⁹² The draft plan outlined a policy in which 'No further capacity should be planned in the new towns in and associated with West Central Scotland beyond the level of their present target populations'; see Colin Buchanan & Partners, *West Central Scotland*, 174.

⁹³ NRS: DD12/4077, *The future for GEAR: key issues and possible courses of action*, August 1978, 4.

⁹⁴ Peter Norman, '£120m for Glasgow's east end', *Roof: Shelter's housing magazine* (July 1976), 98-9.

project is an offer they can't refuse... At the cost of losing some control over areas for which they have statutory responsibility [the local authority] will receive a boost to accelerate progress there'.⁹⁵ Additionally, the author claimed that the investment 'should be seen as a chance for regional and district councils to tackle more effectively some of Glasgow's other black spots like Govan, Maryhill and Springburn'.⁹⁶ Concerns were espoused, however, by some within the local authority at the possible effect of prioritizing the east end.

Regional councillors in Glasgow questioned the increasing focus of government policy on small urban districts and neighbourhoods. This criticism was linked, firstly, to the supposed decline of regional policy, a key pillar of the post-war welfare system.⁹⁷ In February 1978, Strathclyde Regional Council's Economic and Industrial Development Committee (EIDC) noted with concern the 'tragic unemployment trend over the last few years'.⁹⁸ In its policy recommendations, the EIDC therefore requested that 'the Secretary of State for Scotland should urge the Government to confirm the high priority of the Development Areas and re-affirm their commitment to the principle of regional policy'.⁹⁹ In the same discussion, however, the councillors also sought clarification from the Scottish Secretary, asking whether 'some peripheral areas of Glasgow may be counted as "inner urban areas" with special social need for all purposes under the [Inner Urban Areas] Bill'.¹⁰⁰ To support their argument, the councillors claimed that 'successful redevelopment of the inner city would compound the problems in the peripheral areas'.¹⁰¹ That this suggestion was rebuffed demonstrates the extent to which, as this article has

⁹⁵ Norman, '£120m for Glasgow's east end', 98.

⁹⁶ Norman, '£120m for Glasgow's east end', 98.

⁹⁷ In a 1973 parliamentary review, regional policy had been described as 'empiricism run mad, a game of hit-and-miss, played with more enthusiasm than success' and its industrial incentives reduced over time and replaced by urban policy incentives; see Expenditure Committee, *Second report from the Expenditure Committee, session 1973-74: regional development incentives*, HC 85 (London, 1973), 72. Also see Robert Colls, *Identity of England* (Oxford, 2001), 323.

⁹⁸ GCA: SR1/1/3/8, Minutes of the SRC Economic and Industrial Development Committee, 16 February 1978, 203-4.

⁹⁹ GCA: SR1/1/3/8, Minutes of the SRC Economic and Industrial Development Committee, 16 February 1978, 204.

¹⁰⁰ GCA: SR1/1/3/8, Minutes of the SRC Economic and Industrial Development Committee, 16 February 1978, 206.

¹⁰¹ NRS: DD28/43, Note of the Secretary of State's meeting with Glasgow District Council, 3 February 1978.

shown, the 'inner city' was linked to a specific geographical location within an urban area. But the discussion also highlights the extent to which the area-based targeting of British social policy had reached by 1978, whereby urban districts which evidenced similar levels of multiple deprivation were seemingly in competition with each other over resources. As such, there was an imperative for local authorities to use the language of multiple deprivation, as well as statistical evidence of social problems, in framing their requests for additional financial resources. These requests were not always successful, as shown by the refusal to grant Glasgow's outer housing estates as 'inner urban areas'. Nevertheless, they indicate the extent to which universalism had been eroded in the 1970s as welfare state provision fractured into a series of area-based and targeted initiatives.

Conclusion

By the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of the welfare state in 1978, Derek Fraser argued, 'much of the Beveridge vision had either been distorted or eroded'.¹⁰² This was certainly true, with Fraser's assessment based primarily on the introduction of means-testing for certain benefits as well as the demise of full employment as a central tenet of economic and social policy. However, the distortion of the 'Beveridge vision' was also driven by political responses to the emergence of multiple deprivation as both a sociological category and a policy issue. As this article has shown, the accumulation of evidence of the concentration of multiple deprivation led to the targeting of funding on small, predominantly inner urban areas. In this, we can see how conceptual innovation, in the form of multiple deprivation, contributed to the development of the 'inner city' as both an imagined space and a policy problem. The welfare state was reconfigured in order to tackle this problem. Thus, while the categorization of multiple deprivation reflected political concerns surrounding particular urban communities, the key motivation was the alleviation of problems which were understood to compound the effects of material poverty. It is therefore somewhat ironic that the fracturing of the welfare state, and the erosion of universalism, was the result of a concerted effort by local and national policy-makers during the 1970s to improve services for those seen to be most in need.

The fracturing of the welfare state was part of a much larger political and social shift in 1970s Britain as the multifarious 'crises' during the decade led to the search for new policy solutions.¹⁰³ We can see multiple deprivation and the 'inner city' as the spatial dimension of this

¹⁰² Fraser, *Evolution of the British welfare state*, 285. The thirtieth anniversary claim is based on the date for the formal establishment of the National Health Service in 1948.

¹⁰³ Cf. Black, Pemberton and Thane (eds), *Reassessing 1970s Britain*.

shift. Stemming from the rediscovery of poverty in the 1960s, the accumulation of evidence of the persistence and concentration of social need led to the development of new, area-based strategies. Effectively, welfare provision was broken up, with urban areas vying for funding based on the incidence of social problems within particular neighbourhoods. This fragmentation shaped urban and social policy in the 1980s and beyond. Examples include the Urban Development Corporations, Enterprise Zones, and Housing Action Trusts in the 1980s, the City Challenge Partnerships of the 1990s, and the New Deal for Communities in the 2000s. Of course, the primary motivations and mechanisms for some of these later schemes were fundamentally different from the area-based initiatives established during the 1970s. However, it is possible to see certain landmark policy initiatives of Thatcher's first government, including the Enterprise Zones and Urban Development Corporations, as a continuation of the fracturing of the welfare state rather than a cause of it.