Introduction

Jason Annetts
Alex Law
Wallace McNeish
Gerry Mooney

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copy edited version of a chapter published in Understanding social welfare movements.

Details of the definitive published version and how to purchase it are available online at: https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/understanding-social-welfare-movements

Introduction

‘If you sow misery, you harvest anger’
Slogan of unemployed protesters, France 1998

‘Brush with direct action. Helps to prevent truth decay.’
Slogan of anti-capitalist protesters, Seattle 1999

‘Your actions are pointless if no one notices.’
Graffiti on wall, Dundee 2008

Just over a decade ago a new wave of international protest broke out on the streets of Seattle. Between 27 November and 3 December 1999 the world’s most powerful leaders were in Seattle to discuss global trade agreements under the auspices of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). It was a good place for them to get together to discuss how to organise global markets more profitably. After all, Seattle is home to the great brand success stories of the world we live in – Microsoft, Starbucks and Nike. It is also fairly remote from other North American cities, making a coordinated national or international protest difficult to organise. But something happened at Seattle that no one expected: the meeting of the most powerful people on the planet was abandoned in the teeth of resilient and determined demonstrations. In the event, WTO officials packed their bags to go home full of recrimination against each other that no deal on trade could be brokered. But mostly they fumed about the storm of resistance created by the protesters outside the Convention Center.

On the key intersections of Seattle’s streets thousands of protesters fought and recoiled from the acrid tear gas, percussion grenades and rubber bullets fired at them by armoured police units. Seattle resembled some terrifying science fiction scene, a Robocop-Darth Vader-Judge Dredd cliché come to life to wreak vengeance on the puny bodies of flesh and blood protesters.

Astonishingly, against ferocious levels of physical repression the demonstrators held firm. Anything from 60,000 to 80,000 people protested over these five days. The protests were remarkably organised and coordinated, including an impressive level of participation by local people (Charlton, 2000). Under extreme police provocation, perhaps the biggest surprise of Seattle was the unity displayed in action by many diverse groups, above all between direct action activists and the US trade union movement. Teamsters marched alongside Turtles.1 Many protesters were seasoned campaigners from past civil rights struggles, anti-war and anti-racism campaigns, and community activism. Newer direct action activists included,

> Earth First!, the Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment (the new enviro-steelworker alliance), the Ruckus Society (a direct-action training center), Food Not Bombs, Global Exchange and a small contingent of anarchists, dressed in black, with black masks, plus a hefty international contingent including French farmers, Korean greens, Canadian wheat growers and British campaigners against genetically modified foods. (St Clair, 1999: 88).

These were joined by tens of thousands of rank and file trade unionists and labour movement activists determined to resist any further incursions by the WTO into US workers' living standards. When direct-action protesters were violently attacked by the police, shocked rank and file trade unionists rushed to their defence.

What has this motley gathering at Seattle in 1999 got to do with social welfare? Like many social movements, Seattle has both a direct and an indirect relationship to social welfare. Directly, the forces assembled to protest against the WTO were concerned with social welfare broadly understood (Danaher and Burbach, 2000). For some, global trade in welfare services was transforming the right to public goods into private commodities available only

---

[1] Teamsters is the name for the US truck drivers trade union. Turtles refers to the hundreds of environmental activists who wore sea turtle costumes at Seattle. This was in protest against WTO efforts to repeal the US Endangered Species Act as an unfair barrier to market trade.

to those with the ability to pay. For others, global trade creates huge but avoidable diswelfare outcomes for the poorest parts of the developing world. Still others extended what we mean by welfare to embrace the damage being done by industry to the natural environment of our planet, the ultimate source of our subsistence and well-being. More indirectly, Seattle shaped the struggles of the next decade. In one way or another, the ‘anti-capitalism’ that manifested itself at Seattle informed the prevailing mood for any group that found itself contesting the market-led reorganisation of social welfare and, more pointedly, state welfare.

Seattle became a symbolic model of resistance to the domination of human welfare by corporate interests. As social movement activists put it, ‘another world is possible’. European intellectuals like Pierre Bourdieu, Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida issued appeals for a social movement in defence of ‘social Europe’. By this Bourdieu (2003: 56) meant the development of a new internationalism, or ‘universal voluntarism’, to defend and extend the non-market bases of social welfare:

> Social history teaches that there is no social policy without a social movement capable of imposing it and that it was not the market, as some would have us believe today, but the labor movement that “civilized” the market economy while greatly contributing to its effectiveness. Consequently, for all those who genuinely wish to oppose a social Europe to the Europe of the banks and money – flanked by a police and penitentiary Europe (which is already far advanced) and a military Europe (a probable consequence of intervention in Kosovo) – the question is how to mobilize the forces capable of achieving the end and which bodies to carry out this work of mobilization.

Post-Seattle, popular resistance to neoliberal capitalism seemed to provide an answer to Bourdieu’s question about which forces and bodies would mobilise against the destruction of social welfare through market reforms and brutal warfare. One expression of this was the popular rejection of neoliberal Europe in the ‘No’ vote in national EU referendum held in France 2005.

Wherever corporate interests met at G8 or WTO meetings they were greeted with mass protest. In 2001 brutal police actions against the massive demonstrations that shook the Genoa G8 summit saw a protester, Carlo Giuliani, shot dead by armed police and scores of detainees tortured. The highest point of protest came in February and April 2003 when millions marched against the looming war in Iraq. Another huge demonstration met the 2005 G8 summit held in Gleneagles, although the main event was held sixty miles away in Edinburgh. Although it lacked the militant temper of its direct action predecessors, the huge mobilisation in Edinburgh managed to shine a spotlight on the problem of world poverty and third world debt, while the direct action in Gleneagles itself became a sideshow.

In some ways this seemed marked the ebb tide of the remarkable cycle of protest that emerged so suddenly at Seattle. Yet social movements continue to emerge in the most expansive and unexpected ways. For instance, in 2005 France saw major moibilisations around the ‘No’ campaign for the EU constitution, riots in the inner city suburbs, and widescale anti-employment reform protest. In October 2006, riots erupted in 274 towns in the Paris region after two immigrant youths were electrocuted at the end of a police chase. In the rundown suburbs thousands of mainly unemployed youths fought with police and destroyed property (see Sahlins, 2006, for a range of social science analyses). Nor was this unique to France.

Similar uprisings of dispossessed young people occurred in protest at police oppression in the US black ghettoes in the 1960s and 1970s and Los Angeles in 1992, and in Britain in 1981 in the inner city slums of Brixton, Toxteth and Handsworth. In each case an event occurs that concentrates in a single symbolic moment the profound sense of injustice and years of resentment, grievance and alienation that such communities suffer at the hands of the authorities. In December 2008, Greece saw a similar convulsion that shook society to its core (Pittas, 2009). Again the trigger was the police killing of a young person. Within hours riots exploded in Athens. Next day, a mass demonstration at the central police station demanded justice and were met by police tear gas. Students occupied schools and universities. Thousands of supporters of the insurgent youth marched to join a demonstration outside parliament on the day that millions of workers participated in a general strike against neoliberal policies.

In the French case, new protests followed in March and April 2006 in the urban centres against the First Employment Contract (contrat premiere embauche or CPE). The CPE was designed to create a more flexible and docile workforce and represented a deterioration in employment conditions for people under the age of 26. This time youth in education, especially those active against fascism and racism, acted as a lightning rod for the deep currents of French society (Kouvelakis, 2006). Millions demonstrated, rioting was renewed, mass strikes took place and students occupied university buildings. All this disorder forced the government to withdraw the legislation and gave the social movements their first national success in a decade.

This new wave of struggle coincided with the crisis of the world economy and neoliberal ideology, worsening environmental degradation, and endemic warfare (see Concluding chapter). Some like Mike Davis (2009) view Athens as potentially opening up new vistas of popular protest:

> Athens is being widely envisioned as the answer to the question, ‘After Seattle, then what’? The anti-WTO demonstrations and the ‘Battle of Seattle’ in 1999 opened a new era of non-violent protest and grassroots activism. Now an entire cycle has come to an end just as the Wall Street boiler room of global capitalism has exploded, leaving in its wake both more radical problems and new opportunities for radicalism.

Of course, as Davis notes, the significance of Athens for the expansion of social movement activity will only become clear with the benefit of hindsight. Nevertheless, it seems clear that divisions within national governments about how to deal with the crisis of neoliberal legitimation and geopolitical domination will stimulate social movement mobilisations. In January 2009, anti-war demonstrators across the globe protested against the Israeli attack on Gaza in their tens and hundreds of thousands in Cairo, Baghdad, Athens, Barcelona, London, and Tel Aviv.

The 'Miracle' of Social Movements

> The unemployed movement, i.e. the simultaneous initiation of a collective organization and the chain reactions that had led to it and that it contributed to producing: from isolation, depression, individual resentment and vindictiveness towards scapegoats, to collective mobilization; and from resignation, passivity, withdrawal and silence, to making oneself heard; from depression to revolt, from the isolated unemployed individual to the collective of unemployed, from misery to anger. This is how the slogan of the demonstrators became true: 'If you sow misery, you harvest anger'.
>
> (Bourdieu, 2008: 294)

Many social movements when they first appear often have something of the character of a surprise about them. In this sense, social movements are quite literally astonishing. Dull, tedious reality is enlivened and energised by mobilizations and protest. Social movements stand out from the banal background of everyday life. The plain excitement of being with others in public displays of collective togetherness temporarily tears a hole in the fabric of the taken for granted, atomised nature of reality. This is what made Seattle appear for many as a spontaneous manifestation. From the outside, it seemed to arrive, without warning, out of nowhere. From the inside, for long-standing activists worn down by years of fruitless campaigns or defeats, the sudden appearance of newly energised movements seems to defy the laws of gravity. Hence it is important to understand that social movements do not spring out of nowhere fully formed. Instead, they always have a specific 'pre-history' of unspectacular, unseen, patient, molecular, frustrating, routine face-to-face relationships (Charlton, 2003).

Seattle was no freak of nature. It was not a one-off, accidental or spontaneous event without antecedents. Throughout the 1990s protest was already stirring against market reforms. Despite the presidential election of Nicolas Sarkozy in 2007, committed to the ‘modernisation’ of the French welfare state and an expressed commitment to destroy ‘the heritage of May 1968’, social movements have, perhaps more than elsewhere in Europe, defended the welfare state in France with greater success through recurrent forms of popular mobilisation. In November 1995, a French transport workers strike to resist pension reform presaged the wider social movement of December 1995. Two million public sector workers brought France to a standstill in protest against the ‘Juppe Plan’ for reforming the social security system. Although traduced by professional sociologists as a narrow corporatist defence of sectional interests that stood in the way of welfare modernisation, in the December movement labour activists drew connections with a diverse range of other activists among students, gays, immigrants and the unemployed. This heralded a wave of protest where each movement learned to adapt tactics and forms of struggles mutually from each other (Wolfreys, 2000: 39). In January 1998, unemployed workers thus used the tactic of occupying prominent buildings from the *sans-papiers* (immigrants denied ‘legal’ status) whose 1996 occupation of a church and eviction by riot police became a national *cause celebre*. Similarly a protest by workers against redundancies at a factory in Mamers took the form of a ‘die-in’, emulating the form of protest adopted by AIDS activists ACT-UP.

The 1998 unemployed workers movement showed remarkable organisational skills in demanding adequate increases to recover some of the devalued social security payments. For Pierre Bourdieu (1998) the collective mobilisation of the unemployed was something of a ‘social miracle’. What seemed so ‘miraculous’ to Bourdieu was that the unemployed appear to be the most vulnerable group in society, possessing little in the way of structural strength or material resources. In the past the unemployed have been susceptible to reactionary appeals, for instance that immigrants are to blame for the lack of jobs and that authoritarian political solutions, including fascist ones, are necessary. More usually, the unemployed are seen as a lazy, apathetic, demoralised, welfare dependent and criminalised ‘underclass’. In the case of the French movement, the mobilisation of the unemployed challenged all these preconceptions, including the idea of the lazy, feckless unemployed scrounger who refuses to get out of bed to do an honest day's work.

In fact, as the chapters of this book testify, there is nothing 'miraculous' about dispossessed and oppressed groups organising themselves to demand improvements in welfare services or benefits. From its earliest days, capitalism created a class of wage labourers some of which were unable to find paid employment, became dependent on charity or, worse, were exposed to absolute destitution. In a capitalist society nearly all social and personal needs are met through the payment of money wages, which are then exchanged for the goods and services essential to life itself. From the beginning, social movements have contested and challenged market-based inequalities and suffering, resorting to direct action, demonstrations, petitions, mass meetings, hunger marches, occupations of buildings, vandalism of machinery, and political campaigning. Such movements typically make demands for citizenship rights to ensure that adequate welfare measures like unemployment benefits, national insurance and social security are put in place by government action.

For some scholars and politicians social movements of ordinary people fighting for material improvements to their lives represent the past. They are rather nostalgic, old-fashioned reminders of a time before the creation of the welfare state largely resolved the age-old problem of distributing the most basic material necessities, housing, education and health care to those most in need. Since the Second World War, it is often assumed, the welfare state has taken care of these more elementary needs. The 'new' social movements that have emerged since the 1960s are concerned with more elevated, symbolic or even spiritual needs like identity, nature, sexuality, justice, peace, faith or cultural beliefs rather than the crude physical necessities of yesteryear (Williams, 1999). And the nature of what a social movement actually is has been transformed from mass organisations of the working class, largely male and exclusively white, and organised from the top-down, to much more diverse, highly educated, tactically daring, inclusive and participatory groups (Bagguley, 1992).

While this dichotomous picture of old and new social movements is particularly marked in some social movements' scholarship, it has barely resonated within social policy as a discipline (Martin, 2001). It is a key aim of this book to redress both the simplistic division of old and new social movements through the prism of social welfare and the absence of social movements in much social policy. A rigid division of social movements into old and new forms will fail to do justice to the struggles over welfare of the past couple of centuries, let alone the past few years. In one sense, these were clearly a politics of the belly, struggles for material improvements. But, at the same time, they were also demands for dignity, respect, recognition, equality and democracy, attributes that are said to characterise more recent movements (Melucci, 1989). Neither were they always or even usually mass movements of the majority as the frozen picture of a homogenous, largely male and white working class suggests.

What are social movements?

Social movements are heterogeneous, dynamic, constantly evolving social collectivities. By their very nature they make any attempt at hard and fast definition, categorisation or classification a rather foolhardy exercise. Social movement scholars endlessly agonise over what exactly distinguishes a social movement from other forms of collective action, such as interest groups, 'single issue' campaigns, protests, coalitions or political parties. Definitional hair-splitting is not a very productive pastime (Crossley, 2002). Nevertheless, some rudimentary sense of what constitutes a social movement allows us to isolate certain characteristic features. For Charles Tilly (2004: 3) social movements constitute a distinctive form of 'contentious politics' – 'contentious' because the claims that are made will come into conflict with the interests of some other group; 'politics' because some appeal is made to or role is expected of government. Hence the contentious politics of 'social welfare' are translated into the policy process of 'state welfare'. In making claims around state welfare, social movements respond to, struggle against or bring into play the institutions of the modern state.

This has not always been the case. Social movements are a quintessentially modern political phenomenon. Developed in the West from around the mid 18th century social movements embodied three key elements (Tilly, 2004). First, social movements conduct *campaigns* as organised and sustained collective claim-making on authorities, usually the state. Second, they perform distinctive *repertoires of contention* through combining different forms of political activity, communication and voluntary association such as public meetings, processions, rallies, demonstrations, petitions, media relations and propaganda. Thirdly, they are compelled to display the social movement virtues of '*Worthiness, Unity, Numbers and Commitment'* on behalf of themselves or their constituencies.

Likewise, Della Porta and Diani (2006: 20) propose a loose three point definition that conceives of social movements as a 'distinct social process'. Social movement actors, first, enter into conflict with clearly identified opponents; second, actors are linked by dense informal networks; and, third, they share a distinct collective identity. In this definition there is a similar emphasis upon conflict but without the state necessarily being central to the field of conflict. Instead there is an emphasis upon the structure of actors' interaction and the bonds that tie movement activists together. From a social welfare perspective, making a claim on the state at some level is of crucial importance. So while both of these definitions are useful, in the case of welfare movements more than networks and interaction is needed. An emphasis on the state apparatus is vital.

Clearly, social movements seem to suggest something quite different from conventional, mainstream political parties. Again a hard and fast definition is not advisable, not least because there is not a clear line dividing 'conventional' from 'unconventional' politics. Rather, as Byrne (1997: 24-25) suggests, the most meaningful way to conceive of social movements is as part of a 'continuum of political action' located in a 'grey area' where conventional and unconventional blur, and where ‘ideology, tactics and organisation may become rather different’. Forming part of this continuum are other groupings and organisations which have also challenged the prevailing social order in one way or another. However, Byrne (1997) argues that a distinction needs to be drawn in order to isolate what are genuine social movements from more limited and short-lived campaigns and groups. First, ‘protest campaigns’ are confined to limited, single issue, short term campaigns. Examples would include the Anti-Poll Tax campaigns of the late 1980s and user and self-help campaigns in health and social care. Second, broader ‘protest movements’ may contain a wide variety of organizations, oriented towards broad area of government policy, which endure over time, and aim to change public values. Examples here would include CND and Greenpeace. Finally, genuine ‘social movements’ for Byrne are long-lasting movements, conceived in the broadest sense to be striving for fundamental social change. These contain within themselves a wide variety of organizations and groups, such as protest campaigns and protest movements. Examples of such are the peace movement, the environmental movement and the women’s movement.

Byrne provides a useful typology of protest groups. Criteria such as the time frame of campaigns, the breadth of their ideology and the depth of their ultimate goals help to differentiate between all sorts of campaigns and organisations. However, for our purposes we adopt a looser vocabulary in this book. Each of the campaigns covered in subsequent chapters can be considered as part of an overall social movement pressing for the reform of state welfare in some way or another. So while we resist absolutely fixed approaches to defining or categorising the protests around social welfare, it is important at the outset to bear in mind that campaigns, protest events, organisations and social movements may all refer to different moments of the same process. One aim of this book is to encourage an understanding of social movements as a part of a wider totality involving not only far-reaching movement goals but also more immediate interventions by local activists, leaders, actions, events, interaction with the state, the media, political parties, and so on. While individual chapters deal with particular campaigns and events, they are not understood by us as wholly localised and isolated examples and case studies of protest, removed from the wider political culture desiring welfare reform.

These form part of what we might identify as a broader ‘social welfare movement’. Like social movements more generally, ‘social welfare movements’ can be defined in various ways. Oppositional collective action at the point of service delivery is one way of delineating a social welfare movement. For Harrison and Reeve (2002: 757) the term refers to ‘a connected series of conscious actions, interactions and interrelationships constituting collective action focused or organised around the consumption and/or control of important services, and/or the meeting of individual, household or group needs and aspirations, outside the sphere of direct wages’. At some level this involves a challenge to the welfare or regulatory politics of the state. Enduring, organised, contentious interaction of rank and file activism with state welfare characterises social welfare movements. But despite specific studies of particular sites of struggle in health, education, housing, social care, social security and so on, there has been little development of an overall approach to the social welfare - state institutions - social movement nexus. While a continuum can be charted from direct action protest through advocacy and user groups to incorporation with managerial structures a focus on contentious politics reserves our understanding of social movements to conflictual politics that resist assimilation to authority structures and the dilution of a culture of challenge.

Such a movement was integral to the making of the British welfare state in the years 1942-1948. A loose coalition of social movement networks from within and around the labour movement campaigned for progressive reform of education, a free modern health care system, a fair system of social security and benefit entitlements, and for improved housing stock. This agitation contributed directly to the radical political mood during the war years and the landslide Labour victory in the general election of 1945. The welfare state today remains a child of this moment of social reform - a spoiled child, a political compromise, a constantly contested terrain. As such, the idea of a welfare consensus does not quite capture the sometimes ideologically fraught and practically disputed nature of state welfare: it is always a zone of ‘contentious politics’. Welfare contention was heightened through the combined shocks of the end of the long post-war economic boom in the late 1960s and the advent of new ‘social welfare movements’.

‘New welfare movements’ comprise a variety of groups that come together to express specific demands collectively, from HIV+ to reproductive rights groups, but who are united as a social movement by a concern with the fundamental demand for empowerment, representation, and ensuring the quality and accountability of user-centred provision (Martin, 2001: 374; Williams, 1992). As such, *new* welfare movements differ from the welfare movements of previous generations in the UK. They operate in and around an already established welfare state system to preserve, extend, deepen and improve service delivery. They form part of what has been called a ‘culture of challenge’ where expert authority is increasingly contested (Scrambler and Kelleher, 2006). In the contemporary era when neo-liberal antipathy to state welfare has been central to government social policy making, these movements have mobilised to defend the very principle of social welfare itself and to defend the institutions and jobs associated with that principle.

In the 21st century social movements are increasingly operating at a transnational or global level because the interests that they have mobilized around – whether it be environmental justice, human rights or economic exploitation - are recognized as being insoluble at a national level and require coordinated international action. The negative side-effects of globalised capitalism require global solutions. Klein (2001: 84) argues that ‘around the world, activists are piggy-backing on the ready-made infrastructures supplied by global corporations. This can mean cross border unionization, but also cross sector organizing – among workers, environmentalists, consumers, even prisoners, who may all have different relationships to one multinational’. Transnational social movement networks (often facilitated by a combination of information technology and international non-governmental organizations) link activists together in a loose, ever-shifting community of interlinked interests which shares resources (information, organisation, personnel, finance etc.) to stand in opposition to the dominant neo-liberal version of globalization – built, Klein argues, ‘on the back of human welfare’ (2001: 88). These networks emerged dramatically into the open for the first time at Seattle. In one sense, corporate institutions and their allies in right-wing think-tanks, mainstream political parties, academia, corporation boards, banks and trading floors, and the media may be likened to a ‘social movement from above’, in conflict with the coalition of ‘welfare movements from below’, whose abiding concern is to forge an alternative world of a welfare-centred globalisation. These issues are explored in chapter 11.

Welfare movements in context

In modernity an intimate relationship has been established between social welfare and social movements. As the democratic ideal took hold in the nineteenth century the idea was born that all men and, somewhat belatedly, all women were created equal. It can therefore look as if the welfare state is merely the last step on the long historical march of liberal democratic societies, the culmination of an innate civilising process. A further aim of this book is to restore the active agency of social movements to social policy. State welfare can be understood as a process of contentious politics and not simply as a product of expert stakeholders.

A single book cannot possibly do justice to the many facets of welfare movements. We therefore recognise at the outset that many important welfare movements are barely discussed. Much, much more can been said, for instance, about the direct action campaigns of mental health and disabled activists. An important book, *Contesting Psychiatry*, by social movement scholar Nick Crossley (2006) analyses psychiatry and mental health as a complex and shifting ‘field of contention’. Crossley identifies historical waves of mental health and anti-psychiatry activism. Founded in 1946, the mainstream organization The National Association for Mental Health (NAMH) rejected criticisms of psychiatric practices based on an ideology of ‘mental hygiene’. As this model came under attack from the anti-psychiatry movements of the 1960s and 1960s, a radicalised NAMH transmogrified into

MIND in the 1970s to reflect a newly-found voice for modern patient rights. This coincided with the formation of a patient’s movement, the Mental Patients’ Union (MPU). By the 1980s, a ‘second wave’ anti-psychiatry movement emerged through groups, alongside radical survivor movements. In the 1990s such groups as Mad Pride and Reclaim Bedlam drew on the tactics and style of the wider direct action movement engaged in anti-corporate and environmental protest.

Disability rights activists reject institutional practices of dependency and incapacity that deny effective civil rights to disabled people (Shakespeare, 1993; Oliver, 1990). Some disabled people have actively organised to resist disablement as a form of discrimination and prejudice (Barnes, 2007; Dowse, 2001; Oliver, 1990; Shakespeare, 1993). The Disablement Incomes Group was set up in 1965 by two disabled women, leading to the formation of the Disability Alliance. A demand for recognition for disabled rights broader than benefits lobbying lay behind the founding of the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation. By 1981 the British Council of Organisations of Disabled People brought together 130 organisations claiming to represent 400,000 disabled people. Disability rights confront similar dilemmas to other social movements such as the alternative of direct action or institutional incorporation (Barnes, et al, 2007). Incorporation has been posed ever more sharply with the setting up by the government of the Office of Disability Issues, which has had the effect of further blurring the boundaries between movements ‘of’ and organisations ‘for’ disabled people (Barnes, 2007). One indication of how incorporation can erode the ability of social movements to act independently was the cancellation of the Disabled People’s Rights and Freedoms march from Birmingham to London in 2004 organised by the group Our Rights Now (Cook, 2004). Self-consciously modeled after the unemployed marches of the 1930s, ironically themselves modeled after earlier disabled people’s marches (see chapter 4), a coordinated march in support of the Disabled People’s Rights Charter had to be abandoned in light of the difficulty of raising the necessary finance.

Neither have we selected empirical examples to bolster a preconceived affinity with one or other theory of social movements. Nor are we claiming that the historical and contemporary movements covered necessarily represent the only or the most significant shapers of state welfare. In this sense, the book represents a genuine collaboration across research interests and political commitments. In any case, this was how we initially conceived the book; it is down to others to judge how successfully it has been realised. We have attempted to convey the heterogeneous character of welfare movements and some of the specific qualities of different movements covered in individual chapters. To prevent this from becoming too unwieldy the book has been organised around a clear structure that arranges the narrative into three sections. Part 1 sets out the historical, ideological and theoretical context for what follows. Part 2 charts the inter-relationship of welfare movements and social welfare in the founding and development of the classical Beveridgean welfare state in the period following World War Two. Part 3 analyses the impact on social welfare of the new social movements that emerged in the 1960s and after.

In order to counter the sometimes excessive emphasis that social policy as a discipline places on the role of politicians, professional bodies and state administrators in the creation of state welfare, chapter 1 analyses the role attributed to social movements in the immediate post-war phase, at the height of what is sometimes thought of as ‘the Golden Age’ of the welfare state. The chapter compares one of the most influential accounts of the rise of the welfare state, T.H. Marshall’s (1950) ‘Social Class and Citizenship’, to the classical Marxist analysis of the welfare state, John Saville’s essay ‘The Welfare State: An Historical Approach’ (1957-8). Chapter 2 develops this approach further by looking at the relationship of social welfare and social movements in a much longer historical time-frame. It situates the emerging popular struggles over civil, political and social rights in the nineteenth and twentieth century in specific local and institutional cultures. Chapter 3 shifts the emphasis from historical analysis to the theoretical analysis of welfare movements. It establishes the main lines of debate in recent social movement scholarship, whether to characterise movements according to how they mobilise the resources at their disposal or according to the values and ideologies that animate them.

Part 2 addresses the part played by social movements in the founding politics of and later developments in the classic Beveridgean welfare state. This part is roughly organised around the ‘Five Giants’ identified by Beveridge: want (poverty), idleness (unemployment), squalor (housing), ignorance (education) and sickness (health). Almost seventy years later, Beveridge’s Giants remain central to the politics of state welfare. Chapter 4 focuses on how the unemployed struggles of the interwar years shaped subsequent thinking on social security and employment policy. Against considerable hostility and Red scares, a national unemployed movement was built by rank and file activists in the pit of the economic depression of 1930s to resist benefit cuts and demand dignity for the unemployed. Chapter 5 moves from the early politics of the NHS to consider the later challenge to the founding assumptions of medical experts by the women’s movement. Here distinctions between social movements and self-help, user groups or voluntary providers have become somewhat blurred in practice. Chapter 6 deals with the politics of contention stimulated by urban social movements. Struggles around housing, from the Glasgow Rent Strikes of 1915 to contemporary campaigns against housing stock transfers have thrown into especially sharp relief the ‘politics of place’ as an essential component of social welfare. Chapter 7 maps the long, difficult struggle for comprehensive education. Given the central role accorded education as a panacea for social ills and personal improvement a variety of antagonistic interests historically contested around educational institutions and values.

Part 3 examines the impact on social welfare of what are often called ‘new’ social movements. This refers to the advent of radical, direct action campaigns that emerged out of the political tremors of the 1960s. Chapter 8 indicates something of the transition that has taken place in British society in the past few decades by considering one of the ideological bedrocks of the welfare state – family policy. As the family structure was being reshaped by a range of social forces a conservative counter-movement emerged in an effort to influence social policy to restore or salvage an idealised notion of the ‘traditional’ nuclear family. This involved framing as ‘deviant’ other family forms such as single parents or civil partnerships, one to be corrected by state welfare programmes, moral regulation and legislation. Chapter 9 considers how an equally cherished ideal, that of civil rights, long-regarded as a firmly-established progressive element of state welfare citizenship entitlement, became the focus for struggle in a range of post-war civil rights movements. The chapter highlights the past fifty years of anti-racist struggle, paying close attention to the Asian Youth Movement. Anti-racism and multicultural politics continually tread a fine-line of being co-opted and resistance dissipated by authorised community leaders and partnerships.

Chapter 10 extends our understanding of welfare movements further by drawing attention to the environmental movement, a diverse assemblage of activists that has welfare values at the core of its philosophy and action. What might be called ‘eco-welfarism’ has successfully placed sustainability, both social and natural, firmly on the political agenda, so much so that ‘sustainability’ has become the small change of public policy discourse. As the chapter shows through a case study of anti-road protests, eco-welfarism exposes some of the basic faultlines between sustainable communities, especially deprived ones, and infrastructural development. Chapter 11 takes us full circle back to our starting point: Seattle. It establishes the relevance for social welfare to the so-called ‘anti-globalisation’ movement’ or, more accurately, the ‘global social justice movement’. Troubling questions are raised by the social justice movement about social welfare as a universal claim of right as against the specific struggles of particular groups. As neoliberal capitalism plunges deeper into crisis as we write, this chapter has a pointed relevance about how local, regional, and national movements mediate global forces and processes. This movement has also opened-out the debate about which values ought to govern our shared fate on this planet.