

COMMUNITY ECONOMIES

JENNY CAMERON AND ISAAC LYNE

Please cite as:

Jenny Cameron and Isaac Lyne, 2021 (forthcoming). Community Economies. In Nicola Banks, Susan Engel, Paul Hodge, Emma Mawdsley, Jonathan Makuwira, Naohiro Nakamura, Jonathan Rigg, Albert Salamanca, Kearnin Sims and Pichamon Yeophantong (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Global Development*, Routledge.

INTRODUCTION

A community economies approach is concerned with creating post-capitalist worlds.ⁱ In this approach, these worlds are understood as already existing. In place of the refrain ‘another world is possible’, a community economies approach says ‘another world is already here’—but these worlds are hard to detect because of the dominant Western way of understanding economies and societies. Thus, a community economies approach aims to seek out and strengthen already existing post-capitalist worlds. This involves community economies scholars using action research methods to work with community-based partners to help make post-capitalist activities more visible, and then to devise ways and means to build on and strengthen these activities. In this chapter, we demonstrate this community economies approach by discussing three development projects in the Asia-Pacific region. These projects are characterised by attentiveness to local conditions and to local values and aspirations. Thus, a community economies approach to doing development differently starts by acknowledging the local context and valuing the diverse economic activities and possibilities that are already present.

The economic development pathways that result from a community economies approach emphasise the interconnections and interdependencies between people and between people and environments. This differs from mainstream development pathways which generally are based on the Western assumption of individuated and economically rational actors disconnected not just from other people but from the environments around. As we discuss in this chapter, sometimes this means acknowledging, valuing and tracking those things that are already important to local communities, sometimes this means taking steps to actively foster community-based economic initiatives, and sometimes what is important is to “leave the villagers alone” (Somsak 2005 cited in McKinnon 2017: 344). Such an approach has crucial implications for policy and practice, and for pedagogy. Before discussing the three projects and their implications, it is important to clarify what is meant by post-capitalist worlds in a community economies approach.

POST-CAPITALIST WORLDS

For some, post-capitalism is understood in temporal terms as an economic phase that follows capitalism (e.g. Mason 2016). This is not the understanding of a community economies approach. In a community economies approach, post-capitalism refers to a way of thinking about economies and societies (with implications for policy and practice, and pedagogy). Rather than understanding the world as dominated by one form of economy

(capitalism) which might be replaced by another (post-capitalism), a community economies approach understands the world as being comprised of multiple and diverse economic activities (including capitalist activities, but also non-capitalist and even alternative capitalist activities).ⁱⁱ One analogy used in a community economies approach is that of the iceberg. Visible above the waterline are a relatively small set of economic activities associated with capitalism (capitalist firms employing paid workers producing goods and services that are transacted through markets); but hidden below the waterline are an immense array of economic activities. Post-capitalism refers to a shift in thinking—from thinking that the economy is only those set of activities above the waterline to thinking that the economy is vast and diverse.

Thinking in this way is crucial to a community economies approach as it helps to shed light on the economic possibilities that already exist in the world (but are hidden by blinkered economic thinking). In particular, a community economies approach is interested in those diverse economic activities that contribute to wellbeing of both people and the planet. These are the economic activities that help people to survive well; to produce and distribute surplus in ways that take into account the wellbeing of other people and the planet; to transact goods and services more fairly; to care for shared resources; and to invest in ways that will support a better future (Gibson-Graham et al. 2013). Thus, a community economies approach involves identifying and acknowledging the economic activities that contribute to wellbeing and considering ways that these activities might be strengthened and multiplied. In what follows, we discuss three projects that illustrate various aspects of a community economies approach. In these sections, we include discussion of the implications for policy and practice. In the penultimate section we consider the overall implications for pedagogy.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PATHWAY 1: ACKNOWLEDGING AND VALUING COMMUNITY ECONOMIC PRIORITIES

The first project was based in Fiji and the Solomon Islands and here community economies scholars worked with the NGO International Women’s Development Agency (IWDA) and their local NGO partners. These NGO partners were looking to develop community-based indicators to be able to track the gendered impacts of economic social and environmental changes, especially in settings where subsistence and semi-subsistence livelihoods are being impacted by growth of export-oriented agriculture, spread of a cash economy and rapid urbanisation (McKinnon et al. 2016). These current changes are compounding the gendered impacts of colonisation in the late nineteenth century on Solomon Islanders and iTaukei (Indigenous) Fijians. For example, through colonisation, women’s traditional work was devalued and women’s input into community-level decisions eroded; meanwhile, men “gained status, power and recognition in the cash economy” (McKinnon et al. 2016: 1378).

This project sought to develop indicators of the gendered impacts of change that incorporated community-level perspectives. This meant tapping into what mattered for community members, including what their experiences had been to date and what their aspirations were. It also meant putting to one side Western assumptions which generally to frame human rights as individual rights and development as resulting from the actions of economically rational individuals. These assumptions are reflected in the way that programs for women’s economic empowerment tend to prioritise developing the entrepreneurial

skills of individual women so they can run micro-enterprises and participate in local markets. McKinnon et al. (2016: 1379-1380) highlight that the assumption of individualism is at odds with collective ways of being that are important for Solomon Islanders and iTaukei Fijians. As well, such agendas ignore (and potentially undermine) the diverse economic activities on which the wellbeing of families and community members relies, including non-market transactions such as reciprocity and gifting, and unpaid work such as caring labor, volunteering and shared labor.

To inquire into what mattered for community members, the research team engaged in a series of community workshops conducted in local languages. Workshops were held in two rural settlements in the Solomon Islands (in Western Province), two urban settlements around Honiara, and two urban settlements in Suva (with iTaukei Fijians). The workshops were facilitated by the local NGO research partners in Solomon Islands Pidgin and Bauan Fijian. Between ten to fifteen community members participated in each workshop, with roughly equal numbers of women and men, and older (40 years+) and younger (18-40 years) participants (Carnegie et al. 2019: 255). Participants included those from nuclear and extended families, and female-headed households; those who were single or married; and those with or without children. At the workshops the researchers ran four group exercises: an inventory of diverse economies focusing on individual daily work activities; a mapping of distributions of labor, goods and cash within the networks of family and community members; a timeline of events that produced significant change; and role plays on desired changes in relations between women and men. Some exercises were conducted in gender- and age-segregated groups with participants coming together for shared discussion (Carnegie et al. 2019: 255).

These exercises were an opportunity for community members to talk more about their everyday experiences of gendered and economic relationships and their aspirations for how these relationships might be. The exercises were also an opportunity for the team of researchers to listen attentively to the understandings and aspirations of community members:

we listened for and acknowledged the diversity of economic activities in which women and men were involved ... We also listened for the culturally important and different ways that women and men's contributions are valued in the community ... [We listened] to how community members foresaw possibilities of cooperation, negotiation and change for the better. (Carnegie et al. 2019: 255-256)

Based on this exercise in listening, the research team (involving community economies scholars, and staff from IWDA and their local NGO partners) devised an initial series of indicators based on what participants said mattered to them. The indicators were then tested with groups of local volunteers from villages around Honiara and, based on the feedback, further refined. These indicators were organised in terms of four domains related to gendered and economic relationships. The domains were named by incorporating participants' phrases from the workshops: Women 'Come Up' (related to women's individual agency and access to opportunities); Household Togetherness (related to relations between women and men in households); Women's Collective Action (related to mutual support and collaboration between women); and Leadership, Say and Role Modelling (related to women's opportunities for participation and leadership, and the

quality of men's leadership) (Carnegie et al. 2019: 256). Of these four, Women 'Come Up' was most aligned with mainstream development and human rights policy agendas. But in this project all four domains were given equal importance. This was reflected in the representation of the four domains as being tributaries of a River of Change. The metaphor of a river also helped to communicate the role of indicators with comparisons being made to how water samples along the course of a river can provide vital information about water quality and interventions that might be needed to improve water quality. With these indicators (which encapsulate both existing economic activities as well as the way that community members would like things to be) local NGOs and community members can track what is happening and intervene when activities are being weakened or are under threat.

The indicators that were developed and the process used to generate the indicators are documented in resource materials that other communities can apply (Carnegie et al. 2012). In turn, those who have used these materials have documented their processes and the outcomes. For example, Live and Learn International's Western Pacific Sanitation, Marketing and Innovation Project produced a short 6-minute documentary on how their staff have used the floating coconut tool (which had been developed as part of the original project to translate the image of the diverse economy iceberg to the context of the Pacific Island countries) (see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t0zQjGtg2d0>). Staff from the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu report how the tool provides an effective means of making women's economic contribution more evident to women and men, and how this has especially helped men to better understand the crucial contribution of women's work to the well-being of families and communities (see also, Thomas, 2015).

In terms of the implications for policy and practice, this project highlights the importance of attentive listening. Based on the understanding that post-capitalist possibilities are already present, the community economies researchers asked questions, observed and listened for these existing possibilities. This led to an appreciation of how wellbeing is sustained by a raft of individual and collective practices. The process of attentive listening includes putting aside pre-existing assumptions. For example, mainstream development and human rights policy agendas tend to rely on imported assumptions about economically rational individuals and gender equity. This is reflected in programs for women's economic empowerment that are based on the development of individual entrepreneurial skills and micro-enterprises. This research found that such programs are of interest to women but there was also a strong desire for economic empowerment that incorporated greater acknowledgement of women's household contribution, opportunities for women to work collectively and avenues for women to contribute to decision-making. Prioritising only economic activities that have an individual focus overlooks and potentially undermines group, household and community economic activities and relationships which are equally important for wellbeing. Listening attentively and putting to one side familiar assumptions are crucial if the range of activities that sustain wellbeing are to be heard.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PATHWAY 2: BUILDING COMMUNITY-BASED INITIATIVES

The Jagna Community Partnering Project was based in the Philippines (in Jagna on the island of Bohol, in the country's Central Visayas region). The project involved a collaboration

between community economies researchers, the NGO Unlad Kabayan Migrant Services Foundation Inc. and the Municipal Planning and Development Unit from the Jagna Municipal Government. Unlad Kabayan is largely funded through the remittances of overseas migrant workers from the Philippines and it has pioneered a strategy of Migrant Savings for Alternative Investment. Here the goal is to fund alternative investment to help foster economic opportunities within the Philippines, so the next generation of family members do not have to support their families by moving overseas as migrant workers and sending remittances back home. Unlad Kabayan is therefore interested in generating endogenous economic development pathways, and especially the potential for economic initiatives based on the collective effort of groups of people (Gibson et al. 2010).

The Jagna Community Partnering Project employed seven researchers: four community members recruited from economically marginalised groups in Jagna, and staff from the university partner (Australian National University), Unlad Kabayan and the Municipal Planning and Development Unit (Cahill 2008). The action research project started with an assets-based approach of working with community members to document the diversity of assets in Jagna, especially the diversity of economic activities.ⁱⁱⁱ This exercise revealed the extent of available resources, knowledge and skills, and diverse economies (including small-scale rice and fruit farming, and customary exchange practices based on bartering, gleaning, labor sharing and gifting) (Gibson et al. 2010). Community members were then supported to develop economic initiatives that built on these assets. For example, a group of older women were interested in putting together the abundance of ginger in the region with their skills, gained over generations, in processing ginger into tea powder (known locally as *salabat*). Initially, the women felt that an economic initiative was beyond their reach as it would require the input of significant monetary start-up capital, funding they were unlikely to be able to access because of their age and background. But with a tiny grant from the Community Partnering Project they were supported to conduct their own market research and mobilize goodwill from local traders who agreed to sell their product. They learned, “we can start with what we have” (Community Economies Collective & Gibson 2009: 130).^{iv} Other initiatives that were started through the project included a coconut confectionary enterprise that allowed a group of farmers to value-add to their coconut harvest, and a sewing enterprise that filled the demand for specialised clothing including gowns for school graduations. These enterprises provided households with a cash income (for things such as medicines, schooling and transport) which supplemented their largely subsistence-based livelihoods.

The steps and outcomes of the Community Partnering Project have been made readily available through resources that include a Community Partnering website (which includes short videos of all the economic enterprises that were initiated) (<http://www.communitypartnering.info/>) and a 50-minute documentary (Gibson et al. 2008). Here the intention is to expand economic development pathways in the Philippines (and in other countries that are heavily reliant on exporting their citizens as overseas migrant workers or importing exploitative labor and resource stripping practices from the so-called developed world). Unlad Kabayan continues this work through its mission of “mobilizing migrant workers, the marginalized in the community and their resources to build a sustainable local economy” (<http://www.unladkabayan.org/vision-mission.html>), and through the partnerships it continues to build with municipal authorities and others.

Similar to the research project in the Solomon Islands and Fiji, the Jagna Community Partnering Project involved attentive listening to learn more about the post-capitalist possibilities that were already present. Responding to the concerns of local NGOs, the research in the Solomon Islands and Fiji focused on designing a set of indicators that captured those things that community members said they valued and the direction of change they said they wanted (and as outlined above, these concerns are resonating in other contexts in the Pacific as the indicators and associated tools are being applied and adapted). In the context of the Philippines, the research focused on developing a process for stimulating endogenous economic development. One of the lessons from the Community Partnering Project is the value of genuine partnerships. The project serves as an illustration of what can be achieved by partnerships between academic researchers, practitioners and communities, especially when all parties are involved at every step from the initial conceptualisation of the project to the ongoing work of supporting the outcomes of the project (including promoting the resource material). In the case of this project, the partners already had relationships with each other, and had spent developing trust with each other. They were in no rush to enter into the formal partnership that became the Community Partnering Project but waited until they were ready to proceed on their own terms. This approach speaks to the importance of allowing time for relationships to develop and for genuine partnerships to take root.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PATHWAY 3: “LEAVE THE VILLAGERS ALONE”

The third project was based in two villages in eastern Cambodia near the town of Kampong Cham, the country’s sixth largest urban settlement. As across other parts of Cambodia, daily life in these villages occurs in the shadow cast by the violence and terror of the Khmer Rouge’s regime of the late 1970s. Even after the Khmer Rouge was ousted by Vietnamese forces at the end of 1978, local despots stepped into the political vacuum and continued a reign of violence and terror in this part of the country until the 1990s (Hinton 2005). Any development project in Cambodia has to be alert to the ongoing effects of trauma; nevertheless, the effects run deep and even the most attentive of projects can overlook and potentially destabilize the ways and means that people have developed to survive and live together post-conflict. In this setting, Somsak’s (2005) admonishment to “leave the villagers alone” (cited in McKinnon 2017: 344) is a credible development pathway.

The project in these two villages was modelled on the action research approach used in the Jagna Community Partnering Project. Local community members were invited to participate as community researchers; and through workshops, field trips and walking tours an inventory of local economic activities was assembled. The next phase focussed on social enterprise development based on some of the activities identified in the inventory. The inventory phase identified a diverse range of local economic activities, including subsistence agriculture and livestock raising; informal trading in and around the local markets; informal construction work; harvesting, cutting and selling bamboo as barbeque skewers; and in a few cases formal employment in the nearby MedTecs International Corporation which employs around 5,000 workers to manufacture medical clothing.

Participants expressed an interest in developing additional activities based on the bamboo resources in the area. Some requested workshops so they could learn additional skills in

bamboo furniture making. A trainer was secured from the Rattan Association of Cambodia (which supplies products to the multinational furniture retailer, IKEA). Despite initial enthusiasm, attendance was poor, and no project participants came to the final workshop. Even those who had prepared bamboo for this workshop did not attend. Indeed, on the day before the final workshop, on being asked by phone about preparations, one participant proclaimed to the researcher that “tomorrow I will have diarrhoea” (Lyne 2017: 178). The drop-off in interest and attendance can certainly be explained by practical concerns. The participants have to spend most of their time securing what is a precarious existence; they do not have time to participate in an unpaid workshop that is only likely to bring a return on their investment of time at some distant point in the future (if there is any return on this investment).

However, it also became clear that there was a highly nuanced and finely balanced bamboo skewer community economy that could potentially be destabilized by the additional use of bamboo resources in the area. The villagers (mostly women) make bamboo skewers that are sold to one middleman who then sells the skewers further afield to barbeque businesses and street food stalls. The work of making skewers is conducted at home, and it is easy to fit in and around women’s other home-based activities. Even though villagers receive around US\$1.50 for six hours work making skewers, it is an income that can be relied on, especially during the dry season which can be a time of high outward migration with some temporarily moving to urban areas to pick up informal work. Making bamboo skewers also serves as an economic safety net (in the absence of a national welfare system). This became evident when one villager was fired from the MedTecs garment factory because he participated in a strike. The family was dependent on his wage; with that lost, the family immediately turned to skewer making.

There is a tacit agreement that all villagers are entitled to this economic safety net. The bamboo is on public land, but each household has a claim to a specific plot. Those who deplete their plot can borrow from other households and return it when their bamboo regrows. It is unknown for any household to reject the request to borrow. Indeed, there is no theft of bamboo, perhaps because these requests are not refused. When one household borrows the bamboo from another’s plot the bamboo is carefully cut so that the bamboo is thinned to let in light and promote growth. The idea of using the bamboo for furniture had the potential to destabilize this finely-tuned community economy. As one village elder later commented about the workshops, “They were worried about losing the bamboo.” Indeed, the villages had this experience when the nearby lake was designated private and dredged for sand. Their fisheries were lost and the soil quality for agriculture was compromised. As well as an economic safety net, the bamboo skewer community economy served an additional role—it balanced household and community commitments in a way that enabled villagers to build relationships of trust with each other in the post-conflict era.

In terms of implications for policy and practice, this project illustrates how important it is to listen attentively but how difficult this can be. In this instance, the participants were initially keen to develop an enterprise based on an additional use for bamboo, but away from the eyes and ears of the researcher, the villagers reconsidered their initial decision and found a powerful way to relay their revised decision (by not turning up). Certainly, the decision to not attend reflects practical concerns (about the immediate priorities for villagers, including

their use of time). These concerns are important to consider in any development project. But in the post-conflict context of Cambodia a deeper concern is being relayed about the pivotal role that resources play in households and communities, and how sometimes it is best to leave matters as they are. Even though the furniture making did not proceed, the lessons learned about this resource meant that when changes were being made to a nearby bamboo bridge the researcher was able to hear more clearly. In this case, a hand-built bamboo bridge that is reconstructed each dry season to provide access between an island on the Mekong River and the nearby town of Kampong Cham was being replaced by a much larger concrete bridge that would permanently connect the island to the mainland. The bridge builders and the villagers on the island had mixed feelings about this symbol of 'progress.' In response, the researcher initiated, with others, a 60-minute documentary film that captures the final making of the bamboo bridge and the crucial role that bamboo has played in the lives of the bridge builders and the villagers for centuries (Gibson & Salazar 2019). This film reflects back to people their everyday lives, and the resources and relationships that have been important to making their lives what they are.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PEDAGOGY

The community economies approach has three main implications for pedagogy. First, it is important that the language of economics is expanded so the crucial role and potential diverse economic activities is more readily apparent. This would both expand the economic understanding of students who are unfamiliar with economic diversity, and value what is already known by students whose lived experience of economic diversity is not reflected in mainstream economic language. Tools such as the iceberg and the floating coconut provide a good starting point to help make diversity more visible and for valuing diversity (and these tools are readily available online, for example, <https://www.communityeconomies.org/resources/diverse-economies-iceberg>). There are also associated tools such as Asset-Based Community Development that can be augmented by including economic diversity as a crucial community asset (e.g. Cameron & Gibson 2001). Such tools that document economic diversity provide the basis for students to appreciate the contribution that diversity makes to people's lives. Here a community economies approach has sought to develop questions that can be asked to help bring to the fore the ways diverse economic activities contribute to people and planetary wellbeing. This includes questions about how activities contribute to surviving well, to just and sustainable production and distribution of surplus, to the fair transaction of good and services, to care for shared resources, and to forms of investment that are oriented towards a better future (e.g. Gibson-Graham et al. 2013). From this, students might then be able to recognise the multitude of post-capitalist possibilities that already exist and how these possibilities can provide the basis for more equitable and sustainable economic development pathways.

Second, it is important that students develop skills in working with others, including the capacity to listen to and hear others. As community economies researchers point out, the 'community' in community economies is not about pre-existing communities (such as those based on a shared identity or location). Rather, community is a process of "being-with" others (Gibson-Graham 2006: 81-82), including the world around. In other words, fundamental to our existence is our interdependence with others and how we ethically

negotiate ways of living together on a finite planet (captured in different contexts in terms such as living well and *buen viver*). In the classroom setting, doing group work is one way to help develop relevant skills, and here there are opportunities for students with a range of life experiences to work together to try out the various tools that community economies researchers have developed for working with communities. For example, the Community Partnering for Local Development website (<http://www.communitypartnering.info/>), which is based on the Jagna Community Partnering Project, includes exercises in needs and assets mapping and a 'portrait of gifts' that can be adapted for the classroom. The caution with group work (especially assessable group work) is that it has to be scaffolded so that students have the opportunity to learn both cognitively and experientially about group processes, forms of negotiation, and ways of 'being-with' others.

Third, it is important that students have the opportunity to cultivate an open and enquiring mind especially by putting aside pre-existing assumptions. In community economies scholarship, this is associated with "refusing to know too much" (Gibson-Graham 2006: 8). This disposition fits well with the affective and embodied forms of learning that can be prompted through exercises such as fields trips and exposure to cultural artefact such as films. One of the benefits of these types of exercises is that they create opportunities for students to 'stand in the shoes' of others and to see things from others' perspectives. Field trips have been a mainstay of the community economies approach and the types of outcomes that can be provoked through this method have been reflected on in Cameron (2011), Cameron and Gibson (2005) and Lyne (2017). Films have also been produced by community economies scholars as provocations to encounter the world differently.^v For example, the Bamboo Bridge documentary sheds light on little-known things that communities have done well for generations and that intuitively balance social and environmental sustainability and resilience. It also gives room for the world-at-large to speak through evocative images and sounds of bamboo and water. This documentary might help to challenge generalised preconceptions or caricatures of a country such as Cambodia and help to show how sometimes our best inclinations to 'help' or 'develop' communities represents a liability.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we have discussed three projects that exemplify the ways in which a community economies approach to doing development differently starts by acknowledging the local context and valuing the diverse economic activities and possibilities that are already present. This gives rise to economic development pathways that are appropriate to the context. In the indicators project in Fiji this meant acknowledging the current range of activities that contribute to individual and community wellbeing as well as acknowledging the aspirations that community members for how these activities might be changed for the better. In the Jagna Community Partnering Project (in the Philippines) this meant working with groups of community members to build on existing individual and community assets. In the work in Cambodia, the appropriate development pathway was to 'leave the villagers alone.' The implications for policy and practice involve recognition of the importance of attentive listening, relationship building and time. The implications for pedagogy involve deepening economic literacy, developing skills that are vital for working with others and developing a capacity for openness and to be affected by others.

REFERENCES

Cahill, A. (2008) "Power Over, Power To, Power With: Shifting Perceptions of Power for Local Economic Development in the Philippines," Asia Pacific Viewpoint 49(3), 294-304.

Cameron, J. (with Manhood C. & Pomfrett J.) (2011) "Bodily Learning for a (Climate) Changing World," Local Environment 16(6), 493-508.

Cameron, J., & Gibson, K. (2001) Shifting Focus: Alternative Pathways for Communities and Economies, Victoria: Latrobe City Council and Monash University.

---- (2005) "Participatory Action Research in a Poststructuralist Vein," Geoforum 36(3), 315-31.

Carnegie, M., McKinnon, K., & Gibson, K. (2019) "Creating Community-based Indicators of Gender Equity: A Methodology," Asia Pacific Viewpoint 60(3), 252–266.

Carnegie, M., Rowland, C., Gibson, K., McKinnon, K., Crawford, J., & Slatter, C. (2012) Gender and Economy in Melanesian Communities: A Manual of Indicators and Tools to Track Change, Sydney: University of Western Sydney, Macquarie University and International Women's Development Agency.

Community Economies Collective & Gibson, K. (2009) "Building Community-based Social Enterprises in the Philippines," in A. Amin (ed.) The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity, London: Zed Books, 116-39.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (1996) The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy, Oxford: Blackwell.

---- (2006) A Postcapitalist Politics, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., Cameron, J., & Healy, S. (2013) Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming our Communities, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., & Dombroski, K. (eds) (2020) The Handbook of Diverse Economies, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., & Dombroski, K. (2020) "Introduction", in J.K. Gibson-Graham & K. Dombroski (eds) The Handbook of Diverse Economies, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1–24.

Hinton, A. (2005) Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Gibson K. (Executive Producer) & Salazar JF. (Director), (2019) The Bamboo Bridge [Motion picture], Australia: Matadora Films.

Gibson, K., Cahill, A. & McKay, D. (2010) "Rethinking the Dynamics of Rural Transformation: Performing Different Development Pathways in a Philippine Municipality," Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 35(2), 237-55.

Gibson, K., Hill, A. & McLay, P. (2008) Building Social Enterprises in the Philippines, (DVD), Canberra: The Australian National University. Online at <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLKN9NChecdBKp-TicDgbVWp3hm3ifLLbr>

Kretzmann, J. & McKnight, J. (1993) Building Communities from the Inside Out, Chicago: ACTA.

Lyne, I. (2017) Social Enterprise and Community Development: Theory into Practice in Two Cambodian Villages, PhD thesis, Australia: Western Sydney University.

Mason, P. (2016) Postcapitalism: A Guide to Our Future, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

McKinnon, K. (2017) "Naked Scholarship: Prefiguring a New World Through Uncertain Development Geographies," Geographical Research 55(3), 344-349.

McKinnon, K., Carnegie, M., Gibson, K., & Rowland, C. (2016) "Gender Equality and Economic Empowerment in the Solomon Islands and Fiji: A Place-based Approach," Gender, Place and Culture 23(10), 1376-1391.

Roelvink, G., St. Martin, K., & Gibson-Graham, J.K., (eds) (2015) Making Other Worlds Possible: Performing Diverse Economies, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thomas, A. (2015) Floating Coconuts in Vanuatu. Stories from the Field, Online at <https://thewashbusiness.wordpress.com/2015/03/07/floating-coconuts-in-vanuatu/>.

FURTHER READING

Cameron, J., & Gibson, K. (2020) "Action Research for Diverse Economies," in J.K. Gibson-Graham and K. Dombroski (eds) Handbook of Diverse Economies, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 511-519. (A discussion of the research steps in three action research projects, including the Jagna Community Partnering Project in the Philippines. The chapter highlights the role of a politics of language, a politics of the self and a politics of collective action as post-structural research tools that can play a role in policy formulation).

Lyne, I. (2017) "Social Enterprise and the Everydayness of Precarious Indigenous Cambodian Villagers: Challenging Ethnocentric Epistemologies," in C. Essers, P. Dey, D. Tedmanson & K. Verduyn (eds) Critical Perspectives on Entrepreneurship; Challenging Dominant Discourses in Entrepreneurship, London: Routledge, 36-50. (This paper uses a diverse economies perspective to analyse a development intervention which aimed to increase resin tappers' incomes by developing opportunities along the value chain while instigating or supporting resin producer associations. The paper finds that an independently founded producer association was more sustainable than one marshalled together by consultants who were

focused on the value chain primarily. It shows how wellbeing is promoted by a closely integrated subsistence, barter, and gift economy intermeshed with spiritual practices).

Lyne, I. & Madden, A. (2020) "Enterprising New Worlds: Social Enterprise and the Value of Repair," in J.K. Gibson-Graham & K. Dombroski (eds) Handbook of Diverse Economies, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 74-81. (This chapter examines social enterprise through the lens of decolonial thinking and loving kindness, and highlights the role that everyday activities can play in repairing or maintaining communities in damaged and traumatised societies. The analysis is an alternative to the notion that social enterprises are subject to the logic of capital and should act in ways that are competitive and business-like).

Gibson, K, Astuti, R., Carnegie, M., Chalernphon, A., Dombroski, K., Haryani, A.R., Hill, A., Kehi, B., Law, L., Lyne, I., McGregor, A., McKinnon, K., McWilliam, A., Miller, F., Ngin, C., Ocoña-Gutierrez, D., Palmer, L., Placino, P., Rampengan, M., Lei Lei Than, W., Isiyana Wianti, N., & Wright, S. (2018), Community Economies in Monsoon Asia: Keywords and Key Reflections, Asia Pacific Viewpoint 59(1), 3–16. (This collaborative project documents the extent of diverse economic practices across Monsoon Asia that the modernist imaginary assumes have been superseded by the growth of the cash economy. By highlighting the persistence, and even flourishing, of these economic practices, the paper contributes to a post-development agenda).

Mathie, A., Cameron, J. & Gibson, K. (2017) "Asset-based and Citizen-led Development: Using a Diffracted Power Lens to Analyze the Possibilities and Challenges," Progress in Development Studies 17(1), 54-66. (This paper draws on projects from Africa and Asia to show how an asset-based development approach can be used to reverse internalized powerlessness, strengthen opportunities for collective endeavours and help to build local capacity for action. The paper is a counter to the modernist assumption that power is a resource held by some and not others, and that strategies such as asset-based and citizen-led development are an extension of the neoliberal project).

ⁱ The community economies approach discussed in this chapter is associated with the work of J.K. Gibson-Graham (e.g. Gibson-Graham 1996; 2006) and their collaborations with other members of the Community Economies Research Network (e.g. Gibson-Graham et al. 2013; Gibson-Graham & Dombroski 2020; Roelvink et al. 2015).

ⁱⁱ More recently, some community economies scholars have used the term more-than-capitalist rather than post-capitalist (e.g. Gibson-Graham & Dombroski 2020).

ⁱⁱⁱ This was an adaptation of an earlier process developed in Australia (Cameron & Gibson 2005), which in turn was based on an adaptation of the Asset-Based Community Development work of Kretzmann and McKnight (1993).

^{iv} For this publication, the Community Economies Collective writers included May-An Villalba and Benilda Flores-Rom from Unlad Kabayan Migrant Services Foundation Inc; and Maureen Balaba and Joy Miralles-Apag from Bohol Initiatives for Migration and Community Development.

^v Along with the films mentioned in this chapter, other films include *It's in Our Hands* (Parts 1 and 2) (see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=11r_h9GeV2Q and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ptLjXNECrFs>) and *Social Enterprise and Asset Based Community Development in Cambodia* (see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ux2DZ5fGPw0&t=2949s>)