Researching Postcapitalist Possibilities: Pedagogy as Resubjectivation

Jenny Cameron and Katherine Gibson

Pre-publication Version

2025, *Review of Radical Political Economics*. 57(3), 545-565. Special Issue on Anticapitalist Pedagogies and Teaching Radical Economics. DOI: 10.1177/04866134251341912

For more information, please email jenny.cameron@communityeconomies.org

Abstract

Drawing on decades of place-based action research to make other economies possible, members of the Community Economies Institute (CEI) have developed a range of anti-capitalist pedagogies. Most recently these pedagogies have informed the CEI Summer/Winter School on the theme of Researching Postcapitalist Possibilities. Having run the ten-day program for three years with 120 participants, we are now in a position to reflect on what we have learned about anti-capitalist pedagogies and teaching radical economics. We argue that even though the school's curriculum covers the distinctive Community Economies approach what is perhaps more important are the pedagogical exercises and principles that we use to help transform how participants think of themselves as activists, artists, practitioners, and researchers, and how they understand their role in making other economies possible. We discuss how the school uses appreciative, experimental, and collaborative modes of working to provide participants with a taste of what it might mean to step aside from the critical mode that characterizes much academic training, and to adopt the stance of a researcher oriented towards engendering possibility in the world.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the volunteer contribution of members of the Community Economies Institute (and the Community Economies Research Network) who have contributed to Summer/Winter Schools, especially the facilitators (Tuomo Alhojarvi, Elizabeth Barron, Ottavia Cima, Kelly Dombroski, Bianca Elzenbaumer, Stephen Healy, Flora Mammana, Katharine McKinnon, Ethan Miller, Molly Mullen, Pryor Placino, Pieta Savinotko, Emma Sharp, Thomas Smith, Kevin St. Martin, and Bradley Wilson), and those who participated in panels and individual research meetings with participants. We thank the two reviewers Surbhi Kesar and Anastasia Wilson for their guidance to help us sharpen the paper, and we thank Managing Editor Enid Arvidson for her support.

> The Summer/Winter School had a profound impact … I felt it was more of an anti-school, in the sense that it was untraining us in the critical habits of thinking to which we'd become accustomed … I have pivoted to conducting research which strengthens the progressive potential of migrant women's collective actions. The school has opened up truly transformative possibilities for combining community-grounded research and activism!
>
> Rosi Aryal Lees, Participant from the 2022 Summer/Winter School

1. Introduction

Our contribution to anti-capitalist pedagogy has developed over three decades in the context of action research to make other economies possible. We have worked with communities most affected by deindustrialization and colonial underdevelopment (e.g., Cameron and Gibson 2001; Community Partnering for Local Development n.d.). Our practical "how to" book *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming our Communities* (Gibson-Graham et al. 2013) has been translated into five languages and used to open up the vision of a diverse "more-than-capitalist" economy where activism can be directed to strengthening non-capitalist logics such as mutual aid, cooperativism, non-commodified production and exchange, commoning, and non-market distributive mechanisms. From these experiences with communities and activists, we know that the thirst for economic transformation is there on the ground. It is also there in the hallowed halls of academia among new (and old) scholars drawn to addressing the environmental crisis and the violences of racial and economic injustice, and eager to build alternative pathways to the future.

Our practical interventions into taking back the economy are underpinned by our background in anti-essentialist Marxism and post-structural Feminism. These themes inform the graduate-level Summer/Winter School that we now offer in the context of the Community Economies Institute (CEI), an international organization that we describe as a NUERO, a Non-University Educational and Research Organization. The school is a ten-day event facilitated by volunteers from the CEI (and the associated Community Economies Research Network or CERN). The school has run in June 2022, 2023, and 2024, and each year has been offered simultaneously in five nodes in the Asia-Pacific region, Europe, and the Americas. Some nodes are face-to-face and some are online. It builds on earlier iterations of the school offered pre-COVID as face-to-face events at Western Sydney University in January 2018, 2019, and 2020, and in Bolsena, Italy in June 2019.

The school is primarily attended by graduate students with a sprinkling of early- and mid-career academics, activists, artists, and practitioners. A not insignificant number of the graduate students and academics have had "past lives" as activists, artists, and practitioners. Participants come from a range of countries, including Aotearoa New Zealand, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Iran, Japan, Mexico, South Korea, the Philippines, the United Kingdon, and the United States, as well as from across Europe (including central and eastern Europe). Participants' backgrounds include anthropology, economics, geography, political ecology, sociology, and urban planning. They are working

on a range of projects in a range of contexts, and the following gives an indication of the diversity: anti-caste struggles in the city of Chennai, India; artisanal and small-scale mining as an agrarian livelihood strategy for Black and Indigenous communities in Colombia and Peru; community-based economic development centered on Sunni-Baluch women needleworkers in Iran; economic development and community building among a network of LGBTQ+ people curating nightlife and art spaces in Los Angeles and CDMX (Mexico City); the financing of retrofits to multi-family residential buildings as part of the decarbonizing of New York City; food forestry in the Netherlands; Māori economies based on kuku (green-lipped mussel); place-based mutual aid in New Mexico to respond to climate crises such as wildfire; risk management among farmers in conflict-vulnerable areas of Mindanao, Philippines; small-scale fisheries co-management in the Catalan region of Spain; the social and solidarity economy of people of African descent in Europe; sustainability transformation pathways for small and medium-sized enterprises; and the use of Instagram by Lebanese cultural organizers as a means of cultivating transnational spaces of connection. Each year there have been between thirty-six and forty-two participants. As of 2024, each face-to-face node is limited to twelve participants with two facilitators, and each online node is limited to ten participants with one or two facilitators. The language of instruction is English with a pilot school being conducted in Spanish and Portuguese in 2025.

This paper starts by outlining the distinctive Community Economies approach and its contribution to anti-capitalist thinking and practice. We then discuss how we organize elements of the Community Economies approach into the school's curriculum, and we give examples of the types of pedagogical exercises used. We highlight how these exercises help to shift participants' understanding of their role as researchers (broadly defined to include the activity of artists, activists, and practitioners) and how they might contribute to making ethical economies possible. We then discuss some of the pedagogical principles we draw on to prompt participants to experience the "anti-school" as a place of "untraining" (to use Rosi's words from the epigraph) where they can reorient themselves to modes of thinking and being that align with a Community Economies practice of world-making.

2. Community Economies Approach to Anti-Capitalist Thinking and Practice

The approach we take to radical political economy has been shaped by the work of feminist economic geographers and Marxian political economists Katherine Gibson and the late Julie Graham who publish under the joint name J.K. Gibson-Graham. Their 1996 book (republished in 2006) *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy* pointed to the politically disempowering effects of dominant Leftist analysis and politics which, at the time, foregrounded the ever-inventive and all-encompassing power of Capitalism with a big C. Gibson-Graham drew attention not to the "what" of economies, but to the "how." How are economies talked about and thought about? How do the words used help to shape what comes to be? They argued that economic discourse was predominantly "capitalocentric" (1996: 6). In other words, Capitalism was held

up as the model of an economy and, in relation to this dominant representation, all other economic forms were positioned as subordinate, opposite but complementary, prefigurative, or contained within. Households, for example, reproduced the workforce for Capitalism; Indigenous economies withered because of the inexorable global march of Capitalism; cooperatives inevitably took on the exploitative practices of Capitalism; and social enterprises served Capitalism by mopping up the damage left in Capitalism's wake. Even though they were writing thirty years ago, the capitalocentrism of economic discourse remains. Capitalism continues to be understood as the hegemonic economic form, and its dynamics and logics as shaping and dominating all other forms of economy. We find that participants in the Summer/Winter School have been well-trained in this economic knowledge and for most it is indisputable that the (economic) world is capitalist.

Why does it matter that the world is understood in this capitalocentric framing? What Gibson-Graham identified in *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It)*—and what still stands—is that the representation of capitalist hegemony has a stranglehold on the political imaginary, shutting off the capacity to imagine or enact alternatives to capitalism. In the capitalocentric narrative, efforts to build alternatives to capitalism are weak, even doomed. Effective anti-capitalist political action has to directly target a beast whose reign is paradoxically impregnable and all-powerful. Gibson-Graham's anti-capitalist line of attack has been to challenge not capitalism per se but the understanding of capitalism, and to engage in a discursive politics of changing how capitalism is thought about, talked about, and written about as a way of creating toeholds for collective action that might support other forms of economy (Gibson-Graham 2006).

One discursive strategy has been to elaborate a language of the "diverse economy" as a way of drawing attention to the heterogeneity of economic practices that sustain lives the world over, from diverse ways of working (paid, unpaid, and alternatively remunerated), to diverse forms of transaction (market, non-market, and alternative markets), diverse types of enterprise (capitalist, non-capitalist, and alternative capitalist), diverse forms of property (private property, alternative private property, and open access "property"), and diverse forms of finance (mainstream markets, alternative markets, and non-market) (e.g., Gibson-Graham and Dombroski 2020, and see section 3.2 below). This elaboration of the diverse economy is of course indebted to the work of feminist economists (e.g., Folbre 2001; Waring 1988), Black and Indigenous scholars and activists (e.g., Bargh 2012; Gordon-Nembhard 2014; Hossein 2018), economic anthropologists (e.g., Gudeman 2001), and others (e.g., Ostrom 1990). The intent here is to demonstrate just how much economic diversity there is across the globe and to highlight how this diversity has been cast into shadow by the relentless big C representation of Capitalism as the hegemonic economic form. The aim of this strategy is simply to inventory diversity and thereby destabilize the identity of the economy.

The second and related discursive strategy has been to draw on the precise Marxian economic language used by Stephen Resnick and Richard Wolff (1987) of class as a process rather than a social grouping. This is based on Resnick and Wolff's reading of the three

volumes of Marx's *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* and Marx's exposition of class as a process of producing, appropriating, and distributing surplus labor. Alongside the capitalist class process (in which a capitalist appropriates and distributes the surplus labor produced by workers) are other class processes: communal (or cooperative), feudal, slave, and independent (or self-employed). These class processes characterize different types of enterprises, i.e., capitalist enterprises, communal (or cooperative) enterprises, feudal enterprises, slave enterprises, and independent (or self-employed) enterprises. In place of a totalizing understanding of capitalism as a system which has integrated other systems of politics, culture, geography, legalities, and so on, capitalism is definitionally "shrunk" to the very specific form of a capitalist enterprise which co-exists with a range of other enterprises. Today, alongside Marx's original formulation, we also find entities that include social enterprises, Indigenous enterprises, and not-for-profit enterprises. We also find that there are diverse capitalist enterprises, some driven by profit maximization, but other "alternative" capitalist enterprises driven by motives such as environmental stewardship or providing employment opportunities for marginalized groups (Cameron 2020). This class process language (and the associated formulation of different types of enterprises) serves two purposes. First, it helps to elaborate the enterprise component of the diverse economy. Second, it provides the means to dissolve the idea of big C Capitalism and shift the focus to a very specific form of enterprise—the capitalist enterprise—thereby unyoking it from its elevated status as an 'ism' (see also Cameron and Gibson-Graham 2022).

This is not to say that there are not seemingly sedimented "assemblages" comprised of capitalist enterprises, legal and accounting practices, political and market arrangements, and racializing and colonizing frameworks, to name just a few possible elements that contribute to a form of hegemony that appears to be unquestionably durable. However, rather than assuming an inevitability to this assemblage, the task becomes one of asking how assemblages centered on capitalist enterprises take shape and where the "inconsistencies, ruptures, and tensions" that comprise any assemblage might lie (Sarmiento 2020: 490). It is also to ask how, out of the diverse economy, other assemblages might be made, including what we might call Community Economy assemblages that foreground and support ethical economic practices such as widespread surplus distribution, and environmentally and socially responsible transactions that prioritize the well-being of people and the planet.

Thus one contribution of the Community Economies approach to anti-capitalist thinking and practice is a discursive one whereby the language of the diverse economy and the language of class as a process are starting points to help broaden the economic vista and enlarge the scope for "postcapitalist" political economic action. Here we use the term postcapitalist not to name another phase of economic evolution as some do (e.g., Mason 2015) but to signify those ethical economic practices and interconnections, many of which are already here, that can cohere to support equitable and ecologically responsible livelihoods right now and not in some utopian future (see also Cameron 2022).

Most of the participants at the Summer/Winter School are familiar with the language of the diverse economy, however they are less familiar with the distinction between the diverse economy and the community economy. The diverse economy is an alternative representation of economy that foregrounds heterogeneity and breaks apart the assumed alignment of commodity markets with waged labor with private profit-making enterprise with capitalism. This representation is a starting point that helps one "see the glimmerings and hear the mutterings of non-capitalist practices amidst the cacophony of accounts of the ubiquitous and all-powerful Presence of Capital" to quote Donna Haraway's 1996 endorsement for *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It)* (Haraway 1996). The community economy is, however, a political intervention of another kind. It is a counter-hegemonic focus for anti-capitalist political action based on reconfiguring economies around ethical practices and interconnections.

The mechanics, practices, and assemblages of the community economy are where new theorizing is sorely needed. The Summer/Winter School participants are all engaged in research well-suited to this kind of exploration. But to bring the ethical economic possibilities around which community economies are built to the fore, to nourish and aerate them, or actually bring them into being, our participants must become a different kind of researcher. In *A Postcapitalist Politics* Gibson-Graham ask: "If we want other worlds and other economies, how do we make ourselves a condition of possibility for their emergence?" (2006: 7). They suggest that researchers shift their stance from one of "mastery, melancholia, and moralism and cultivate capacities that can energize and support the creation of 'other economies'" (7).

This Community Economies approach to capitalism is confronting for some Summer/Winter School participants as it challenges a precept that has shaped their understanding of not just a Neoliberal Capitalist world but the driver for progressive/oppositional politics. What we have learned with each iteration of the school is to ask participants at the outset to "sit with the discomfort" as we engage with the foundations of the Community Economies approach and what this means for how they think of themselves as researchers (broadly defined). In the next section, we turn to some of the pedagogical exercises that we use to explore the foundations of the Community Economies approach and we give an indication of how these exercises act as prompts for participants to shift their stance and activate new practices of the researcher-self—what we refer to as the resubjectivation process. In the fourth section we reflect on the pedagogical principles that we use to further the resubjectivation process by providing participants with opportunities to test out new practices of the researcher-self.

3. Pedagogical Exercises for Theoretical Explorations

The participants who sign up for the Summer/Winter School have been well trained in critical thinking but they are also curious about the Community Economies approach and interested to find out more about how it can inform their research. Some are specifically attracted to the school because they are seeking to move beyond a critical standpoint.

Participants come to the school uncertain and vulnerable, and worried about whether they have read enough in preparation and if they are sufficiently "on top" of the literature. For those for whom English is a second (or third or fourth) language there is an additional anxiety about whether they will be able to keep up with the readings and the discussion. Having mostly been schooled in the deficit model of education (i.e., students as empty vessels needing to be filled with knowledge) they tend to underplay their skills. Yet all have a wealth of place-based knowledge related to their research areas and are eager to share their experiences and discover new ways of working. There is a great deal of excitement about meeting others "in the same boat" who share a desire for something else.

We use a series of exercises that give participants the opportunity to try out some of the foundational thinking tools of the Community Economies approach. We do not ask participants to commit to these tools but to explore them through a "what if" lens: what happens if I apply this tool in this way? what new insights does it help to generate? what political possibilities are opened up? In what follows we feature some of the exercises and what participants take from these.

3.1. Ontological and epistemological foundations

One of the first exercises invites participants to apply their critical thinking skills towards the ontology and epistemology they have been schooled in. Might it be possible that dominant rationalist, realist, and determinist ways of thinking—those critical "habits of thinking" that Rosi (above) refers to—are standing in the way of possibility and creativity? This exercise introduces participants to the distinctive anti-essentialist, feminist, and postructuralist ontology and epistemology of the Community Economies approach, which alongside the anti-essentialist Marxian analysis of Resnick and Wolff (1987) builds on the work of poststructuralist feminists such as Judith Butler (1990) and Elizabeth Grosz (1994).

The reading for this exercise, "Poststructural Interventions" (Gibson-Graham 2000), focuses on three thinking strategies that can be used to explore how dominant discursive formations, such as big C Capitalism, are produced:

- Discourse analysis—how is the hegemonic capitalocentric language of economy constructed? How is power distributed by this language? Where are the silences and invisibilities, and what are their effects?
- Genealogy—how did the capitalist identity of the economy become normalized, through what technical infrastructures and discursive mechanisms? Are there counter genealogies that have been suppressed and thus disempowered?
- Performativity—how do the words we use to describe the world as Capitalist contribute to making the world more Capitalist? What other economic worlds are further sidelined with each repeated statement of the dominance of Capitalism?

Rather than presenting knowledge as mirroring or reflecting an inherent reality, the reading demonstrates how knowledges and realities are produced, and how by explicating this process other knowledges and possible realities open up. Alongside the example of how a so-

called Capitalist reality is produced, the reading gives examples of research in related areas that also uses these thinking strategies to call into question received ideas and dominant practices, including Arturo Escobar's (1995) research on development and the making of the "third world" and Lakshman Yapa's (1999) research on urban poverty in North American cities.

After reflecting on the reading, participants are set an exercise in which they work in groups of two or three to devise a research project that applies one or more of the thinking strategies. The idea is that participants step aside from their own projects to think in an inventive and low-stakes way about how some knowledges have become accepted and embedded, and what possibilities emerge if these knowledges are destabilized. For example, one group proposed a project to explore the discourse of economic revitalization in place-based economic development settings. They identified the ways this discourse reinforces the idea that there is no economic life in some neighborhoods. They asked, what would it mean to attend to the diverse economic life that is there? Another group took the example of community gardens (in the context of cities in the West) and what they saw as a dominant body of academic work that represents these gardens as spaces of whiteness and economic privilege. They identified this narrative as having the effect of silencing the experiences of queer, trans, black, brown, and the other multiplicities of people who use and make community gardens in their communities. They asked, if we attend to these diverse experiences, what other imaginaries might open up about who local food and gardening spaces might serve? Another group took the ubiquitous personal development industry and identified how through the lens of this industry success for young scholars is defined in terms of a high achieving academic career and a healthy personal life. They proposed a two-fold project of studying the consequences for young scholars of this expectation while looking to counter-movements such as China's "lying flat" movement (in which young people are rejecting the pressure to over-achieve through overwork [Su 2023]) and South Korea's 4B movement (which is trying to enact a radical feminist future outside of the government's pro-natalist policies [Lee and Jeong 2021]).

Through this exercise participants are exploring what it might mean to put aside a realist approach to knowledge and instead to focus on how knowledges come to be and what effects these knowledges might have, including what these knowledges silence and what other knowledges and realities might be made possible. By exploring this through the invention of a research project participants are starting to work with the understanding, pivotal to the Community Economies approach, that researchers can play a crucial role in world-making based on the decisions they make around questions such as: to what extent does my research reinforce dominant knowledges? what knowledges are being silenced in my research? what future possibilities is my research helping to engender? what contribution is my research making to creating the postcapitalist world I want to live in?

3.2. Techniques of reading

A second exercise, from day 3 of the school, focuses on techniques for reading and the distinction between what in the Community Economies approach is called reading for difference and reading for dominance:

- **Reading for difference not dominance**—how are disparate aspects of economic life read as lining up as part of a single and dominant capitalist economic system? What happens if we read economic practices "against the grain" by disentangling them and allowing for the possibility that they have their own agencies and dynamics?

The exercise starts with discussion of the chapter, "Reading for Economic Difference" (Gibson-Graham 2020), that outlines these two techniques. The reading introduces the idea that "reading" is a way of analyzing and interpreting primary and secondary data and others' accounts by continually "selecting and aligning, foregrounding and overlooking, splitting and lumping, differentiating and homogenizing, connecting and disconnecting, judging, accepting, and dismissing" (477). Reading for economic dominance aligns with a capitalocentric approach as it foregrounds and bundles together various practices, relations, and dynamics (for example, commodification, marketization, proletarianization, globalization, neoliberalism, and land enclosures) as further evidence of Capitalism. This type of reading often dismisses those things that don't fit as evidence of Capitalism. On the other hand, reading for economic difference means attending to the plethora of practices, relations, and dynamics and unbundling things that are normally bound together. As the chapter for this exercise identifies, the purpose of reading for economic difference is to multiply economic possibilities by producing an understanding of an economically differentiated world and being open to the potential for things to connect in unexpected ways.

Participants apply this reading strategy to their own research by inventorying the diversity of economic activities they encounter in their projects. One inventory, for example, documented the range of enterprises, labor arrangements, transactions, forms of property, and financial arrangements in which the Māori-owned community housing organization Hikurangi Enterprises Ltd is embedded (see table 1, below). Such inventories help to produce a "thick description" (Gibson-Graham 2014: S147) of the care, gifts, reciprocity, respect, stewardship, creativity, cooperation, love, and experimentation that economic practices might be aligned with. In place of reading for evidence of Capitalist dominance, such as further elaborating examples of capitalist enterprises, the plethora of more-than-capitalist transactions and relationships are enumerated.

Another inventory was worked on by all the participants at an Americas online node and they documented economic practices associated with regional food systems in North America (see table 2, below). By reading regional food systems for difference and "mapping out" the diversity of economic activities centered on food, this inventory helps to shed light on various forms of food politics that might be enacted. For example, a regional council concerned with food poverty might consider ways of supporting neighborhood-based initiatives that provide direct access to food; a regional food coalition of NGOs might consider the ways they could

link-up with each other to share resources and connect more strongly with capitalist and more-than-capitalist enterprises to leverage their resources; or a group of food activists might consider ways of further diversifying non-monetary means of securing food.

Table 1: Reading Hikurangi Enterprises Ltd for difference.

YOUR RESEARCH TOPIC/AREA: *Diverse Economy of Hikurangi Enterprises Ltd*

Enterprise	Labor	Transactions	Property	Finance
Non-capitalist *Community Housing Associations*	**Unpaid** *Work of board members* *Volunteering mahi to help other local projects* *Reciprocal labor of milling crew at different sites*	**Non-market** *Gifting of timber from local whenua* *Sharing knowledge with other Māori housing providers*	**Open access** *Some intellectual property associated with Whare Ora build e.g. building plans* *Replication model*	**Non-market**
Capitalist *Engagement with for-profit building and hardware firms*	**Waged** *Salaries for Kaimahi* *Wages for Kaihanga (builders)* *Wages for timber millers*	**Market exchange** *Purchasing building supplies* *Consulting work*	**Privately owned** *Housing on private property* *Building equipment owned by Hikurangi Enterprises*	**Market** *Purchasers borrow from mainstream lenders*
More than capitalist *Hikurangi Enterprises Ltd, a social enterprise and charitable company which distributes surplus to housing production and to community projects e.g. Nāti-kai growers collective*	**Otherly remunerated** *Timber millers can use machines on weekends, and keep excess timber for their own building supplies*	**Other market** *Kurutete o te aroha – transactions of love, e.g., emergency assistance during flood response* *Government contracts – Kainga Ora design* *Procurement through other local housing suppliers (Toitu) and Runanga (Iwi and private)*	**Collectively 'owned'** *Land governed under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993* *Iwi land holdings* *Communally owned milling equipment* *Shared equity*	**Other market** *Rent-to-buy* *Impact investment* *Philanthropic finance* *Economic development agencies* *Government loans* *Community-controlled finances*

Created by Jack Barrett. Used with permission.

Even though these inventories are produced by participants in a short 20- to 30-minute time frame, they illustrate how the process of reading for difference (in this case through inventorying diverse economies) can be a precursor for taking action. Elsewhere we have characterized the Community Economies approach to building other postcapitalist worlds as involving three forms of politics (Cameron and Gibson 2005; Gibson-Graham 1996). First, there is a politics of language (which includes the technique of reading for difference) which helps to shed light on the economic diversity we have at hand to work with, and most especially the ways that people the world over secure livelihoods by taking into account their impacts on and connection to others. Second, there is a politics of the subject which means opening out economic identification from a narrow capitalocentric repertoire. For example, when people no longer identify themselves as only ever a worker in a capitalist firm or as one-dimensional profit-seeking entrepreneur, they are able to see the variety of other

economic subject positions they occupy and from which they can act (be it as a hunter who sources wild food on state land; or a member of a Community Supported Agriculture scheme who volunteers their labor to help distribute the weekly food boxes; or a part-time food service worker who is also part of a small group that uses the commercially licensed community kitchen to produce specialties that are sold at a road-side stall as a way of sharing their food culture with others, to build on just some examples from table 2). Bringing these economic roles to the fore involves a process of resubjectivation, or reframing oneself economically as, for example, a custodian of state lands, an economic linchpin between farmer and consumer, or a sustainer of food cultures. This reframing provides the grounds for the third politics, a politics of collective action. This involves reframed subjects tapping into a new sense of self and a new sense of power that is potentially unleashed as collective action to enact change in the world. How a politics of the subject and a politics of collective action might work in practice is illustrated by the reading that forms the basis of the next exercise that we discuss.

Table 2. Reading regional food systems for difference.

YOUR RESEARCH TOPIC/AREA: Diverse Economies of North American Regional Food Systems

Enterprise	Labor	Transactions	Property	Finance
Non-capitalist	**Unpaid**	**Non-market**	**Open access**	**Non-market**
Community garden	*Volunteer labor brigades*	*Gifting and sharing food*	*Public waters for fishing*	*No-interest community loans*
Food bank	*Migrant workers whose wages are withheld*	*Food pantry distribution*	*Community kitchens*	*Lending equipment*
Commercially licensed community kitchen	*Family labor on farms*	*Dumpster-diving*	*Occupying land to grow food*	*Seed libraries*
Consumer Coops	*Student internships (for course credit)*	*Stealing food*	*Community garden*	*Land return*
Worker-owned farm	*Nonhuman laborers (e.g., hens)*	*Hunting and gathering*	*State land for hunting*	*Dues from members*
NGO run fish ponds		*Poaching*		*Donations*
Capitalist	***Waged***	***Market exchange***	***Privately owned***	***Market***
Walmart, Kroger	*Migrant farm workers*	*Land markets*	*Farms & farm equipment*	*Loans for land & equipment*
Big agribusiness	*Factory workers*	*Grocery stores*	*Greenhouses*	*Speculative investment in lands*
Seed companies	*Retail and food service workers*	*Food bought online*	*Factories*	*Land bought by high net worth individuals then donated to NGOs*
Local farms	*Employees of NGOs*	*Restaurants*	*Buildings leased to restaurants*	
Convenience stores	*Trucking and shipping workers*	*Food trucks*		
Restaurants				
More-than-capitalist	**Otherly remunerated**	**Other market**	**Collectively "owned"**	**Other market**
Locally-owned farms with ethical more-than-capitalist motivations	*U-pick fruit and berries*	*Farmers markets*	*Tool banks*	*Community Supported Agriculture*
Road-side stalls sharing food cultures (e.g., Filipino tamales)	*Reduced CSA subscription in return for labor contribution*	*Farm stores*	*Community land trusts*	*Community Supported Fisheries*
	Student internships (paid via grants)	*Foodbox subscription*	*Tribal reservations*	*Off farm "day jobs" to support family farms*
		Government distribution	*Amish collectively owned land*	

Created by Americas Online Node.

3.3. Tracing economic determinants

Training in social sciences that privileges strong theories of determination and Western-centric worldviews means that participants can find it difficult to grant any practical or historical effectivity to more-than-capitalist sources of social or economic transformation. The Community Economies approach draws on Althusser's theory of overdetermination as one way to counter the allure of determinist thinking:

- **Overdetermination**—what are some of the non-capitalist economic relationships and dynamics that shape the world? What ethical economic negotiations take place in a world that is multiply (over)determined?

To explore this onto/epistemological stance we use an exercise based on a close reading of a chapter that applies overdetermination and conveys what this stance can accomplish. Cecilia Rio's "'This Job Has No End': African American Domestic Workers and Class Becoming" (2000) provides insights into how a multiplicity of factors play a role in shaping change in the world. The chapter traces how African American domestic workers were able to radically transform the economic and social conditions of their paid domestic work during the first half of the twentieth century by shifting from being live-in workers (i.e., quasi slaves) who were constantly at the beck and call of their white employers to being independent producers and sellers of household services who could "live out" with their own families. Without support from labor unions, but drawing on the resources of community- and church-based networks and the penny-saver clubs that helped to provide financial security, these women negotiated how much they charged for their services, how many hours of the day they worked, what was necessary for their survival, and how much surplus they wanted to produce and appropriate for themselves. As an under-recognized form of class transformation, this story joins the many others that could be told about Black women's world-shaping activism and used to revolutionize our understanding of economic transformation (Hossein, 2024).

We ask participants to report on "one big idea" they took from the chapter and something that the reading confirmed for them or made them think differently about (see table 3, below). While participants comment on how the reading illustrates the use of overdetermination, what is striking is that they recognize how this analytical approach can reveal social and economic transformation in unexpected arenas and by groups not usually associated with economic activism (theme 1 in table 3). During the school, we do not explicitly discuss this reading in terms of a politics of the subject and a politics of collective action. However, these responses gesture to the ways in which African American domestic workers were tapping into a new sense of themselves as empowered economic agents, as captured by Rio in the phrase "from 'they job' to 'my job'" (2000: 32). It is this transformed sense of self which was mobilized through the networks and clubs to enable women to develop "collectivized" strategies for transforming their conditions of work.

Table 3: Examples of participants' responses to Rio (2000).

One big idea from the reading	**What has the reading confirmed for you or made you think differently about?**
Theme 1: Overdetermination, and factors and sites of transformation	
Overdetermination. How the transition of class politics of Black domestic workers was overdetermined by all sorts of other things including the value placed on family life, the churches, the networks between women (e.g. the role of the laundress). And how class as a process was used to unravel these interconnections. *African American women were able to subvert the dominant view, discourse, and materiality of their domestic work to create something that worked for them. Through various avenues such as contracts for work as well as living off site, they created "economic independence, autonomy, self-empowerment, spirituality, kin-keeping, communalism, and cooperation." Their struggles to define and create work on their own terms and make space for themselves outside of the association with slavery and servitude has had lasting impacts on "black womanhood" (p.23).* *What collective action can look like: in this case it was outside institutions, in domestic spaces and often via individual actions.*	*It helped me understand how one can work with the concept of overdetermination (which stands in stark contrast with "causal" or single factor explanations required in mainstream economics).* *Struggles do not have to take place through large-scale or institutional mechanisms to be considered as effective catalysts for seeds of change.* *Economic change can involve minor shifts in individual and collective practices, subjectivities, and related materialities, together with institutions such as legislation, technologies (e.g., washing machines, methods of transportation), and so on.* *People do have power and agency. Often personal striving for better conditions is critiqued as "neoliberal." I think this is another example of women who were able to use the power and agency they did possess to make lasting change. While one woman doing this likely would not have made a cultural shift, perhaps it was one woman who gave another woman the courage to do it as well. The ripple effect then can be far reaching.*
Theme 2: The role the researcher plays	
Re-examining a period via a consideration of overdetermining factors can reveal actions and agency that have been overlooked. A capitalocentric lens or multiple oppressions theory focuses on victimization and can deny agency; a black feminist lens reveals domestic labor as a "site of political potential." *Focusing on structural power and privilege leads us to dismiss or discount "non-traditional" actions of economic participation.* *The need to take seriously what situations, processes and events mean to the people doing it, and to really value their interpretations, rather than layering over some grand theory that both minimises their lived experience and situated knowledges, and objectifies and disempowers them.* *How the analysis, representation, and positioning of research subjects involves choices by the*	*In terms of intersectionality, focusing exclusively on multiple vulnerabilities/oppressions can reinforce victim/passive narratives that obscure the ways in which individuals and groups creatively and powerfully assert agency in and through "oppressed" subjectivity positions. Individual action can be empowering and politically salient. So how do we tell "empowering narratives" that platform, rather than obscure, subjects' self-agency/dignity, whilst critiquing processes that foreclose "performing otherwise"?* *Confirmed my thinking about really looking closely at and interrogating the dominant history and narratives about something, and for looking for how the narrative has been shaped to fit a particular idea.* *The political potential of using an anti-essentialist framing (where we don't assume that we know the who and where of political action). The "empowered" story that emerges in this telling*

writer/researcher and that applying this poststructural approach can make invisible actions visible (also the small and subtle), can show how subjects exercise agency, can allow for new narratives to emerge, and in this case can allow us to see the sites of resistance and potentiality. *The dominant and widely-accepted narrative of resistance tends to prioritize collective (union) actions and bargaining powers, while dismissing individual actions as something very "personal" (i.e., not effective or enough to change things). The author identifies individual acts as productive sites of resistance and change, effectively flipping around what is often seen as the weak and the minor into something powerful and emancipatory.* *The reading made me challenge the presumption that the oppressive forces at work in a given circumstance are by default the most important focal point of observation and analysis.*	*(though I note that Rio says on page 33 that these women did not see themselves as powerless). This confirms for me the importance of looking for political actions in places where we might not expect them.* *This reading made me think about a paper I am working on, on the topic of elderly women cassava farmers. In this paper I am trying to shift the analysis away from women depicted as victims of the agrarian transition (trapped in debt cycles, dispossessed of land, disconnected from family) and reading Rio has given me a theoretical framework, tool, and language to further develop my analysis.* *The value of revisiting history and of rereading the past looking for things we might have missed. In the opening, Rio uses the phrase "making the invisible visible."*

What is also striking is that participants identify the importance of the decisions that researchers make in terms of: the topic selected for study (e.g., revisiting an historical event); where the focus is placed (e.g., whether on expected or unexpected agents of transformation); and the analytical framing used (e.g., whether one that confirms a familiar narrative of victimhood and oppression or one that seeks out "lines of flight") (theme 2 in table 3). In these responses, we see the participants answering the "what if" question that we pose for them at the start of the school. We find it encouraging that they identify the insights and political possibilities generated by a tool such as overdetermination, but we can see that they are also reflecting on what this might mean for their role as a researcher and the implications of the analytical and theoretical choices they make.

3.4. Confronting commonly cited barriers to possibility

Although participants in the school are learning about the sorts of research decisions they can make with a view to opening up political possibilities they, and the facilitators, are not immune to the undermining force of BIG CONCEPTS that appear to be politically potent and thus "need" to be addressed. In our heads are critical reverberations that threaten glimmers of possibility—what about the STATE? what about POWER? what about the dangers of COOPTION? how can this possibly be SCALED? where is RACIALIZED violence? is this DECOLONIAL? what is it saying about CLIMATE CHANGE? It is easy to be derailed by these frequently asked questions (FAQs).

Towards the end of the school we ask participants to address one FAQ in the context of their research project using the thinking strategies and tools of analysis they have learnt. The

challenge is to work with the power of the critical sensibility from which the FAQ emerges and to reframe these barriers so that possibilities for action are opened-up. Participants prepare a presentation to show how the FAQ relates to their research (especially how it stands in the way of possibility) and what strategies they propose for working with or around the barrier.

Participants working on place-based projects in localities and metropolitan contexts, for example, often begin to inventory the diverse manifestations of "the state," showing how policies, regulations, laws, decision making mechanisms, levels of government, and so on do not speak with one voice, are oft times contradictory, can allocate resources to commoning, or act to protect the rights of those disadvantaged by capitalist urban development. The STATE is rendered diverse and openings for research and action are identified. Those who are interested in the question of scale have to confront the "scalar hierarchy" and the concern that local and small-scale endeavors have limited impact and only achieve influence if they are scaled-up to a national or even global level. Some participants start to engage in a politics of language to reframe scale through the use of terms such as proliferation, repetition, mutation, replication, and multiplication, and they start to the consider the ways their research might play a role in connecting geographically dispersed activities to help enact some of these other understandings of scale. Other participants respond by inventorying different types of impacts, for example impacting programs and policy by scaling up, impacting a larger number of people by scaling out, or generating durable cultural impacts by scaling deep (as discussed by Riddell and Moore 2015).

For participants this exercise helps to reinforce the refrain from across the school that research is a performative practice of world-making. Researchers make theoretical and analytical decisions that can produce very different insights and have different consequences. For example, researchers can decide to follow the well-trodden pathway of studying capitalism, thereby confirming what is already settled about where economic power "really" lies; or researchers can shed light on relatively unfamiliar economic practices and actors with the goal of strengthening these other economic worlds. This entails a shift in the subject position of the researcher from one whose role is to accurately capture the world as we know it, to one whose role is to help make other postcapitalist worlds possible.

4. Pedagogical Principles

The exercises that we use in the Summer/Winter School provide participants with insights into the intellectual basis for rethinking the researcher-self but resubjectivation also involves shifts in the affective domain in order to support ways of thinking and acting differently. During the ten days of the school participants get to experience a different way of being a researcher (again, broadly defined). There are number of pedagogical principles that we use to do this.

4.1. Appreciative reading

Appreciative reading is a practice that is fostered by asking participants to identify quotes in the texts they are reading that "speak" to them and why. Participants extract a short segment of text, upload it to a Google Slide, and note in a few sentences what resonated for them in the quote, what it prompted them to think, and how it extended their understanding. In this exercise, participants are invited to align with the author and pull out meaning that is relevant to them. Facilitators participate in the exercise as well and, based on what they are learning about the participants' projects, they think with participants about how they might apply material from the readings to their projects. This exercise is very different from the usual "critical reading" mode that asks the reader to pin down the argument and identify the problems and absences in the text. Such a deficit orientation often leads to dead end discussions that emphasize the weaknesses in a text and what the writer should have done. The appreciative orientation, in contrast, generates lively connections without compromising clear-headed insights into how analyses could be strengthened. As a group, participants and facilitators work in a non-judgmental and appreciative mode, thinking in an exploratory way with the texts and each other about possibilities for the directions in which participants' research might go.

In their written evaluation of the school, participants comment on this practice and how important it is to help guide their reading. One participant, for example, commented that without this direction they would have used the critical reading approach:

> I really liked the frequent use of "generative" quotes that build up ideas and thoughts. Otherwise I tend to only pick out quotes that I want to critique/pull apart. (face-to-face participant)

Another commented on how it helped structure their reading process:

> Finding a quote you like and talking about why you like it is much less intimidating and more accessible that simply discussing how you found the reading. (face-to-face participant)

Others commented on how it was a new approach to reading a text, and a practice they were going to continue using:

> I really took a lot from the generative reading approach in general and will apply this learning to my work very broadly. (online participant)

> The practice of noting two quotes that stood out from the readings was a really great way to prepare for, and equitably distribute group discussion around the readings (will be applying this strategy to other reading groups I am a part of). (online participant)

This appreciative reading of texts mirrors the way that Community Economies researchers read the world. Community Economies research practice focuses on the ethical economic practices and interconnections that are already present, and seeks to appreciate what those involved are attempting to achieve. This is not to be naïve and overly-romanticize these efforts. Researchers draw on their critical capacity to think with those involved to

identify the sorts of things they are coming up against and the types of strategies that might be used to address weaknesses or barriers—in much the same way that school participants engage in the FAQs exercise discussed above. In other words, Community Economies researchers align themselves with those engaged in building community economies and they use their capacities to help sharpen and strengthen these activities.

The practice of appreciative reading in the classroom and appreciative reading in the world involves a shift in the researcher subject position from being an expert knower who can definitively judge whether something is good or bad, right or wrong, and astutely assess what is "really" going on in a situation, to being one who is working with others in a process of co-creating a postcapitalist world.

4.2. Appreciative listening

Many of the exercises involve pairs or small groups of participants sharing thoughts about readings, speculative exercises, or their specific projects. We use a number of strategies to boost active listening that searches for meaning in what is sometimes being muddily expressed as participants work through their ideas. One exercise on day 1 involves the Troika method whereby one participant explains their project for five minutes in front of two other participants. The first participant then turns their back (or turns off their camera on Zoom) and listens to the pair discussing their project for ten minutes without their input. Finally, all three face each other and the first participant responds to, clarifies and builds on what they "overheard" as the pair discussed their project.

In the first year of the school we did not give explicit instructions to participants on the importance of taking an appreciative stance when they listened to each other and then discussed each other's work. We simply explained that the Troika method was about learning from each other and helping to build collective knowledge. We assumed that this was sufficient information for participants to take an appreciative stance. However, this did not always occur. In the school evaluation, one participant wrote about how they experienced this exercise as crushing and alienating, and they made a suggestion for future years:

> It also helps for people to be taught about the technique … otherwise, it ends up being an aggressive session when you thrust academic students into a room to do this since they revert to doing what they are trained to do in their own environments which can just be critiques to tear ideas apart. To the person whose project is being talked about, the reflections from the others should feel like a gift, and not an attack. (online participant)

This participant's experience reveals just how ingrained the critical stance can be as a result of academic training that values the practice of looking for weaknesses and "tearing ideas apart." This participant also highlights the deep impact this stance can have on those on the receiving end. We now introduce this as an exercise in which participants have to "think with" the person's project and resist the temptation to negatively criticize or pick faults with the work. Based on the participant's suggestion, we ask participants to think of the way they listen and then discuss the project as a form of gift-giving to each other. As a result,

participants report that through this exercise they experience being heard and having their project seriously engaged with. In the school evaluation, one participant described the exercise in the following way: “Loved the Troika exercise. Great way to scramble the heaviness of presenting your research, skid vividly into view of each other, and experience new ways of colluding and responding” (online participant).

As with appreciative reading, the pedagogical principle of appreciative listening mirrors the Community Economies research practice of cultivating a “beginner’s mind,” in which there are many possibilities, compared to an expert’s mind in which there are few (Gibson-Graham 2006: 8). Appreciative listening is an embodied practice whereby the researcher-subject actively listens to research participants to think with them about the sorts of contributions being made by the community economies they are building, the sorts of weaknesses and barriers they might be encountering, and how these might be addressed. It is not easy to cultivate a researcher-self that refuses to know too much, that allows failure to educate and success to inspire, and that steps back from early diagnosis. It takes practice and the school draws on pedagogical principles such as appreciative reading and listening that support this mode of thinking and being.

4.3. Experimenting

A third pedagogical principle used in the school is the idea of experimenting. As noted above, we invite participants to adopt a “what if” approach. Participants get to practice this through a variety of exercises that build on the readings. Generally the discussion of a reading is followed by an exercise that applies the main concepts from the reading. The exercises are presented as an opportunity to try out and experiment with the material—not something that participants have to “get right.” Generally, the exercises are done in groups of two or three and we rotate participants so they work with the different people in their node. Sometimes the facilitators join in, especially to balance the numbers to make groups of two or three.

In the school evaluation, participants comment on the importance of the exercises as an opportunity to apply the conceptual material, for example:

> I found the more practical, small group exercises to be very interesting and stimulating. I really appreciated the chance to apply the theoretical concepts to real-case scenarios, using different tools, and discussing them as a group. (online participant)

> The combination of reading and then immediately applying or presenting our findings through our work or in hypothetical scenarios really brought the theory to life! (online participant)

> The daily exercises were really great—thought they were useful for thinking through concepts and strategies, and often productively challenging and applied. (online participant)

Participants specifically comment on the experimental aspect of these exercises:

> All the activities encouraged us to “give it a go” in a safe space. (face-to-face participant)

> I most appreciated our group culture of exploration and a sense of playfulness with the concepts, the learning environment was a space of possibility. (face-to-face participant)

> What worked well was the open spirit, welcoming all questions with a sense of figuring it out and exploring together, taking everyone where they are. (face-to-face participant)

Again, the experimental approach of "giving it a go," "building a culture of exploration," and "figuring it out and exploring together" is something that Community Economies researchers try to adopt in their research practice when they are working with research participants. This involves enacting a researcher subject position that is oriented towards the co-production of knowledge as a contribution to world-making.

4.4. Collaborating

The fourth pedagogical principle that characterizes the school is collaboration. This is most evident in the exercises in which participants work in groups of two or three that rotate throughout the school so they get to work with different people (including the facilitators). Along with the exercises discussed already, some of the other exercises use strategies that include getting participants to use the comments function in Google Docs to write reactions to the work of others in their node, and pairing participants together to have silent written conversations with each other in Google Docs. These strategies, intended to generate connection between participants, are supported by the small daily practice of doing a "check-in" and a "check-out" as a way for participants to lightly give a verbal indication of how they are feeling and how the school is going for them. In their school evaluation, participants comment on how this combination of strategies and practices results in a sense of connection and collaboration, for example:

> I felt really connected to everyone, and very comfortable to share opinion and listen to others. (online participant)

> I think the CE teaching style is perfect. You really nailed the objective of learning through practice and fostering collaborative approaches and connection between participants. (online participant)

> I loved attending a face-to-face node and making connections with like-minded and curious others. (face-to-face participant)

A second way that collaboration occurs is through having multiple nodes running simultaneously in different parts of the world. Although more precisely the node based on Aotearoa New Zealand time starts the day, followed a few hours later by the node based on Eastern Australian time, followed a few hours later by the node based on Central European time, and finally another few hours later by the node based on Eastern Standard Time in the Americas. Having multiple nodes, including some that are online, enables participants to attend from a range of locations, especially those who are on field work in various parts of the globe. The materials and exercises are accessed through a shared G Drive for all participants. This means that participants can see what is going on in the other nodes, and

especially how groups in other nodes have worked on the exercises (including exercises such as having participants upload a "check-in" image mid-way through the school that illustrates their experience of the school thus far). Participants comment on how the school helps to create a nascent sense of connection with those in other parts of the world, for example:

> Seeing the responses from different nodes simultaneously was also inspiring, especially with creative exercises such as presentations and check-ins (especially the exercise where we used a picture to illustrate our experience with the school was an honest, open, and reassuring activity!). (face-to-face participant)

> The global community was a highlight. By this I mean having different nodes made you feel like you were part of something bigger. I liked this a lot. Having different nodes exemplified the diversity of scholars within the school, and various means and ways that the material could work in different contexts. (online participant)

> A highlight was the possibility of meeting people all over the world. It enables us to develop a real network beyond our institutions and to discover the work that others are doing in other countries. (face-to-face participant)

The nascent international connections fostered during the first part of the school then coalesce on days 8 and 9 when there are online panels with members of the CEI from around the globe discussing and thinking together with participants about challenging topics that are extending and influencing Community Economies work, for example, topics such as "Community Economies in Allegiance with Decolonization," "Power and Assemblages," and "Visions of Social Change and Research Trajectories." Through these panels (which are recorded for participants in different time zones), participants get to interact with researchers (including artists, activities, and practitioners) and to learn more about how they are working with the Community Economies approach in their own projects. As one participant put it, the panels offer a "space for thinking, holding silence, and exploring ideas—a very special experience" (online participant). The panels showcase collaborative thinking in action and invite participants into the conversation to deepen their knowledge and see themselves as part of a broader network of researchers. Participants comment on this in the school evaluation, for example:

> The panel sessions were very stimulating and conducted in such a collegial way that it felt like a conversation with friends! It was also nice to have a chance to meet the other nodes' participants and to hear about the experiences of people working with a CE framework. (online participant)

> The panel discussions were brilliant and really helped to clarify and develop ideas, as well as feel connected to the wider community. (online participant)

> The online panels featuring both academics, academic-activists and people working outside of academia were enlightening, as they demonstrated how the concepts we learned have influenced real-world actions over the years and continue to be transformative in real time. (face-to-face participant)

The feeling of being part of an international cohort is not to be underestimated. Participants have the opportunity to share their research across national borders; to see the connections, and similarities and differences between community economies practices across the world; and to imagine networks of interconnection they can help to foster. They discover that their research is no longer isolated, or off-topic, or insignificant. This sense of being a researcher-self in association with others is especially valued by those who feel that they are working in isolation, as several reported in the school evaluation:

> Prior to attending the school, I felt really despondent, intimidated and isolated in my thinking. Now, I feel like I have an entire network supporting me and encouraging me to continue to try to do what I can, with what I have, "where I am." (online participant)

> What I learned most is knowing there is a research network—I am not alone in my research. (face-to-face participant)

The process of understanding and experiencing oneself as a researcher who can make a difference in the world, including by collaborating with others, does not end when the school finishes. To help sustain the resubjectivation process, participants are encouraged to join the Community Economies Research Network (CERN), the almost 400-strong online network of artists, activists, practitioners, and researchers who are interested in Community Economies practice and research. Being part of the network helps to keep alive the sense of connection and collaboration that is initiated at the school. In practice, this occurs in a variety ways. One way is through putting out a call on the network for resources on a specific topic (or responding to a call from another member). Recent calls by school alumni have been for documentary films on food and agriculture that could illustrate community economies in practice, and for work on reparative economies or community economies from the perspective of Indigenous communities. Another way school alumni continue collaborating is by joining one of the six locally-based CERN groups that meet regularly (usually by Zoom and usually monthly) to discuss shared work and readings. Many of the school alumni who join are among the most active members of these groups. A third way is by participating in LIVIANA, the annual on-line conference for CERN members, and school alumni play an active role organizing, presenting, and attending sessions.

5. Conclusion

The Summer/Winter School on the theme of Researching Postcapitalist Possibilities is one of the initiatives offered by the Community Economies Institute as part of our agenda to contribute to a more just and sustainable world. One way the school does this is by synthesizing insights from the theoretical and conceptual work of Community Economies scholars, and the practical experiments of activists, artists, and practitioners. Universities are increasingly shying away from teaching courses that challenge the status quo; and on the front line of economic activism there is little time to reflect on strategic frameworks and what

works. This is where our Non-University Educational and Research Organization (NUERO), the CEI, can step in by offering programs such as the Summer/Winter School.

Based on our experiences of place-based action research we have come to understand change in the world as involving three forms of politics: a politics of language, a politics of the self/subject, and a politics of collective action (as noted above in section 3.2). We have come to understand that pedagogical interventions such as the Summer/Winter School also draw on the same well of political inspiration. A politics of language is reflected in the school curriculum in terms of the concepts that are featured and the readings selected. Participants are introduced to various schools of thought and are prompted to identify how their research has been shaped by specific traditions. They are encouraged to gain fluency in theoretical languages that enable, rather than constrain, a transformation agenda. Over the last six years and through the seven schools we have conducted with almost 200 participants from across the world we have refined this curriculum. What we have also learned and have paid more explicit attention to in the three recent schools that are the focus of this paper is the role played by a politics of the subject and a politics of collective action.

One of the challenges for researchers interested in using the conceptual and theoretical material associated with Community Economies work is the encounter with the researcher-self. With so much academic training heavily weighted towards the adoption of a critical stance (as noted by Rosi in the epigraph and by other participants in their evaluation comments that we have drawn on throughout the paper) researchers can find it hard to sustain an orientation that seeks out and values the postcapitalist possibilities that are alive, even flourishing, in the world. The tendency is to want to find the weaknesses and problems with community economy initiatives—in the extreme is it to move into attack mode and "tear ideas apart" as one participant reflected above. Through the pedagogical exercises and the pedagogical principles that are now explicitly built into the school we have sought to generate opportunities for participants to experience a different mode of engaging with school curriculum, with each other, and with the world at large. This resubjectivation process involves activating new practices of the researcher-self through modes of thinking and being based on appreciation, generosity, curiosity, and even uncertainty and not knowing. The intention is that this might open up new pathways for collective action, whether through small instances of classroom based collective action based on collaborative problem-solving or through the work of collaborating with others in the world to help make postcapitalist possibilities more real.

References

Bargh, Maria. 2012. Rethinking and re-shaping indigenous economies: Māori geothermal energy enterprises. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 6 (3): 271–83.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, Jenny. 2020. Framing essay: The diversity of enterprise. In *The Handbook of Diverse Economies*, eds. J.K. Gibson-Graham and Kelly Dombroski, 26–39. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Cameron, Jenny. 2022. Post-capitalism now: A community economies approach. In *Post-Capitalist Futures*, eds. Samuel Alexander, Sangeetha Chandra-Shekeran, and Brendan Gleeson, 41–52. London: Palgrave.

Cameron, Jenny and Katherine Gibson. 2001. *Shifting Focus: Alternative Pathways for Communities and Economies, A Resource Kit*. Traralgon, Australia: Latrobe City Council and Monash University.

Cameron, Jenny and Katherine Gibson. 2005. Participatory action research in a poststructuralist vein. *Geoforum* 36 (3): 315–31.

Cameron, Jenny and J.K. Gibson-Graham. 2022. The diverse economies approach. In *Handbook of Alternative Theories of Political Economy,* eds. Frank Stilwell, David Primrose, and Tim B. Thornton, 329–42. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Community Partnering for Local Development. n.d. About Community Partnering. Accessed at: http://www.communitypartnering.info/about33.html.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York: New Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 1996. *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2014. Rethinking the economy with thick description and weak theory. *Current Anthropology* 55 (S9): S147–53.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., 2000. Poststructural interventions. In *A Companion to Economic Geography*, eds. Eric Sheppard and Trevor J. Barnes, 95–110. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2020. Reading for economic difference. In *The Handbook of Diverse Economies*, eds. J.K. Gibson-Graham and Kelly Dombroski, 476–85. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., Jenny Cameron, and Stephen Healy. 2013. *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide to Transforming our Communities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. and Kelly Dombroski. 2020. Introduction to *The Handbook of Diverse Economies*: Inventory as ethical intervention. In *The Handbook of Diverse Economies*, eds. J.K. Gibson-Graham and Kelly Dombroski, 1–24. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Gordon-Nembhard, Jessica. 2014. *Collective Courage: A History of African American Cooperative Economic Thought and Practice*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 1994. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gudeman, Stephen. 2001. *The Anthropology of Economy: Community, Market, and Culture*. Williston, Vermont: Blackwell.

Haraway, Donna. 1996. Endorsement for *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Accessed at: https://www.communityeconomies.org/publications/books/end-capitalism-we-knew-it-feminist-critique-political-economy.

Hossein, Caroline Shenaz, ed. 2018. *The Black Social Economy in the Americas: Exploring Diverse Community-Based Markets*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hossein, Caroline Shenaz. 2024. *The Banker Ladies: Vanguards of Solidarity Economics and Community-Based*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lee, Jieun and Euisol Jeong. 2021. The 4B movement: Envisioning a feminist future with/in a non-reproductive future in Korea. *Journal of Gender Studies* 30 (5): 633–44.

Mason, Paul. 2015. *Postcapitalism: A Guide to Our Future*. London: Allen Lane.

Ostrom, Elizabeth. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Resnick, Stephen and Richard Wolff. 1987. *Knowledge and Class: A Marxian Critique of Political Economy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Riddell, Darcy and Michele-Lee Moore. 2015. *Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Advancing Systemic Social Innovation and the Learning Processes to Support It*. Montreal: The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation. Accessed at https://www.dunstan.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/TIR_SCR_2017_Riddell_Moore.pdf.

Rio, Cecilia Marie. 2000. "This job has no end": African American domestic workers and class becoming. In *Class and Its Others,* eds. J.K. Gibson-Graham, Stephen Resnick, and Richard Wolff, 23–46. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sarmiento, Eric. 2020. Field methods for assemblage analysis. In *The Handbook of Diverse Economies*, eds. J.K. Gibson-Graham and Kelly Dombroski, 486–93. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Su, Wendy. 2023. "Lie Flat"– Chinese youth subculture in the context of the pandemic and national rejuvenation. *Continuum* 37 (1): 127–39.

Waring, Marilyn. 1988. *Counting for Nothing: What Men Value and What Women are Worth*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin Press.

Yapa, Lakshman. 1996. What causes poverty? A postmodern view. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86 (4): 707–28.