

FINAL DRAFT: Chapter for Moulaert, F. (ed.). 2009. *Social Innovation and Territorial Development* (Ashgate Publishing)

Social Innovation for Community Economies

J.K. Gibson-Graham and Gerda Roelvink

Abstract: In this chapter we stage a conversation between two innovative and longstanding projects, (1) the multiphase European-based research project on local social innovation that is represented in this book and (2) the Community Economies project which is engaged in rethinking economy through action research in Australia, the Philippines and the US. Tracing the overlaps and divergences between these projects in terms of four key themes—starting with diversity, the ethics of individual and social needs, community governance, and building innovative communities—we highlight the contribution of each to the construction and spread of resilient communities and the establishment of a more just social order.

Beginning a conversation for change

The Community Economies project is an ongoing effort to contribute to an emerging economic politics, one that is centred on the practice of economic self-determination, oriented by the vision that ‘another world is possible’, and committed to postcapitalist economic futures (see www.communityeconomies.org, Gibson-Graham 2006). The project seeks to ‘reclaim the economy’ as a situated and diverse space of ethical decision

making and negotiated interdependence; through that process of reclamation, the Economy – a remote and powerful sphere that seems to dictate our lives – becomes instead a familiar, even intimate, space of engagement.

Central to the project are three key elements: (1) rethinking economy to create a conceptual platform for its re-enactment; (2) enrolling and resubjecting communities and individuals (including ourselves) in new worlds of possibility; and (3) promoting collective action to build community economies. A community economy is not defined by geographic or social commonality; instead it is an ethical and political space of decision in which interdependence is constructed as people transform their livelihoods and lives.

The Community Economies project is one of many contemporary projects seeking to foster new worlds and innovative economies. In this paper we attempt to open a conversation between Community Economies and another such project, a multiphase European-based research initiative on local social innovation. While it is variously designated ALMOLIN and SINGOCOM (alternative models for local innovation and social innovation in local community governance), for the sake of clarity we will call it simply the Local/Social Innovation project. Like Community Economies, the Local/Social Innovation project has affinities with the politics of possibility of the World Social Forum and highlights the ways that social movements are starting where they are to meet previously unmet needs (see Moulaert et al. 2002). In particular, local/social innovation is seen as a way to include marginalized groups into social and political governance institutions and processes. Local/social innovators privilege participation of

the needy themselves in projects that seek to harness resources in the face of contemporary economic and social crises.

So why might a conversation between these two projects be of interest or use? In *A Postcapitalist Politics*, J.K. Gibson-Graham ponders the proliferation of a diverse range of economic initiatives around the globe and asks ‘...how do we multiply, amplify, and connect these different activities? How do we trace “connections between diverse practices...to dissolve the distinctions between inside and outside the movement”...and thus actualize movement goals in a transformed social order’ (2006, 80–81)? In beginning a conversation between two different but related bodies of research, this chapter offers one way to respond to the challenge of connection. While the Local/Social Innovation project is oriented toward studying and theorizing movements and organizations, Community Economies is more interested in performing and instituting them, primarily through action research. Nevertheless, both projects can be seen as promoting and supporting an economic and social order that is emergent yet not fully constituted. By making this nascent and largely non-credible ‘movement’ an object of research, and by enhancing the knowledge and self-knowledge of the projects and subjects involved, they participate in bringing it into being as a transformative force worldwide.

As an academic exercise, the somewhat one-sided conversation embarked upon here necessarily comes out of a critical tradition, one that we would hope to step aside from at least for the moment. In the spirit of the new politics that seeks alliances rather than mergers (or deeper divisions), this chapter inquires about the ways in which Local/Social Innovation connects and overlaps with the project of creating innovative and

resilient community economies. In doing so, it develops four key themes: (1) starting with diversity, (2) a local ethics of individual and social needs, (3) community governance and (4) building innovative communities. Each of these themes resonates with a core principle of the politics of 'other worlds'. In the concluding section of the chapter, we highlight fundamental similarities and differences between the two projects that make them potentially fruitful contributors to each other and to the self-reflection of each.

Starting with diversity: a project of visibility

It may come as no surprise that both Community Economies and Local/Social Innovation are grounded in an appreciation of social and economic diversity. Yet for both frameworks, the recognition of diversity is not simply a matter of reflecting the truth of the world; rather it is a strategic theoretical choice. For Gibson-Graham (2006), for example, identifying and describing a rich diversity of economic practices and organizations is a key aspect of a politics of language – making space for, and giving legitimacy to, forms of social and economic activity that are obscured and devalued by a capitalocentric worldview. By bringing these to the attention of participants and stakeholders, they hope to widen the field of possibility for economic activism and development.

In a similar vein Moulaert and his colleagues are working to broaden and diversify the dominant notion of innovation, which is limited to innovations that enhance economic efficiency (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1973; Moulaert and Nussbaumer 2005). They define social innovation broadly in terms of the inclusion of the marginalized into a range of

areas, including education systems, labour markets, political institutions, and sociocultural life (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1970). In their research, they have focused primarily on innovative ways of meeting the needs of excluded groups and on innovative governance structures in organizations created by and/or serving those groups. Taken together, such organizations are understood as constituting the social economy, a concept that encompasses a wide array of initiatives oriented toward the satisfaction of needs (sometimes called the third sector or the solidarity economy) (Moulaert and Ailenei 2005). The development of the social economy is seen as a response to the distributive failures of market and state; its presence has thus fluctuated over time with the business cycles of national and global economies, changing labour markets, the impact of World Wars, the emergence and decline of the welfare state, and other events (Moulaert et al. 2005). Depending on the historical and geographical context, the social economy will take diverse forms and may include initiatives that draw on the market and the state as a way to satisfy needs that are unmet by these institutions (Moulaert and Ailenei 2005).

SINGOCOM (centred on ‘social innovation in governance for local communities’) documented diverse social economy projects in Europe with the aim of providing ‘these initiatives with a new synthesis of theoretical foundations’ (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1970). Initiatives in the SINGOCOM database include a mediating and coordinating neighbourhood organization in Berlin; an organization to support skill sharing and the development of cooperatives in Sunderland, UK; an informal social support network in Quartieri Spagnoli, a poor section of Naples; and arts projects to record local histories in Cardiff (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1970). All of these innovative projects are at the same time projects of inclusion, whether geared toward meeting the material needs of the

marginalized, opening social arenas to the previously excluded, or giving ‘voice’ to those who have had little or no say in political life.

Community Economies is likewise interested in strategies for including the marginalized by developing diversified social economies. Their strategic entry point, however, is a reconceptualization of the *entire* economy as a diverse social arena, creating an alternative economic language of the ‘diverse economy’. This language provides a discursive space and an open-ended set of categories with which to make visible the wide range of transactions, forms of labour, and economic organization that have been marginalized by the discourse of the ‘capitalist economy’ (see Figure 1). The representation of economy in Figure 1 both ruptures the presumed unity of capitalism and calls into question its presumptive dominance, especially when we recognize that noncapitalist market and nonmarket activity constitutes well more than 50 percent of all economic activity (Gibson-Graham 2006, 68). In particular, unpaid labour in households and neighbourhoods constitutes 30 to 50 percent of economic activity in both rich and poor countries (Ironmonger 1996). Interestingly, the social economy of Local/Social Innovation enrolls many of the practices and organizational forms of the diverse economy, including alternative market and non-market transactions, alternatively paid and unpaid labour, and alternative capitalist and non-capitalist enterprises.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE – PORTRAIT

Like SINGOCOM, the diverse economies framework is a tool for inventorying and describing economic diversity in an open way that begins rather than forecloses discussion. In Community Economies action research around the world, mapping the local diverse economy has allowed people to see and valorize the economic activity they

are already engaged in. Whereas conventional economic development usually starts with the presumption that a community is lacking and needs capitalist development, the Community Economies project presumes the opposite; it affirms the presence of hidden assets and capacities that could provide a useful starting place for previously unimagined development paths. In the Latrobe Valley in Australia, the municipality of Jagna in the Philippines, and western Massachusetts in the United States, Gibson-Graham (2006) and their colleagues have shown how mapping assets and capacities rather than needs and deficiencies reveals that there is something to build upon and opens up discussions of the direction that a building process might take. In these community discussions, there is an affect of surprise and relief at discovering existing and potential alternatives to the vision of capitalist development on offer from governments, international institutions, and many academics and NGOs.

Shared principle for 'other worlds': making diversity visible, promoting credibility, enhancing possibility.

The local ethics of individual and social needs: a vision of distributive justice

Both Community Economies and Local/Social Innovation suggest that social inclusion through innovative community initiatives can be understood as an ethical practice of locality (Gibson-Graham 2003). In the Local/Social Innovation framework, inclusion is referenced to the needs of the excluded, seen as social groups that are in some way marginalized from society, from immigrants to the disabled. The project brings the unmet and often unregistered needs of marginalized groups into full view as a trigger of local/social innovation.

Although needs are recognized to be diverse and changing, they can be summed up as ‘alienated basic needs’, and the project itself concentrates on needs for access to resources and political participation (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1976). Needs are viewed as both individual and social. Thus Local/Social Innovation sees personal desires for dignified livelihoods and political voice as integrated with community development strategies. Projects of Integrated Area Development, for example, initiate and support community enterprises that improve individual living conditions and, at the same time, strengthen the local economy and its social, cultural and physical infrastructure (Moulaert et al. 2000).

Social Enterprise Sunderland, one of the case studies in the SINGOCOM project, exemplifies the ways in which cooperatives can be established to meet social and individual needs. Social Enterprise Sunderland developed from a joint venture responding to local concerns about individual needs for employment and dignity in work, as well as social needs for community wealth in the form of infrastructure and housing. They offer assistance to groups wishing to develop and build cooperative and social enterprises and are beginning to link these enterprises in broader networks. They also promote community development by managing community projects, such as a co-op centre, a sports centre, and a community primary school (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1970, www.socialenterprise-sunderland.org.uk).

Viewed through the lens of the Community Economies project, the range of needs identified by Local/Social Innovation implies the possibility of ethical debate and local decision making about what is necessary for individual and social life and how the common wealth (the ‘commons’) that defines a community is to be shared. Such ethical

decision making is both the marker of community economies and the process by which they are formed; at the most fundamental level, it is a practice and enactment of 'being-in-common', which is Jean-Luc Nancy's phrase for the radical and unavoidable commonality of co-existence with others (Nancy 1992). For Gibson-Graham and her colleagues, a community economy is an ethical practice of being-in-common, a space of negotiated interdependence where decisions are made about what is necessary for individual and social life, and the 'question of how to live together' is openly engaged (2006, 81–82).

Gibson-Graham uses the Mondragón Cooperative Corporation in the Basque region of Spain to exemplify the kind of ethical debate that is constitutive of community economies. Reflecting on the 50 year history of the Mondragón cooperatives, which were established by the local Basque people to provide employment and allow for economic self-determination, she emphasizes how the surplus generated by each cooperative was pooled through the cooperative bank in order to capitalize more cooperatives and expand the community economy of Mondragón. The decision to use the surplus in this way and to keep wages equivalent to those of other workers in the Basque region established a certain standard of living for Mondragón workers; whatever was declared to be surplus was not available to individual workers to increase their personal and family consumption. In Mondragón, what is necessary and what is surplus are neither given by nature nor decreed by a capitalist employer; they are constituted relationally by the cooperators themselves, in the ethical process of balancing their individual desires for consumption with their goals for the Basque people and the local economy (Gibson-Graham 2006).

From a Community Economies perspective, cooperative enterprises do not simply respond to unmet needs but provide a site in which such needs are de-naturalized and opened up for discussion. In the very different context of the labour movement, we can see a similar process of de-naturalization and the negotiated status of necessity; as the movement has struggled to increase workers' wages and improve working conditions, they have redefined what is necessary for a fair and decent way of life (Gibson-Graham 2006, 89). Needs are also negotiated and redefined in the process of establishing differential taxation, through which wealth is collected from some individuals and redistributed to others on the basis of a malleable and changing vision of what is necessary to support human existence. Indeed, ethical decisions around needs are made in all sorts of contexts, signalling the presence of community economies (or aspects of them) in unexpected places at a variety of scales.

Shared principle for 'other worlds': meeting needs directly, innovatively, democratically – distributive justice on the agenda.

Community governance: cultivating new practices and subjects

From the perspective of Local/Social Innovation, needs satisfaction requires changes in social relations and, in particular, relations of governance. The development of governance capacity, or the 'ability of the institutional relations in a social milieu to operate as a collective actor' (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1984), is thus a focus of concern for the project, which is particularly interested in the ways that socially innovative governance initiatives emerge from the grassroots and take hold in a wider context (Gonzalez and Healey 2005). When used as an 'analytical tool' in local/social innovation, a focus on governance draws attention to the people involved in decision making and also

to the forms and flavours of such decision making. To resist prevailing modes of thinking and acting, innovative governance must involve a range of people, including ‘non-traditional actors’ (Gonzalez and Healey 2005, 2061). The concern for social innovation in governance also suggests that the success of innovative enterprises is not simply to be measured by their life span and growth but also by the ‘seeds’ and ‘sediments’ that may influence future practice (2065). Innovation in governance is actually a useful metric for evaluating social enterprises, as the scope of their successes and failures extends beyond quantifiable outcomes of particular projects to more general changes in participation, practices and values.

The SINGOCOM project examines the Ouseburn Trust in Newcastle-on-Tyne as an example of innovative governance. The Trust was initiated by local church and community leaders in response to development plans for the Ouseburn Valley that threatened the local commons, particularly the natural environment and industrial heritage. Over time the Trust developed networks with other local initiatives and a relationship with government, relationships that were formalized and institutionalized through the creation of an Advisory Committee. Gonzalez and Healey draw on the story of the Ouseburn Trust to highlight several aspects of innovative governance. These include the role of ‘non-traditional actors’ such as church leaders, partnerships with other enterprises and government which involve adaptation by innovators to formal governance rules and processes as well as the exchange of ideas, and a more general change in ideas and values of governance institutions through the inclusion of diverse participants and areas of concern (Gonzalez and Healey 2005).

In the Community Economies approach, governance has been framed primarily in terms of subjectivity and subject formation, particularly the ethical practice of self-transformation that is involved in producing subjects for a community economy. The understanding that the economy is something we do, rather than something that does things to us, does not come naturally or easily. Innovative economic subjects must be nurtured and cultivated to value and act upon their interdependence.

The experience of Argentina during the early years of this century offers an inspiring example of self-cultivation as an aspect of innovative governance emerging from the grassroots. When hundreds of thousands of Argentineans became unemployed because of the economic crisis, the unemployed started to build community economies by engaging in barter and using alternative currencies, providing neighbourhood-based social services and schooling, and taking over factories and cooperatively running them. But they had to remake themselves in order to do this. To transform themselves into community economic subjects, they created a cooperative radio station; they went to the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre to see themselves reflected in others who were also engaged in projects of self-determination; they opened a school to teach themselves how to make their own history. Gibson-Graham has called this deliberate process of self (and other) transformation ‘a politics of the subject’ (2006), but it could just as easily be seen as a mode of (self) governance, oriented toward the creation of ‘other worlds’.

Community Economies is also interested in governance processes within social and community enterprises. In order to deliver on the dual objectives of benefiting those involved in the enterprise and also the wider community, community enterprises require novel governance strategies as well as innovative ways to evaluate economic and social

performance. At present, the Community Economies Collective is collaborating with community enterprises in the US, the Philippines, and Australia to produce a template for self-study for community enterprises. In this project, the governance strategies of community enterprises are being treated as experimental moves, that is, as innovations to be learned from both for the enterprises involved and for nascent or future community enterprises. One outcome of the project will be an alternative metric of success (or failure) that will clearly distinguish community enterprises from the mainstream enterprises against which they are often measured and found insufficient. This effort at self-knowledge and self-evaluation can be seen as helping to bring the community enterprise sector into the next stage of being – recognized by itself and others (including planners and policymakers) as a crucible of social innovation and an important sector of the economy, with its own distinctive dynamics, modes of governance, and criteria of success.

Shared principle for ‘other worlds’: self-determination and innovative governance at every scale, from self to world.

Building innovative communities: a new economic politics

Both Local/Social Innovation and Community Economies are interested in projects of building new communities in which innovative governance is a central feature. In particular, scholars of local/social innovation view the inclusion of marginalized groups into the ‘politico-administrative system’ as a key ‘political rationale’ in the diverse initiatives they study (Moulaert et al. 2005, 1970). The participatory budgeting practiced in Porto Alegre, Brazil, exemplifies the type of political empowerment they seek to understand and promote.

Andreas Novy and Bernhard Leubolt (2005) analyze the Porto Alegre experience by placing it in the context of the tension between democracy and capitalism in Latin America. From their perspective, participatory budgeting aims to strengthen the democratic state and, at the same time, contribute to an alternative economy (2026) by including local people in decision making about the distribution of public money. In order to work well, it requires a sizeable and decentralized budget and substantial public participation (2027).

Novy and Leubolt's research demonstrates that participatory budgeting has widespread benefits. In Porto Alegre, it has greatly increased transparency in budgetary decisions and installed democratic processes, including both direct democracy and the election of representatives to participate in ongoing decision making (2005, 2028). It has also provided a process for achieving distributive justice. Like other projects collected under the banner of local/social innovation, participatory budgeting responds to local needs and tends to benefit the needy more than the well off (2028). In Porto Alegre, it has increased the civic participation of the socially marginalized and provided public assistance to a diverse array of small projects.

Participatory budgeting has had another interesting outcome in Porto Alegre. As Novy and Leubolt (2005, 2030–31) describe it, the process prompts participants to articulate their individual needs in relation to community needs. Open political contestation facilitates the re-expression of 'my' needs as 'our' needs; in moving from 'I' to 'we,' participants develop and express a sense of themselves as members of a community. They become, in the language of Community Economies, communal

economic subjects – open to new forms of association and to the individual becomings that arise when connection is forged and interdependence acknowledged.

In their action research in the Latrobe Valley of southeastern Australia and the Pioneer Valley of western Massachusetts in the US, the Community Economies project found that building community economies entails an ongoing process of cultivating subjects who can open up to new forms of economic being (Gibson-Graham 2006). Initially this required working closely with action research participants to elicit their painful attachments to the dominant Economy, giving them space to air their sense of economic injury and deficiency. As participants became involved in inventorying and representing a diverse and surprisingly vibrant local economy, their existing (narrow and relatively powerless) economic identities were destabilized, and they began (tentatively at first) to experience their economic selves in very different ways. Rather than being needy and deficient, isolated in an environment of scarcity, they could see themselves as having assets and capacities, embedded in a space of relative abundance. As the research process continued, revealing innovative livelihood strategies, informal transactions, and a wealth of caring connections, a sense of possibility –again, tentatively expressed – became palpable among the participants: some were motivated to take up new activities; others were able to revalue old ones, not formerly seen as economic; and still others became involved in community enterprises, showing their willingness to relate to people in unfamiliar ways (Gibson-Graham 2006, Ch. 6).

In addition to the project of opening themselves and others to economic possibility, the Community Economies project is engaged in studying and fostering collective action to construct community economies on the ground. Rather than laying out the contours of

an ideal community economy (which might obscure or preempt the decisions of communities themselves), they offer four ‘coordinates’ – necessity, surplus, consumption, and commons – around which interdependence could be negotiated and explored (Gibson-Graham 2006, Chs.4 and 7). These coordinates constitute a rudimentary lexicon of interdependence, and collective decision making around them can be understood as the ethical ‘dynamics’ of a community economy.

Constructing the vision of a community economy around the four coordinates highlights the interdependencies among what are usually targets of single-issue politics (with the exception of surplus, which is not generally considered outside of cooperatives). The living wage movement, for example, concentrates on access to *necessities* of life; the simplicity movement devotes itself to lifestyle and *consumption*; the environmental movement focuses on protecting and restoring the *commons* in various forms. Bringing these issues together creates a complex field of decision in which trade-offs and other relationships can be examined and discussed – the question, for example, among a group of migrants of whether to pool their (surplus) remittances and, if they decide to do so, how to use the money that results. Do they want to help replenish the fisheries at home, or to shore up the incomes of the elderly and disabled, or to invest in enterprise development so migration will not be necessary for future generations? These questions open up different ways of consuming a common store of wealth, and beg the question of who should be involved in making the decisions. For the community involved, however constituted, the decisions taken will directly or indirectly affect a variety of forms of necessity, consumption and commons, not to mention the size of a possible future surplus. What the coordinates provide is a starting place for economic decision making

that provisionally maps a complex ethical space, and creates potential connections between what are seemingly disparate and distant constituencies and issues.

Shared principles for 'other worlds': new framings for economic politics; constituting 'we' in novel ways.

Conclusion

Situating Local/Social Innovation and Community Economies together in this chapter, we have highlighted areas of common concern and distilled them into widely shared principles for a politics of 'other worlds'. Yet it would be equally possible to see these two projects as very different, each with a well-honed self-conception that separates and distances it from the other (and indeed from all other initiatives). For us, part of the ethical challenge of engagement with other projects lies in adopting an experimental rather than a critical stance; this means that differences are examined for what they can teach us, rather than presumed to be signs of deficiency on one or the other side. It is in this spirit of openness that we conclude the chapter with a discussion of salient differences between the two projects, grounded in a summary of their overlapping concerns.

Both projects are clearly concerned with redressing marginalization. Local/Social Innovation is primarily interested in marginalized social groups and their inclusion in social decision making (governance) and social allocation (meeting unmet needs). Community Economies conceives marginalization differently. They see everyone as marginalized by the dominant conception of Economy that is assumed to govern itself and to disproportionately affect the surrounding social space. In the face of this general marginalization, their language politics attempts to bring widespread but discursively

marginalized activities to light, revaluing caring labour, informal transactions, alternative enterprises (and more) as major economic forces, and thereby revaluing the subjects who enact them.

Turning around the emphasis on marginalization, both projects are concerned about fostering its opposite – social justice and inclusion. Local/Social Innovation is interested in the inclusion of the marginalized in democratically governed projects that address their needs, and in strategies of connecting these innovative projects with existing governance institutions. Community Economies focuses on rethinking economy as a social space of interdependence. Inclusion in this space requires cultivating new forms of self-recognition, through which individuals and groups come to see themselves as shaping/governing economic processes rather than as simply subjected to them.

Perhaps the most interesting overlap between the two projects is their concern with theorizing the dynamics of innovation. Local/Social Innovation is interested in the growth and development of the social economy, which they see as emerging both from people's changing aspirations and also in response to the crises of a larger (capitalist) economy that periodically fails to meet people's needs for employment and well-being. In this latter framing, capitalism is positioned as the principal motor of change, with the social economy and social innovation seen as responding (Moulaert et al. 2005). At the same time, social innovation is (implicitly) understood as a present and proliferative force, ready to be called into action at critical moments; it emerges from the marginalized themselves as they struggle to have their needs met, including their needs for changes in social relations and governance.

While similarly concerned with dynamics, Community Economies is interested in displacing capitalism from the driver's seat of social and economic change. They turn their attention away from the so-called structural dynamics of a capitalist system, and emphasize instead the ethical dynamics of decision making involved in constructing community economies. While they recognize and admire the capacity of the marginalized to spontaneously engage in social innovation, at the same time they are attuned to the resistances of those marginalized by the Economy (all of us). In their view, subjects tend to experience the Economy as an external, almost colonizing power to which they are beholden. Even within the domain of activism and entrepreneurship, the economic imagination is often timid when it comes to thinking outside the capitalist box. This means that we need to cultivate ourselves and others (everyone, that is) as economic subjects with the capacity to innovate and the courage to explore an unmapped terrain.

The final shared concern of the two projects is the goal of bringing a new economy and society into being (though Local/Social Innovation would probably not express themselves in such immodest terms). Focusing on the social economy as a site of innovation and dynamism in contemporary Europe, Local/Social Innovation brings to bear concentrated intellectual resources on an economic sector that has only recently begun to emerge from the shadows. Their attention to the sector and its innovative and inclusive potentials is critical to its emergence as a potent social force, helping to attract credibility, resources, and talent to the sector, and to make it the focus of policy initiatives and political agendas. Their project is an example of how attention strengthens what is attended to, and how social research contributes to consolidating realities by

making previously marginal sites and activities the focus of widespread interest and deliberate action.

The Community Economies project is more explicit about the role of social research in helping to create the realities it also describes. Whether through presentations and publications or through action research on the ground, they see their work as potentially ‘performing’ a diverse economy – that is, making it an everyday, commonsense reality by broadening and strengthening the activist imagination, inciting academic investigations among colleagues and students, and suggesting innovative directions for policy intervention. Their vision of the performativity of research foregrounds the ethical decision making of researchers, the choices we make about what to devote attention to and thus to strengthen. The process of ethical self-cultivation that is required to create subjects of community economies is also required of us as academic subjects interested in creating other worlds. This chapter could be seen as a locus and instrument for cultivating a new academic subject, one who regards the academy as an integral and active part of the new worlds being constructed and who seeks academic allies in the process of construction.

References

- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2003), 'An Ethics of the Local,' *Rethinking Marxism* 15:1, 49–74.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006), *A Postcapitalist Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Gonzalez, S. and Healey, P. (2005), 'A Sociological Institutional Approach to the Study of Innovation in Governance Capacity', *Urban Studies* 42:11, 2055–69.
- Ironmonger, D. (1996), 'Counting Outputs, Capital Inputs, and Caring Labor: Estimating Gross Household Product', *Feminist Economics* 2:3, 37–64.
- Moulaert, F., Delvainquière, J.-C., and Demazière, C. et al. (2000) *Globalization and Integrated Area Development in European Cities*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O. (2005), 'Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present', *Urban Studies* 42:11, 2037–53.
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E. and Gonzalez, S. (2005), 'Towards Alternative Model(s) of Local Innovation', *Urban Studies* 42:11, 1969–90.
- Moulaert, F., and Nussbaumer, J. (2005), 'The Social Region: Beyond the Territorial Dynamics of the Learning Economy', *European Urban and Regional Studies* 12:1, 45–64.
- Nancy, J-L. (1992), 'La Comparution/The Compearance: From the Existence of "Communism" to the Community of "Existence"', Trans. Strong, T. B., *Political Theory* 20:3, 371–98.
- Novy, A. and Leubolt, B. (2005), 'Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Social

Innovation and the Dialectical Relationship of State and Civil Society', *Urban*

Studies 42:11, 2023–36

Figure 1 A Diverse Economy*

<i>Transactions</i>	<i>Labour</i>	<i>Enterprise</i>
MARKET	WAGE	CAPITALIST
<i>ALTERNATIVE MARKET</i> <i>Sale of public goods</i> <i>Ethical 'fair-trade' markets</i> <i>Local trading systems</i> <i>Alternative currencies</i> <i>Underground market</i> <i>Co-op exchange</i> <i>Barter</i> <i>Informal market</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE PAID</i> <i>Self-employed</i> <i>Cooperative</i> <i>Indentured</i> <i>Reciprocal labour</i> <i>In kind</i> <i>Work for welfare</i>	<i>ALTERNATIVE CAPITALIST</i> <i>State enterprise</i> <i>Green capitalist</i> <i>Socially responsible firm</i> <i>Non-profit</i>
<i>NON-MARKET</i> <i>Household flows</i> <i>Gift giving</i> <i>Indigenous exchange</i> <i>State allocations</i> <i>State appropriations</i> <i>Gleaning</i> <i>Hunting, fishing, gathering</i> <i>Theft, poaching</i>	<i>UNPAID</i> <i>Housework</i> <i>Family care</i> <i>Neighbourhood work</i> <i>Volunteer</i> <i>Self-provisioning labour</i> <i>Slave labour</i>	<i>NON-CAPITALIST</i> <i>Communal</i> <i>Independent</i> <i>Feudal</i> <i>Slave</i>

*Note: The figure is meant to be read down the columns, not across the rows. Source:

Gibson-Graham (2006, 71).