Community Development as Double Movement

Gussai H. Sheikheldin and John F. Devlin

School of Environmental Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph, Canada

This paper argues that the theoretical contributions of Karl Polanyi can provide a compelling foundation for the analysis of community development (CD) processes and cases. Through a review of the international theoretical and empirical literature in CD the paper demonstrates that CD scholars work with concepts such as social solidarity, agency, self-help and mutual help, social capital, and reciprocity, that can be effectively understood in Polanyian terms. CD scholars explain the emergence of CD as a response to "modernization" where communities seek to mitigate the impacts of modernization while also taking advantage of its promises to improve communities and livelihoods. Also CD normative actions are explained in terms of building – and rebuilding – social capital in response to the erosion of communities caused by modern forces such as the nation-state and industrial capitalism. CD scholars borrow from social analysts such as Jurgen Habermas, Paulo Freire, and Anthony Giddens to structure their explanatory and normative writing. But Polanyi is notably absent as a conceptual source in the CD literature. We argue that Polanyian concepts of the double movement, social disembeddedness, reciprocity institutions, and fictitious commodities can offer conceptual benefits to CD studies. For instance, Polanyi's faculty for coherently defending the social and cultural spheres by using the language of institutional economics provides new perspectives that can induce new analyses of CD processes. Introducing these new perspectives can strengthen and broaden the theoretical and practical capacity of CD by further bridging the gap between explanatory and normative trends in the field.

Key Words: Community development theory; Karl Polanyi; fictitious commodities; decommodification

Introduction

Community development practitioners and researchers today offer common principles and objectives of community development, but many still voice concerns that the theoretical literature on the subject lags behind the literature on community development 'practice' (i.e., community development programs and projects). Community development analysts have and continue today to seek a more theoretic formation and synthesis (Sanders 1958; Cary 1979; Ledwith 2005; Lowe and Harris 2009; Robinson and Green 2011). This paper proposes that community development (hereafter 'CD') can be viewed as an expression of what Karl Polanyi called the double movement in modern, market societies. The main argument is that viewing CD through Polanyian lens and concepts has the potential of strengthening and broadening the research and practical capacity of CD. Recent multiple searches through academic search engines show that, except for very few publications, Polanyi is notably absent as a conceptual source in the CD literature.

The paper starts with an extensive literature review to highlight the characteristics, themes and common concepts of the CD literature. It also reviews some influential theories on CD from the broader social sciences and how they are used in the CD literature. The paper then suggests how the common foundations of CD can be re-interpreted through Polanyi's ideas and concepts. Sample cases then demonstrate the argument.

Community Development Theory: A Review

Definitions of community development

The scope of CD lies in the components of its name: 'community' and 'development'. The concept of community and its parameters are an essential and common subject in the CD literature. Earlier literature emphasised locality (a geographic relation) as

---

Corresponding author: John F. Devlin, PhD, Associate Professor, School of Environmental Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph, Canada. Email: jdevlin@uoguelph.ca

the main distinctive character of a community (Sanders 1958; Megil 1970; Cary 1970; Chekki 1979). Still, that literature struggled with identifying a community within a given space, since the same geographic proximity can be hosting many communities at once. Association with place was also challenged by the growing phenomena of 'communities of interest': in their daily lives individuals were more involved, with energy and sentiment, in their 'functional communities'--"occupational groups, various interest groups, organizations, etc." (Voth 2001) (also Smith 2001a; Bhattacharyya 2004). Also, populations of former European colonies and newly independent countries did not abandon their ethnic ties despite the fact that migrations and vast movements, inside and outside their home countries, made the space-oriented definition insufficient. The CD literature settled the issue by adding 'identity' to the 'space' condition. Shared identity manifests in shared norms and aspirations. 'Identity' could consist of space-oriented elements and/or functional elements, but shared identity is the main criterion (Phillips & Pittman 2009; Robinson and Green, 2011). The way shared identity is expressed is thought to be in elements of 'reciprocity and trust' (Smith, 2001a) and 'solidarity' (Bhattacharyya, 2004; Ledwith 2005) among community members.

The concept of 'development' has a wider related literature, but with reference to CD it is used in more focused terms. 'Development' in the CD literature is used in two ways: "development-in-the-community [and] development-of-the-community" (Shaffer & Summers 1989, quoted in Robinson & Green 2011, p. 3). Other writers distinguish between CD as a 'process' and CD as an 'outcome', both however refer to what 'development' means in the CD context. Phillips & Pittman (2009) argue that academics prefer to deal with CD as a process, which makes it observable and verifiable as a subject of objective study. Practitioners of CD, on the other hand, are outcome oriented, perceiving CD as a field of action measured by visible results—social, economic, political and physical. Lower & Harris (2011) articulate the same 'process and outcome' distinction by saying that CD wears two hats for different circumstances: the hat of a 'science' in request for rigor and requiring verifiability of methods, as a process, and the hat of an 'art' in focusing on practice, expression and outcomes. "The reality, however, is that [CD],[1] on a continuum, is a mixture of science and art." (p. 197).

Bhattacharyya (1995 and 2004) proposes that, in CD, 'community' refers to 'solidarity' and 'development' refers to 'agency'—agency meaning "the capacity of people to order their world, the capacity to create, reproduce, change, and live according to

their own meaning systems" (2004, 12). Mattessich (2009) proposes that developing a community means the building of its social capital; therefore 'development' means 'social capital building' in the CD context.[2] It is also synonymous to 'community capacity' (hence development is also community 'capacity building'). Garkovich (2011) argues that Amartya Sen's definition of 'development as freedom' is the best to borrow for the CD field:

"Sen argues that development is the expansion of "substantive human freedoms" to lead the kind of life one values. This... requires the elimination of those things that limit freedom, such as poverty, limited "economic opportunities as well as systematic social deprivation, [and] neglect of public facilities." (Garkovich 2011, 29).

To summarize, the scope of CD is determined by what 'community' means, which is generally a shared identity based on special relations – expressed in solidarity, trust, reciprocity, etc. – among a particular segment of a larger population. Within that community, 'development' refers to the process of fostering desired qualities founded on those special relations themselves, for the overarching goal of more satisfied members.

Objectives and principles

A number of the early definitions viewed CD as an educational process that aims at bettering conditions through community education (Poston 1958; United Nations 1956; Mezirow 1960; Sehnert 1961). For other writers CD was practically the same as community organization (Rothman 1968). Community organization, however, was viewed by other writers as very distinct from CD albeit related to it. Sanders (1970) and Smith (1996, 2006) maintain that, while community organization shared with CD the encouragement of partnership between local communities and public and civil society organizations, CD differed mainly in that it emphasized education and collective learning as central principles. Cary (1970) highlights 'characters of community development' as the conditions for recognizing cases of CD, such as "inclusive participation", "use of resources from both within and outside the community", and "local initiative and leadership". Warren (1970) defines CD by relating the emergence of the practice to the historical context of the industrial era, and to the broad phenomenon of modernization. Thus:

"[CD] is a means for promoting industrialization as well as coping with its consequences... From these applications, it would appear that [CD] is being asked to bring about a set of conditions– roughly, "modernization" – and then being asked to

cope with the conditions modernization has created." *(p. 32-33).*

Warren also emphasises 'community' from a social perspective, not economic or physical; hence, the process of 'introducing modernization' and 'coping with its consequences' refers to the social relations affected by modernization. Chekki (1979) says, "Ideally, it is the objective of [CD] to create a caring society" (p. 10). That caring society is one in which people have developed personal relationships with each other, rather than just occupying the same space. Therefore, "it is the ideal of [CD] to allay this remoteness and estrangement of man from man." (p. 10). In modern society, this estrangement can be witnessed in that it has become very acceptable that neighbours who live very close to each other for years do not know each other at the personal level. Also many members of communities of interest (such as unions, voluntary organizations, socio-political associations, etc.) rarely know each other outside that interest capacity. Chekki also maintains that, "The central credo of [CD] is to develop the competence of a community so that it may confront its own problems" (p. 9). This same credo is expressed by other writers as the pursuit of agency (Douglas 1987; Bhattacharyya 2004; Hustedde 2009). Phillips & Pittman (2009) use the concept of social capital as the central theme of CD; therefore CD is the process of building social capital. "Social capital or capacity is the extent to which members of a community can work together effectively to develop and sustain strong relationships; solve problems and make group decisions; and collaborate effectively to plan, set goals, and get things done." (p. 6)

In a historical review of CD, Smith (1996, 2006) cites an early definition by the UK government in 1958: "active participation, and if possible on the initiative of the community, but if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it in order to achieve its active and enthusiastic response to the movement." (UK Colonial Office 1958, p. 2, quoted in Smith 1996, 2006). This colonial definition of CD continued in colonial Africa, Smith says, through the post-colonization era. A document that can attest to that claim is Tanzania's CD policy paper, by the Ministry of Community Development, Women Affairs and Children (1996), which defines CD as "those measures which enable people to recognize their own ability and identify their problems and use resources to earn and increase their income, and build a better life for themselves." (p. 3-4).

Hudson (2004), with an argument based on the work of Michel Foucault, takes a rather cynical approach on the entire body of CD literature and practice: "I argue that [CD] is necessarily an ambigu-ous term that can be used within a variety of ideological frames for a broad range of purposes." The conclusion of Hudson is that a CD's definition only reflects the ideological concerns and situated objectives of those who define it, and it effectively means many different things that are not necessarily related coherently to each other. As an example, Hudson mentions that CD to "leftist writers" entirely differs from CD to "conservatives". Ledwith (2005 and 2007) defines CD goals and principles from an expressly 'radical agenda' perspective. CD to her is a 'critical pedagogy' approach: learning based on mutual search. CD seeks to make community members face not only their challenging conditions, but also the structural causes of those conditions in their social context. CD arms communities to challenge structures of oppression by promoting 'thoughtful action' which demands 'weaving theory into practice' and using small projects as vehicles for critical education. Ledwith bases her approach CD on the concept of 'conscientization', coined by Paulo Freire.[3]

All in all, we can say that CD is *a process of building community relations as a vehicle for improving living conditions or defense from emergent perceived threats.* While the improvement of living conditions is the overall aspiration of all fields of development, CD enters that arena through the process of building community relations. While CD, in most definitions, emphasises social potential, it does not neglect the 'meat and bread' of development—physical, economic, political and technological transformation. Ayres and Silvis (2011) say that research shows that the ability of communities to build strong relations among each other is essential to the success of their local development initiatives.

Common concepts

Common concepts that stand out in CD literature are: (a) agency and self-help; (b) solidarity and social capital; and (c) reciprocity and mutual help. We can simply call them agency, solidarity and reciprocity.

The concept of agency is expressed in different but consistent ways. Cary (1970) and Sanders (1958 and 1970) firmly express that "local initiative and leadership," and "inclusive participation" are foremost conditions for defining CD. Several critical studies of CD expose any 'top-down' effort under that name as fallacious (Tan 2009; Jimu 2008; Dasgupta 1979). Cook (1994) emphasises that public participation for the purpose of self help is one essential criteria of CD. Douglas (1987) asserts that, "at a very general level, CD is about group self-determination set within a context of change" (p. 18). Ledwith (2007) and Smith (1996, 2006) declare that

communal participation for self-articulation of challenges and self-help in addressing those challenges are the criteria for recognizing CD in action. Empirical case studies of CD practice, such as Campfens' (1997) and Gunn & Gunn's (1991), also express that self-help and communal participation are essential to CD. Bhattacharyya (2004) articulates these diverse statements as references to the same concept named 'agency'. Hustedde & Ganowics (2002) and Hustedde (2009) embrace Bhattacharyya's conclusion. Beikart et al. (2009) prefer 'citizen driven change' as a form of agency, referring to change that is initiated by citizens as opposed to markets and states.

The concept of solidarity (and social capital) is equally expressed in the literature, and so is the concepts of reciprocity (and mutual-help). In the earlier literature through the debate of 'geographical' versus 'functional' (interest) communities, solidarity and reciprocity are used among indicators of the existence of genuine communities (rather than just geographical proximisty). As the definition of community became more based on the 'shared identity' criteria, solidarity became more prominent in defining CD. Emphasising solidarity is emphasising the drive to retain, or increase, that shared identity as a major objective of CD. Chekki (1979) articulates this solidarity objective by addressing the state of 'estrangement' – the opposite of solidarity – that has been brought about by modernization.

Many indigenous peoples around the world give particular names to the principles of reciprocity, solidarity, and agency in the community, such as the concept of 'Ubuntu' in Southern Africa. Ubuntu refers generally to the importance of the collective life and identity – e.g. mutual support networks, emotional affiliation, group expressions – as an essential part of each and every individual member.

Explanatory theory of community development

Explanatory theory of CD seeks to explain the origins and reasons of the emergence of CD as a discipline. Early writings on CD indicate that the practice was born before the theory that explains its goals and propositions. In 1979, Cary said that CD, as a practice, was growing more distinct from other approaches to planned social change but yet awaited a theory to match. In 1970, Sanders proposed that the relatively new discipline CD had emerged as a descendent of two older disciplines, namely community organization and economic development. Community organization, on the one hand, in Western Europe and North America, dealt generally with administering welfare programs through local governments.[4] Economic development, on the other hand, addressed macro planning and systemic movements towards desired economic goals, and operated generally within the international context, administered through governmental aid and bilateral programs. Linking these two disciplines in a new discipline, Sanders argues, could have only been possible in the post-World War II era. Smith (1996, 2006) argues that CD is mainly a 'colonial legacy', with its first manifestations in colonial programs in colonized countries (also in the post-world war II era). Smith suggests that colonial authorities moved towards CD as a response "to the growth of nationalism, and, in part an outcome of a desire to increase the rate of industrial and economic development." Jimu (2008) also explains the emergence of CD as a colonial tool that draws on the British tradition in Anglophone Africa. This explains the notion of 'self-help' as originally derived from the main "British strategy for implementation of welfare oriented colonial development policy in the 1950s". Both Smith and Jimu argue that the former colonies overall reached a level of disenchantment, in the 1970s, with the promises of the colonial version of CD.

Ronald Warren (1970) argues that CD practice emerged as a response to modern industrialization. The goal of CD was both promoting industrialization and coping with its consequences. This double purpose of CD explains reasons behind the diverse goals of different CD projects in different contexts, as some projects seek to introduce 'modernized' ways of doing things, while other projects seem to be doing the opposite, i.e. resisting some top-down modernized 'solutions'. This 'double' nature, to Warren, consequently brings about conditions that introduce a distinct CD theory. Some CD scholars, such as Dasgupta (1979) and Bhattacharyya (2004), embraced Warren's explanation of the emergence of CD. Dasgupta (1979) presents a critical view of CD by saying it is a tool for dealing with the new global political-economic conditions of the welfare state. Now that there are no colonies, industrialized societies have to survive upon conditions of exploitative production within their own borders. CD is seen, in Dasgupta's argument, as a battle field in which both the state and the exploited communities try to win more points for their sides. Communities use CD to rise above their conditions, and it is also a space that the welfare state allows to exist only to prevent more radical measures from unfolding. Bhattacharyya argues that the emergence of CD is "a positive response to the historic process of erosion of solidarity and agency" (2004, p. 14). This historic process of erosion is explained in the context of the emergence of the nation state—and the social outcomes it continues to propagate—along with industrial capitalism and 'instrumental reason'[5]. Bhattacharyya then

makes the first and strongest, yet, connection between CD and Karl Polanyi's work, by invoking and citing Polanyi's argument of how modern market societies – being products of the nation state and market economies – create markets for the fictitious commodities of land, labour and money. Bhattacharyya then argues that fictitious commodities are strongly connected to the erosion of solidarity and agency in modern societies. While Bhattacharyya does not go as far as basing his theoretic proposal on Polanyi's work, or making Polanyi's concepts or fictitious commodities and market societies central to his argument, he utilizes Polanyi in the most relevant way, as yet, to the CD literature.

Normative theory of community development

A number of normative approaches to CD start their approach with an explanatory theory, then derive normative conclusions of what ought to be done about the situation explained—how CD should work. Attempts such as Sanders' (1958 and 1970) and Warren's (1970) tried to cooperate and complement each other to produce a comprehensive theoretical framework. Oscillations between seeing CD as a process, on one hand, and as a normative method, on the other, often occurred.[6] Chekki (1979) argues that even research in CD has to be socially engaged, and that "action research is both an appropriate and useful method for [CD]." (p. 118). This position is echoed by Ledwith (2005) who says that 'emancipatory action research' is the ultimate tool of CD and in which theory and practice come together (praxis). Other writers emphasise that a theory of CD can only be normative (such as Cook 1994 and Bhattacharyya 2004), while others take the normative inference for granted (see Tan 2009; Gunn & Gunn 1991; Campfens 1997).

Theories borrowed from other social sciences

Another important characteristic of the CD literature is the borrowing of existing concepts and theories from other fields of social science. Habermas, in his communicative action theory, is concerned with how the emancipatory use of language can change the interaction between actors (speech-community) to become based on trust rather than power (Hillier 2002). Hustedde (2009) sets out to demonstrate how the theory of communicative action is useful for CD. He argues that the act of communication, given that certain conditions are fulfilled, is capable of building community relations through consensus, in a way that can increase solidarity and agency. Hustedde maintains that participation in 'communication for change' is effectively a process of CD when undertaken in community settings. De Wit and Leishout (1997) propose that "Habermas is of interest to CD work, because he... provides a way out of the fundamental dilemma in social theory, which is the relationship between normative and cognitive aspects of the acquisition of knowledge" (p. 202-3).

The concepts and tools of 'dialogue' and 'conscientization' in Paulo Freire's work are also relevant to CD in more or less the same way as Habermas' communicative action. In many ways, Freire and Habermas both contribute to laying out conditions for transformative communication—communication that transforms both those who are engaged in it and their surrounding environment (Smith 2001b). Freire's presence in CD practice and theory is more established however. To Freire, the purpose of human dialogue is transformative. It, however, needs to be practiced in certain ways to be humane and positive for the people. "Human existence cannot be silent, nor can it be nourished by false words, but only by true words, with which man transforms the world. To exist, humanly, is to name the world, to change it." (Freire 1984, 77). Freire's work is mainly about proposing education – not any education, but critical education engaged in critically addressing social reality – as a conscientization and emancipation process. Power at the hand of the oppressor can be countered by educational dialogue that arms people with knowledge about their situation and possibilities and thus about transformative action. Ledwith (2005 and 2007), for example, founds her advocacy for CD primarily on Freire's work on education and conscientization.

Giddens' influence on the CD literature is highlighted by several writers. Hustedde & Ganowics (2002) first argue that the three key concerns that CD theory has to deal with are structure, power, and shared meaning. The three concepts weave together and envelope any potential context for CD.[7] The greatest theoretical challenge, the authors claim, is to find the balance between macro (structure) versus micro (behavior) conflicts – such as individual vs. communal conflicts, or conflicts between smaller groups in a certain larger group – in a given setting. This micro-macro conflict has been a dominating problem in the overall literature of the social sciences. Hustedde & Ganowics propose Giddens' concept of modalities (Giddens 1984), in his theory of structuration, as a good theoretical tool to navigate the common ground between the macro and the micro:

"Behavior [micro] is neither haphazard nor merely a reflection of the existing social structure and its divisions, but it follows certain paths (modalities) established and available to people through the cultural patterns. Similarly, new rules [macro] of behavior also occur through the medium of modali-

ties, in this instance their creative divisions. This is how the existing divisions can be overcome and new bonds between people forged." (Hustedde & Ganowics 2002, 13).

Essentially, Hustedde & Ganowics support Giddens in that both new structures and behaviors stem from the common ground of modalities and are not separate from those origins. Modalities themselves, however, are capable of being re-shaped and re-connected, with a level of flexibility that requires creative and consistent effort. Possibilities for CD emerge as a process of navigating how modalities work in order to implement that knowledge into a process of weaving through structure, power and shared meaning to build solidarity and agency. De Wit and Leishout (1997) also mention Gidden's importance to CD because of his work on modalities and his contribution to bridging the gap between culture and structure. Henderson & Vercseg (2010), in their discussion on CD and civil society, point to Giddens' work on communities as central to the new politics he proposes. "The theme of community is fundamental to the new politics, but not just as an abstract slogan. The advance of globalization makes a community focus both necessary and possible, because of the downward pressure it exerts." (Giddens 1998, quoted in Henderson & Vercseg 2010, p. 22).

Polanyi: The Place of the Economy in Society

When Karl Polanyi's book *The Great Transformation* was first published in 1944, it brought a new perspective to the social sciences and offered several concepts relevant today to CD. The book presents this new perspective by specifying one historic phenomenon and one institutional phenomenon. The historic phenomenon was the nineteenth century's hundred years of relative peace and prosperity in Europe, preceded by continuous internal wars and followed by World War I and an economic collapse. The institutional phenomenon was the emergence of the market economy (the self-regulating market mechanism) as the dominant economic institution of our time (Latham 1997). Four institutions, Polanyi argues, formed the basic conditions of nineteenth century European civilization: the balance of power, the gold standard, the liberal state, and the self-regulating market. Out of these four the most outstanding in importance was the fourth. It is the emergence of the market economy for the first time in history that constitutes 'the great transformation.' The thesis of the book is that, "the idea of a self-adjusting market implied a stark utopia. Such an institution could not exist for any length of time

without annihilating the human and natural substance of society." (p. 10). Polanyi argues that the market economy—the economic sphere of society being dominated by the market—itself was a created utopia. It did not emerge naturally, but was devised through consecutive ideas and legal regulations that took place in Europe, before and through the industrial revolution era. Through the historical analysis of the European nineteenth century civilization and its collapse, Polanyi defines concepts, builds a theoretic framework and articulates arguments that support this thesis. Three ideas/concepts form the core of Polanyi's argument (Polanyi-Levitt 2007): embeddedness, fictitious commodities, and the double movement.

Embeddedness refers to the observation that economic institutions were always inseparable from social ones—i.e., they do not have distinct laws and motives from those of society as a whole. Economic systems and practices are 'embedded' in social institutions, guided by the collective culture and its laws and motives. Laws (communal) and motives (personal) here are the key factors, for in earlier societies (pre-colonial, pre-industrial), Polanyi argues, there was no special designation for the laws and motives of economic activities. This, however, was changed with the introduction of the idea of the self-regulating market (by Adam Smith, Ricardo and others), which paved the way for the market economy to dominate the national and international scene in European relations (Harriss 2003). The law of supply and demand is assumed to be a self-regulating mechanism and personal gain is presumably the 'natural' motive all individuals have under the market economy.

"This new world of 'economic motives' was based on a fallacy. Intrinsically, hunger and gain are no more 'economic' than love or hate, pride or prejudice. No human motive is per se economic. There is no such thing as a sui generis economic experience in the sense in which man may have a religious, aesthetic, or sexual experience. The latter give rise to motives that broadly aim at evoking similar experiences. In regard to material production these terms lack self-evident meaning" (Polanyi 1968, 63).

Polanyi asserts that in history, although the economy always played an important role in human societies, it only came to play 'the' leading role since states facilitated the emergence of the market economy. Personal gain or self-interest for the first time in the history has become a justified motive in the everyday life of individuals in a civilization. The idea of the self-regulating market is based on the assumptions that:

1. People behave in a way that aims at maximizing personal gain

2. Markets can regulate themselves according to the supply and demand rule, which controls prices
3. Prices also control distribution and determine incomes. (Polanyi 1944).

What is important, in Polanyi's argument, is that these assumptions have been erroneously presented as axioms—as self-evident facts. The first assumption denies the role of social norms and culture in influencing human aspirations. The second assumption turns a blind eye to the historical fact that all markets in history operated under social regulatory institutions and did not regulate themselves (not even capitalist markets, which cannot exist without standardized monetary and security systems provided by the state institutions). The third assumption fails to acknowledge historical evidence that prices often do not control distribution, but are rather controlled by redistributive authorities in societies for the sake of different social priorities, such as stability and security (Polanyi et al. 1957). Although the market economy sought to create economic institutions distinct (disembedded) from the rest of society this separation was ultimately untenable. Thus society had to shift to adapt to the new conditions. The economy became relatively disembedded from society and society had to change to contain this new phenomenon; thus a market society came into existence."This is the meaning of the familiar assertion that the market economy can function only in a market society." (Polanyi 1944, 57).

The situation above, typical of modern capitalist societies, calls for the other two ideas of fictitious commodities and the double movement. Polanyi calls labour, land and money 'fictitious commodities'. They are fictitious because they are not and cannot be produced for sale in the market.

"Labour is only another name for a human activity which goes with life itself, which in its turn is not produced for sale but for entirely different reasons, nor can that activity be detached from the rest of life, be stored or mobilized; land is only another name for nature, which is not produced by man; actual money, finally, is merely a token of purchasing power which, as a rule, is not produced at all, but comes into being through the mechanism of banking or state finance. The commodity description of labour, land, and money is entirely fictitious" (Ibid, 72).

Nonetheless, these three are the elements of industry, and the market economy cannot leave them excluded. They were 'commodified' as a necessary requirement of a market society. The introduction of the factory system in a commercial society, Polanyi adds, made it inevitable to commodify the elements of industry (Borgmann 2010). Since it is obvious that

the commodification of these elements will have a dire impact on society, and if left absolute—which is to say, if the market is left to self-regulate—society and nature will face dire consequences. This is where the state came, representing society, and did not allow absolute commodification. Society, now, through the state regulatory institutions, continuously intervenes in the market economy to set regulations to protect itself from the ruthless demands of absolute market self-regulation (Kumbamu 2009). On the other hand, the market needs society to exist with a sufficient level of coherence and security, otherwise there will be no flourishing market for the 'genuine commodities' since consumption will be highly unstable. On the other hand, excessive state regulation restrains market self-regulation, so the proponents of the market economy will also fight what they perceive as excessive regulation. This inherent conflict between the agents of society and the market creates the double movement: "The extension of the market organization in respect to genuine commodities [is] accompanied by its restriction in respect to fictitious ones" (Ibid, 76). The social history of the nineteenth century, says Polanyi, was shaped by this double movement.

The double movement created two relatively separate spheres in society, which are the economic and the political spheres, represented mainly by the market and the state institutions. It is a separation that is maintained by law, however, which is a tool of the state, and which shows that complete market self-regulation is untenable (Hodgson 2007). This is another manifestation of the 'dis-embeddedness' the market economy created, for in history these two spheres were never separate in human societies, nor were they alienated from culture (traditions, belief systems, gender relations, etc).

Reciprocity, redistribution, and exchange

Furthermore, Polanyi makes sure that his proposed study of economics has an adequate conceptual framework. There are two meanings, Polanyi observes, to the word 'economic'. The first one is substantive, which basically means our dependence, as human beings, upon nature and upon each other to satisfy our material wants. As such, this substantive meaning encompasses many possibilities of organizing elements of industry to achieve that satisfaction of material needs and wants. The second meaning of economics is formal, which means the organized character of the ends-means relationship to satisfy those material wants within society, based, however, on regulating ends and means on logical terms that assume a continuous 'insufficiency of means'. Polanyi (1957) argues that formal economics is based

on a logic of scarcity while substantive economics are based on broad facts of livelihood. When operating within a formal economy, the broad 'fact' that some economic systems do not need money at all to function, or that most economies in history did not relegate price-making to markets, is irrelevant. Material-want satisfaction is not the goal in formal economies, but rather following the rules of the devised system (Hopkins 1957). Besides, formal economies are usually incapable of being inclusive of all economic activities within their jurisdiction, which is why the social sciences use the term 'informal economies' to refer to economic activities that are not calibrated by the 'formal' rules of the economy, despite being important elements in the livelihood system (Harriss-White 2010). Polanyi et al. (1957) then propose, for the realm of social sciences, that the study of the different possible ways of organizing the economy, in the substantive meaning, is the study of 'the economy as an instituted process'.

To understand what Polanyi means by 'institutedness' we need to briefly discuss Polanyi's understanding of institutions and his position on how they relate to collective and individual patterns in society. Hodgson (2007) defines institutions as "durable systems of established and embedded social rules that structure social interactions." (p. 67). While this definition addresses both written (legal) and unwritten rules, and while some scholars of institutionalism argue that a big-scope definition like that can bring analytical confusion to research (Fukuyama 2005, quoted in Orrnert 2006, 450), Polanyi's work with institutions is consistent with Hodgson's definition. To Polanyi, even legal systems differ from social norms only in degree, because both legal systems and social norms represent patterns in society (Polanyi 1957). Polanyi is an "old-institutionalist". Old institutionalism states that institutions shape and influence the motives of individuals in complicated ways which cannot be simplified in one-way directions or made exclusive to rational reasoning (Clague 1997; Hodgson 1998 and 2001). For example, Polanyi says that although individuals in communities tend to have the motive of reciprocity, and might act upon it frequently, that would not be sufficient by itself for a reciprocity-based institution to be established in the economic system (1957). The main difference between old and new institutionalism is that new institutionalism assumes the principles of rational choice theory and thus sees institutions as necessarily reflections of the interaction of 'rational' individuals (Leys 1996). Old institutionalism recognizes a variety of material and ideational sources for the formation of institutions.

Instituting the economy in society is achieved through three 'forms of integration'. Polanyi names them: reciprocity, redistribution and exchange (1957). Reciprocity organizes economic relations around symmetrical patterns, whereby groups and individuals fulfill each others' material wants by mutual help and ceremonial gift exchange, without the need for wages or monetary rewards. Redistribution organizes economic relations around 'centricity', whereby goods flow in and out of a centre that assures satisfaction of material-want (such as state taxes) (Polanyi 1957). Only the third form of integration, exchange, employs a market system, which is why early societies that did not use this form did not have permanent markets but certainly had economic systems. Also while some of these early societies had large trade systems they did not necessarily have markets. Polanyi's theoretical framework—backed by historical evidence and analysis (Polanyi et al. 1957)—directly challenges the historical assumptions of the market economy. Polanyi and other proponents of this theoretic framework gave the name of 'institutional analysis' to the framework's analytical method. The Polanyian legacy offers a way of looking at the economy that is more tied to society and social dynamics. It can be therefore useful for CD.

Community Development as Double Movement

A proposed theoretical perspective

Below we seek to present an approach to CD which incorporates the Polanyian perspective. We build on the shared language (conceptual framework) already established in the CD literature and also drawn from the existing CD theories reviewed earlier in the paper. We present a Polanyian perspective, of concepts and explanatory relations between the concepts, to CD theory.

As reviewed before CD has been explained as a response to the consequences communities faced as a result of 'industrialization' and 'modernization' (Warren 1970) or the emergence of 'the nation state, industrial capitalism and instrumental reason' (Bhattacharyya 2004). One can consequently see that both Warren and Bhattacharyya are generally talking about the same conditions. These new conditions that led to the emergence of CD are expressed as the emergence of the market society in the Polanyian argument. This market society is a result of the commodification of land, labour and money. This commodification created what Bhattacharyya called 'the erosion of community'. This erosion, in Polanyian terms, is a result of the 'liquidation of cultural

institutions' due to the commodification of land and labour under market economies.

CD then can be seen as a communal response to such unfavourable conditions; i.e. an expression of the double movement. Through CD society is trying to protect itself from the social erosion or destruction brought about by the imposition of the market economy. It is an expression, at the community level, of stronger ties, shared interests, shared norms and meaning systems (whether by communities of place or interest/functional communities). The Polanyian perspective is applicable to CD because Polanyi gives great value to social embeddedness which can be understood as community identity and solidarity as determinants of economic behaviour. Moreover, Polanyi himself had made a similar argument to explain specific economic outcomes. For example, he said:

"Indian masses in the second half of the nineteenth century did not die of hunger because they were exploited by Lancashire; they perished in large numbers because the Indian village community had been demolished… While under the regime of feudalism and of the village community, noblesse oblige, clan solidarity, and regulation of the corn market checked famines, under the rule of market the people could not be prevented from starving according to the rules of the game." (1944, 167-68).

Solidarity and agency, common concepts in the CD literature, are resonant in the writings of Polanyi. In addition to the example above, Polanyi also says that 'solidarity' is the reason why early societies allowed no *"transactions of gainful nature in regard to food and foodstuffs" (1957, 255).* As for the concept of agency, it is very relevant to Polanyi's arguments that the deprivation of a people from their own cultural institutions (through colonization, for example) almost always renders bad economic consequences, regardless of the actual evidence of increase in the quality and quantity of material goods. What can be concluded from this is that Polanyi understood social agency as an essential element of genuine economic activity, i.e., one that is not propagating the rule of the market economy. Polanyi's double movement itself implies agency or response by those who are negatively affected by the commodification of land, labour and money.

So the new proposed approach is to understand CD as a response to the trend of commodification of land, labour and money—with more emphasis on land and labour—in the modern context of the nation state. CD is an expression of the double movement. In the short term, it seeks to protect land and labour from the commodification that awaits them under absolute market economies. In the long term, CD can be understood as one expression of the larger social movement for re-embedding the economy in society by raising social values above economic values, and allowing solidarity and agency to shape economic institutions.

To summarize, the theoretic approach, proposed, views CD as one social response to prevent the complete prevalence of the self-regulating market economy. This response seeks to 're-commodify' the elements of industry that the market economy treats as commodities. We can call this a process of de-commodification.

The concept of decommodification has a presence in the current CD literature, albeit minimal. Meikle & Green (2011) argue that decommodification is a strategy through which communities resist economic globalization:

"There are alternative strategies that resist the process of economic globalization. Rather than considering these factors of production (land, labour, and capital) as commodities, these strategies tend to decommmodify them. This means that land, labour, and capital are allocated not solely on the basis of their exchange value, but also on their contribution to community sustainability." (p. 290).

Decommodification, as a terminology, has a wider presence in the anti-market economy literature, with very similar definitions, and without necessarily referencing Polanyi by name (see, for example, Bond 2006 and Huo et al. 2008). In this paper, decommodification is specifically defined, using Polanyian arguments and concepts, as a process of re-embedding the economic value of land, labour, and money, into the broader social and political institutions. Often, forms of reciprocity and redistribution are used in this process. Decommodification does not necessarily mean the total elimination of the role of the market. It means however that social regulation is emphasized, strengthened and enhanced. Social regulation, as an expression of the double movement, resists the complete or overwhelming control of the market by inducing and sustaining social regulation of the economy, rather than 'self-regulation' of the market. Land, labour and money take priority in this general process, due to their 'fictitious commodity' status in the Polanyian analysis.

CD, in particular, can be seen as a process of de-commodification that invests in community social capital by creating and increasing solidarity and agency. Cultivating the community's solidarity and agency is a vehicle for improving overall socioeconomic conditions.

Table 1: Summary - CD as double movement

Question	Answer
What is CD and why it emerged? (explanatory)	- A response to the expansion of the market economy and commodification of land, labour and money. - Thus, an expression of the double movement, at the community level.
What does CD seek to do? (normative)	- Seeks to re-embed the economic value of land, labour and/or money into society (decommodification). - In different contexts, seeks to resist attempts of commodifying land, labour and/or money when already embedded (anti-commodification).
How CD works? (tools and outcomes)	- Building of community relations (social capital, solidarity and agency) as communal vehicles to address conditions of challenges and/or promises. - Often introduces or strengthens institutions of reciprocity and/or redistribution as remedy to market exchange, to eliminate or, at least, weaken market exchange institutions.

Such perspective of CD helps to present a coherent explanatory and normative theory of CD. Explaining the emergence of CD lays the foundation for what CD seeks to accomplish in response to the conditions that called for its emergence. Decommodification of land, labour and money then becomes the content of the response of CD to the market economy and commodification. Therefore CD sometimes can also be a form of 'anti-commodification', which occurs when communities resist the commodification of their socially embedded resources of land, labour and/or money. Table 1 summarizes the paper's proposed approach to CD.

Linking Polanyi and others under CD theory

Polanyi adds institutional economic analysis, and possibly economic anthropologic analysis, to the frameworks proposed by Freire, Habermas, Giddens and maybe others. His defence of the social and cultural spheres using economic, political and institutional language is not found with the same faculty and coherence in the work of the other mentioned writers.

Habermas' distinction between the two concepts of lifeworld and systems is very relevant to the topic of this paper. To Habermas, lifeworld consists of the elements of "culture, society, personality" (Habermas 1987, 153), and it is reflective of the social norms, behavioral patterns and personal contributions that form the fabric of social life and human-oriented communication. Systems, on the other hand, "such as capitalist economy and bureaucratic administration... operate via the steering media of power and media. There is no common orientation of actors in the 'system', but rather society is impersonally integrated through 'functional or cybernetic feedback' (Hillier

2002, 32). This 'impersonalization' of society that occurs in the system is resonant to Polanyi's concept of disembeddedness, whereby a system, such as the market economy, isolates its institutions from the rest of the social fabric and norms. Habermas gets even closer to Polanyi when he says that systemic mechanisms are "largely disconnected from norms and values" (Habermas 1987, 154). In the same sense, Freire's conscientization process is embodied in social movements around the world which seek to decommodify labour and land. An example for those movements is the *La Via Campesina*, the International Peasant Network, and its 'food sovereignty' proposal for the global decommodification of food (Martinez-Torres et al. 2010).

Another area worthy of further exploration is in how Giddens intersects with Polanyi on the study of the double movement, where social values (modalities) play a great role as media for the agents of society to counter rapid commodification of land, labour and money. Communities will have to defend themselves against market forces by utilizing modalities in support of their causes. Thus, modalities and their use seem to animate the expression of the double movement, and without that expression they remain ambiguous notions.

Case Studies

Below some sample CD cases demonstrate how they can be re-described through the proposed theoretic approach and how that illuminates aspects of the double movement, decommodification, and the institutionalization of reciprocity and redistribution. Cases will be categorized in three orientations: land, labour and money, although in reality these categories are often mixed and overlapped.

Communities and land

One form of demonstration of CD is the trend of communal resistance against the commodification of their land for the building of big dams (anti-commodification). In India, community organized resistance against big dam projects has been existent since the late 1940s and continues to this day (Pande, 2007; Khagram, 2004; Fisher, 1995). The early versions of this resistance were formed in communal demands for fair compensation for being displaced and losing their lands. These demands grew over the decades to include expressed community and environment concerns. Compensation became less of a concern and alternating the dam projects themselves became the objective. Building community relations, through education and strengthening of communication channels, became prominent tools for mobilization (Ram, 1995; Dwivedi, 1998) and NGOs became widely involved with national and translational support of a network of NGOs and other affected communities. Similar to other disciplined social movements from other parts of the world, resistance to dams is not based on a position of claiming poverty and requesting compassion, but based on communal assertion of rights (Bebbington et al. 2009). Communities are claiming their right to agency over their affairs, instead of having their fates determined by top-down policies of national and regional authorities.

It can be argued, however, that the case of dams resistance in India is not against the market economy, but against national planning; or in other words against an economic system of redistribution, which Polanyi supports. It is, however, important to recognize when the state uses its redistributive role for the benefit of market forces instead of the benefits of citizens. The argument of the Indian communities against these large dams is that the state is serving the interests of market-controlling classes (Pande, 2007) with less regard to the participation and cultural institutions of the affected village communities and with less regard to the cultural, non-economic value of the land affected by the projects (Deegan, 1995). The double movement, as explained by Polanyi, does not rule out the state acting as an agent of the market sometimes. Some of India's national 'industrialization' schemes are documented to have caused severe consequences on poor communities, simultaneously with wealthier classes gaining more wealth. A Polanyian analysis would stress how this industrialization scheme is itself market-promoting and commodifying of land while ignoring the interests and existing institutions of local communities.

An example of anti-commodificaiton of land—a bit different from decommodification, but similar in

principle—is found in Ostrum's book *Governing the Commons* (1990). She Presents various cases of common-pool resources (CPRs) that were managed by communities, as opposed to the conventional options in political science theories.[8] These conventional theories predict that, if such resources are left unregulated by either the state or the market, they will be severely exploited and thus soon degraded due to unsustainable use. The famous theory of the Tragedy of the Commons is prevalent in this account. Ostrum's case studies examined different approaches, by different communities around the world, in which CPRs were managed, relatively sustainably, by the communities that made their livelihoods out of them.

One particular case, from Törbel, Switzerland, narrates a system of communal land tenure in high mountain meadows and forests. For centuries, Törbel peasants have had a system of land tenure that combines both privately owned plots and community owned land. Herdsmen tended the village cattle in communally owned alpine meadows. The villagers have managed five types of communally owned lands: the grazing meadows, the forests, the "waste" lands, the irrigation systems, and the paths and roads connecting privately and community owned properties. Documents from 1483 show that Törbel residents formally established an association to better regulate the use of most of the communal land:

"The law specifically forbade a foreigner (Fremde) who bought or otherwise occupied land in Törbel from acquiring any right in the communal alp, common lands, or grazing places, or permission to fell timber. Ownership of a piece of land did not automatically confer any communal right... The inhabitants currently possessing land and water rights reserved the power to decide whether an outsider should be admitted to community membership." (Netting, 1976, quoted in Ostrum, 1990, p.62).

There are also established regulations among the community members on how and when these communal lands are to be used. For at least five centuries, these Swiss villages have opted for continuing with this system, after their exposure to the different advantages and disadvantages of market-regulated and state-regulated CPR management options. These villages, in terms of life-style and material progress, are modernized communities now, but they remain loyal to this system of governing communal land. The unique regulation regarding foreigners and access to communal land shows a strong principle of anti-commodification of land. Communal land is not a commodity, i.e., not available for sale in the market and its value is not determined by the market. Rights to this land need not money, but a communal decision that follows different criteria. This rule applies even to those who buy the private land of some community

members. They do not automatically gain the same right to communal land that the selling community members had. How the economic elements of the land are embedded in the social relations is clear in this case.

Communities and labour

At the outset, it can be said that worker unions and associations in general are usually tools for decommodifying labour, on different levels. They seek to protect the rights of their members and ensure their job security, benefits, fair treatment and collective bargaining for improved working conditions. They act as functional communities (communities of interest), and although their main objectives are economic, they aspire for safer and more fulfilling working conditions and they seek them through strengthening their own networks for collective bargaining. However, the larger they are the more they seem to lose that status of 'community', since they become more involved with policies at the regional, national and international levels, which also increase their membership. This in turn renders less 'caring' elements and more formal communication among the members and the management, and reduces the factor of 'building community relations'. That, then, takes them outside the realm of CD into something else; it might include decommodification of labour, but it is not CD.

However, smaller 'worker associations' in smaller settings are more representative of CD as defined in this paper. Ledwith (2005) provides a story of migrant workers in Ireland and their challenging of the 'work permit' system that tied workers to one employer. The work permit system was a "leading factor in the exploitation of workers from outside the European Union. [It made them] face great difficulties securing a new employer, [and] if made redundant, can become undocumented in trying to change employer and for others means limited routes out of low paid work." (p. 114). The CD work started with a group of ex-work permit holders, who met and discussed with each other their experiences and the oppressive situation they had to endure because of this law. "A critical and collective analysis soon emerged out of this process… one which ultimately called for greater power to be bestowed on workers by allowing the right to freely change employer." Eventually, a protest campaign to challenge the law initiated from this process, and "as the campaign went national meetings were convened with workers around the country and a venue for mass participation for migrant workers was created." (p. 115). The campaign grew bigger and diversified in tools of resistance, which included letter-writing to govern-

ment officials, visiting local politicians, a national demonstration, etc.. The campaign also built alliances with employer groups and labour unions, and the media was engaged. This is an example where educational objectives and a processes of conscientization resulted in collective action taken by self-empowered communities to challenge conditions of oppression and demand measures of decommodification.

Communities and money

Money that is used solely for the exchange of real commodities is used genuinely (i.e., not fictitious). In CD, however, the criteria are not just that. CD cases of decommodifying money use money in activities that contribute to building community relations. Inducing the social value that money can serve is important.   One case study to demonstrate this is the communal loan program of the Women Development Associations (WDAs) of Eastern Sudan. WDAs were initiated in a few eastern Sudanese villages by the NGO Practical Action-Sudan. Their general objective was to help women improve their livelihood conditions through capacity building and strengthening institutions of small-scale production for women-headed households (Abukasawi & ElKarib, 2004). Although WDAs started humbly as food processing training programs for women, they gradually grew to aim at "strengthening WDAs as active civil society organizations in Eastern Sudan." (Abukasawi & ElKarib, 2004, p. 6). WDAs became community educational agencies to inform women about various economic and legal aspects related to their small-scale businesses. More importantly, for our purposes here, WDAs established a loaning system among themselves that is common in small groups in Sudan. Through their own membership contributions, the associations gave members interest-free loans to establish their own businesses. Only a member or two get enough money in each period to start their businesses. They are then expected to repay the money they took in installments, earned from their businesses, which will then be used to supply other women with their capital. There is no interest generated from this circulation, and the WDAs receive no profit from this process. The only purpose of the program is to supply its members with enough capital, at a time, to push-start their own businesses. Money here is decommodified because it is not 'sold' with interest and is used for no capital gain to the WDAs. The only gain they get is the improvement of the living conditions of their members, both economically and socially.[9]

Implication

Viewing CD practice as an expression of the double movement - a concept explained by Polanyi - has the capacity to organize existing common aspects of CD theory and provide a coherent narrative that includes both explanatory and normative views of CD. This argument can then thus can further bridge the gap between the practitioner world and researcher/academic world in the field, making way for more communication and collaboration between the two worlds. Also, the fields of institutional economics and economic anthropology can now have more connection with CD studies through the work of Polanyi. Further review of literature, studying of concepts and methods, case studies, and authentic theoretic analysis may need to take place to further support the argument.

Conclusion

This paper argues that the theoretical contributions of Karl Polanyi can provide a compelling foundation for the analysis of community development (CD) processes and cases. Viewing CD as an expression of the double movement starts by linking the phenomena of modernization to the argument of Karl Polanyi and others about the emergence of the market economy and the establishment of 'fictitious commodities' (land, labour and money) in modern societies. The commodification of these 'elements of industry' can be linked to the deterioration of solidarity and agency within communities (i.e., how commodification liquidated cultural institutions and dis-embedded the economy from society, thus deteriorating solidarity and agency). CD can then be viewed as an attempt to decommodify land, labour and money in order to re-embed the economy in society (at the community level). The thesis is that introducing the Polanyian legacy to CD theory is a productive direction which benefits the field of CD.

The paper started with an extensive literature review to highlight the characteristics, themes and common concepts of the CD literature. It also reviewed some influential theories on CD from the broader social sciences and how they are used in the CD literature (such as the theoretical contributions of Jurgen Habermas, Paulo Freire, and Anthony Giddens). The paper then suggested how the common foundations of CD can be re-interpreted through Polanyi's ideas and concepts. Finally some case studies are briefly reviewed to demonstrate the argument.

Notes

1. In this paper every time the bracketed '[CD]' is located inside a quote from another source, it is replacing the exact term 'community development' in that quote.
2. Social capital, defined by Mattessich (2009), is "social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity." (p. 49).
3. Conscientization is the process of becoming critically aware of structural sources of oppression in society as obstacles to emancipation and development (Ledwith 2005; Doré 1997).
4. Community organization also has some commonalities with what is called community planning. In some cases the two terms are used interchangeably.
5. Instrumental reason is defined, by Bhattacharyya, as the reason of material efficiency devoid, allegedly, of subjective criteria.
6. An example of that oscillation is Cary's own comment that, "[CD] can be viewed as both a radical and a conservative process." (p. 5). Cary later said that CD theory should ideally be a normative theory; "a practice theory sufficient to guide the professional" (1979, p. 32).
7. Structure refers to the social institutions and organizations that play a role together in the process of CD. Power "refers to the relationships with those who control resources such as land, labour, capital, and knowledge or those who have greater access to those resources than others." (Hustedde & Ganowics 2002, 4). Shared meaning refers to the values and symbols that determine priorities and communication among members of communities. A successful recipe for a guiding CD theory, the authors say, is one that weaves and balances these three key issues at work in any CD context.
8. i.e. political theories that assert that CPRs can only be managed either through the direct management of the state or through private property regulation and market systems.
9. One threat to the success of this approach is the element of inflation. Members who receive their capital late in the circle would have their money de-valued compared to those who get their capital earlier. This issue is witnessed repeatedly as a source of conflicts in similar initiatives in Sudan (between small groups in neighborhoods or families in Sudan), but it has not been a reason for the disappearance of the practice at all. "The WDAs in East Sudan have established several branches in the region (more than 40 branches), with about 2000 members, and more than 430 individual projects." (Abukasawi & Elkarib, 2004, p.74).

References

Abukasawi, Mustafa J. & Asha K. Elkarib (2004). *Evaluation of Women Development Associations [WDAs] Project*. Khartoum: Intermediate Technology Development Group [ITDG].

Adaman, Fikret, Pat Devine & Begun Ozkaynak (2007). "Reinstituting the economic process: (re)embedding the economy in society and nature" in Mark Harvey, Sally Randles and Ronnie Ramolgan's (eds.) *Karl Polanyi: New perspectives on the place of the economy in society.* Manchester: Manchester University Press. Chapter 6: 93-112.

Bhattacharyya, Jnanabrata (1995). "Solidarity and agency: Rethinking community development." *Human organization,* 54(1): 60-69.

Bhattacharyya, J. (2004). "Theorizing community development." *Journal of community development society,* 34(2): 5-34.

Bebbington, Anthony, Diana Mitlin, Jan Mogaladi, Martin Scurrah & G. Bielich (2009). *Decentring Poverty, reworking government: movements and states in the government of poverty.* Working paper no. 149. Chronic Poverty Reseach Centre.

Beikart, Kees and Fowler, Alan (2009). "Civic Driven Change: a concise guide to the basics." A report by the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague - The Netherlands.

Bond, Patrick (2006). "The decommodification strategy in South Africa." *State of Nature,* Winter 2006. Retrieved on March 8, 2012 from: http://www.stateofnature.org/decommodification.html

Borgmann, Albert (2010). "Reality and Technology." *Cambridge Journal of Economics,* issue 34: 27-35.

Campfens, Hubert (1997). "International review of community development: theory and practice" in Hubert Campfens' (ed.) *Community Development Around the World: Practice, Theory, Research, Training.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Part II: 11-46.

Cary, Lee (1970). "Introduction" in Lee Cary's (ed.) *Community Development as A Process.*

Cary, L. (1979). "The Present State of Community Development: Theory and Practice" in Dan A Chekki's (ed.) *Community Development: Theory and Method of Planned Change.* New Delhi: Delhi Press. Chapter 2: 32-46.

Chekki, Dan (1979). "Prologue" and "Review of Change Strategies" in Dan Chekki's (ed.) *Community Development: Theory and Method of Planned Change.* New Delhi: Delhi Press. Introduction and Chapter 8: 117-120.

Clague, C (1997). "The New Institutional Economics and Economic Development" In Christopher Clague's (ed) *Institutions and Economic Development: Growth and Governance in Less-Developed and Post-Socialist Countries.* Johns Hopkins University Press. Chapter 2.

Cook, James (1994). *Community Development Theory.* Publication MP 568, University of Missouri Extension: Organization Development. Retrieved December 14, 2010 from: http://extension.missouri.edu/ publications/DisplayPub.aspx?P=MP568

Dalton, George (1990). "Writings that clarify theoretical disputes over Karl Polanyi's work" in Kari Polanyi-Levitt's (ed.) *The life and work of Karl Polanyi.* Montreal: Black Rose Books. Chapter 18: 161-170.

Dasgupta, Sugata (1979). "Three Models of Community Development" in Dan A Chekki's (ed.) *Community Development: Theory and Method of Planned Change.* New Delhi: Delhi Press. Chapter 4: 60-75.

Deegan, Chris (1995). "The Narmada in Myth and History." Chapter 2 In *William F. Fisher's (ed.) Toward Sustainable Development: Struggling Over India's Narmada River. London: M. E. Sharpe.* 47-68.

de Wit, Cees, and Lieshout, Peter van (1997), "Theoretical Developments in Community Work in the iNetherlands" In Hubert Campfens' (ed.) *Community Development Around the World: Practice, Theory, Research, Training.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Part IV, chapter 7: 196-209.

Douglas, David (1987). "Community Development: Scope, Issues, Potentials." *Journal of Community Development,* March/April 1987: 15-23.

Doré, Gerald (1997). "Case study: Conscientization as a specific form of community practice and training in Quebec" in Hubert Campfens' (ed.) *Community Development Around the World: Practice, Theory, Research, Training.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Part III: 93-100.

Dwivedi, Ranjit (1998). "Resisting Dams and 'Development': Contemporary Significance of the Campaign Against the Narmada Projects in India." *European Journal of Development Research,* 10(2): 135-183.

Fisher, William (1995). "Development and Resistance in the Narmada Valley" in William F. Fisher's (ed.) *Toward Sustainable Development: Struggling Over India's Narmada River.* London: M. E. Sharpe. Chapter 1: 3-46.

Freire, Paulo (1984). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Translated by Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum.

Garkovich, Lorraine E. (2011). "A historical view of community development" in Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Gary Paul Green's (eds.) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* SAGE Publications. Chapter 2: 11-34.

Giddens, Anthony (1984). *The Constitution of Society.* University of California Press.

Gramajo, Andrés Marroquín (2008). "Rationality as a social construction: What does individual behaviour have to say about development in an Amazon community?" *Journal of economic issues,* XLII(1): 115-32.

Green, Gary Paul (2011). "The self-help approach to community development" in Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Gary Paul Green's (eds.) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* SAGE Publications. Chapter 5: 71-84.

Green, Gary Paul, and Robinson, Jerry W. (2011). "Emerging issues in community development" in Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Gary Paul Green's (eds.) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* SAGE Publications. Chapter 18: 295-302.

Gunn, Christopher and Gunn, Hazel Dayton (1991). *Reclaiming Capital: Democractic Initiatives and Community Development.* Ithace: Cornell University Press.

Habermas, Jurgen (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2. Lifeworld and System: a Critique of Functionalist Reason.* Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hardin, Garrett (1968)."The Tragedy of the Commons" *Science,* 162(1968):1243-1248.

Harriss, John (2003). "Institutions, Politics and Culture: A Polanyian Perspective on Economic Change." *International Review of Sociology,* 13(2): 343-55.

Harriss-White, Barbara (2010). "Work and Wellbeing in Informal Economies: The Regulative Rules of Institutions of Identity and the State." *World Development, 38(2): 170-83.*

Harvey, Mark, Ronnie Ramlogan and Sally Randles (2007). "Working with and beyond Polanyian perspectives" in Mark Harvey, Sally Randles and Ronnie Ramolgan's (eds.) *Karl Polanyi: New perspectives on the place of the economy in society.* Manchester: Manchester University Press. Chapter 1: 1-22.

Harvey, Mark (2007). "Instituting economics processes in society" in Mark Harvey, Sally Randles and Ronnie Ramolgan's (eds) *Karl Polanyi: New perspectives on the place of the economy in society.* Manchester: Manchester University Press. Chapter 9: 163-84.

Henderson, Paul and Vercseg, Ilona (2010). *Community Development and civil society: Making connections in the European context.* The Policy Press.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy and Patricia Leavy (2004) (eds.) *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hillier, Jean (2002). *Shadows of Power: An Allegory of Prudence in Land-use Planning.* London: Routledge.

Hodgson, Geoffrey M. (1998). "The Approach of Institutional Economics." *Journal of Economic Literature,* Vol. XXXVI: 166-92.

Hodgson, G. (2001). "Institutional Economic Thought." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,* pp. 7543-50.

Hodgson, G. (2007). "The enforcement of contracts and property rights: Constitutive versus epiphenomenal conceptions of law" in Mark Harvey, Sally Randles and Ronnie Ramolgan's (eds) *Karl Polanyi: New perspectives on the place of the economy in society.* Manchester: Manchester University Press. Chapter 4: 58-77.

Hopkins, Terence K. (1957). "Sociology and the Substantive View of the Economy" in Karl Polanyi, Conrad M. Arensberg and Harry W. Pearson's (eds) *Trade and market in early empires: Economies in history and theory.* Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. Chapter 14: 270-307.

Hudson, Kim (2004). "Behind the rhetoric of community development: how is it perceived and practiced?" *Australian Journal of Social Issues,* August issue. Retrieved from HighBeam Research. (January 13, 2012). http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-122660312.html

Huo, Jingjing, Moira Nelson and John D Stephens (2008). "Decommodification and activation in social democratic policy: resolving the paradox." *Journal of European Social Policy,* 18(1): 5-20.

Hustedde, Ronald and Jacek Ganowics (2002). "The basics: What's essential about theory for community development practice?" *Journal of community development society,* 33(1): 1-19.

Hustedde, Ronald (2009). "Seven theories for seven community developers" in Rhonda Phillips and Robert Pittman's (eds) *An introduction to community development.* New York: Routledge. Chapter 2: 20-37.

Jimu, Ignasio (2008). "Community Development: A Cross-Examination of Theory and Practice Using Experiences in Rural Malawi." *Africa Development,* XXXIII(2): 23-35.

Khagram, Sanjeev (2004). *Dams and Development: Transnational Struggles for Water and Power.* Oxford University Press.

Kumbamu, Ashok (2009). "Sublatern Strategies and Autonomous Community Building: a critical analysis of the network organization of sustainable agriculture initiatives in Andhra Pradesh." *Community Development Journal,* 44(3): 336-50.

Latham, Robert (1997). "Globalization and Democratic Provisionism: Re-reading Polanyi." *New Political Economy,* 2(1): 53-64.

Ledwith, Margaret (2005). *Community development: a critical approach.* The Policy Press. 2nd edition, 2011.

Ledwith, M. (2007) "Reclaiming the radical agenda: a critical approach to community development." *Concept,* 17(2): 8-12. Reproduced in *the encyclopaedia of informal education.* Retrieved from: www.infed.org/community/critical_community_development.htm

Leys, Colin (1996). *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory.* Nairobi: EAEP.

Lowe, Jeffery S., and Harris, William M. (2011). "Community development challenges in inner-city neighborhoods" in Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Gary Paul Green's (eds) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* SAGE Publications. Chapter 12: 193-208.

Lucena, Juan, Jen Schneider and Jon A. Leydens (2010). *Engineering and sustainable community development.* Morgan & Claypool Publishers.

Martinez-Torres, Maria Elana, Peter M. Rosset (2010). "La Via Campesina: the birth and evolution of transnational social movement." *Journal of Peasant Studies,* 37(1): 149-175.

Mattessich, Paul W. (2009). "Social capital and community building" in Rhonda Phillips and Robert Pittman's (eds) *An introduction to community development.* New York: Routledge. Chapter 4: 49-57.

Megill, Kenneth (1970). "The Community in Marx's Philosophy." *Philosophy and Phenomonological Research,* 30(3): 382-393.

Meikle, Paulette, and Green, Gary Paul (2011). "Globalization and community development: synergy or distintegration" in Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Gary Paul Green's (eds) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* SAGE Publications. Chapter 17: 279-94.

Mezirow, J. D. (1960). "Community development as an educational process." *International review of community development,* 5:137-38.

Ministry of Community Development, Women Affairs and Children (1996). *Community Development Policy.* Dar Es Salam, June. United Republic of Tanzania.

Netting, R. McC. (1976). "What Alpine Peasants Have in Common: Observations on Communal Tenure in a Swiss Village." *Human Ecology* 4: 135-146.

Neale, Walter C. (1957). "Reciprocity and Redistribution in the Indian Village" in Karl Polanyi, Conrad M. Arensberg and Harry W. Pearson's (eds.) *Trade and market in early empires: Economies in history and theory.* Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. Chapter 11: 218-35.

Orrnert, Anna (2006). "Missing pieces: An overview of the institutional puzzle." *Public administration and development,* 26: 449-55.

Ostrum, Elinor (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action.* Cambridge University Press.

Ostrum, E. (2005). "Doing Institutional Analysis: Digging Deeper than Markets and Hierarchies" in C. Me´nard and M. M. Shirley (eds.) *Handbook of New Institutional Economics.* The Netherlands: Springer. Chapter 30: 819–848.

Pande, Rohini (2007). "Large Dams in India," in Kaushik Basu's (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to Economics in India.* Oxford University Press.

Phillips, Rhonda, and Pittman, Robert (2009). "A framework for community and economic development" in Rhonda Phillips and Robert Pittman's (eds.) *An introduction to community development.* New York: Routledge. Chapter 1: 3-19.

Polanyi, Karl, Conrad M. Arensberg and Harry W. Pearson (eds.) (1957). *Trade and market in early empires: Economies in history and theory.* Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Polanyi, Karl (1944). *The Great Transformation.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1957

Polanyi, K. (1957). "The economy as instituted process" in Karl Polanyi, Conrad M. Arensberg and Harry W. Pearson's (eds.) *Trade and market in early empires: Economies in history and theory.* Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. Chapter 13: 243-70.

Polanyi, K. (1968). "Our Obsolete Market Mentality" in Karl Polanyi's *Primitive, Archaic and Modern Economies: Essays of Karl Polanyi,* edited by George Dalton. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books. Chapter 4: 59-77. Reprinted from an earlier publication of *Commentary,* Vol. 3, February 1947, pp. 109-117.

Polanyi-Levitt, Kari (2007). "Preface: the English Experience in the Life and Work of Karl Polanyi" in Mark Harvey, Sally Randles and Ronnie Ramolgan's (eds.) *Karl Polanyi: New perspectives on the place of the economy in society.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Poston, Richard W. (1958). Report of the chairman, Division of community development, Annual meeting of national university extension association, Salt Lake City, Utah. Quoted in Sanders 1970.

Ram, Rahul N. (1995). "Benefits of the Sardar Sarovar Project: Are the Claims Reliable?" Chapter 5 In William F. Fisher's (ed.) *Toward Sustainable Development: Struggling Over India's Narmada River.* London: M. E. Sharpe. 113-34.

Rankin, Katherine N. (2008). "Manufacturing Rural Finance in Asia: Institutional Assembleges, Market Societies, Entrepreneurial subjects." *Geoforum,* 39: 1965-77.

Robinson, Jerry, and Green, Gary Paul (2011). "Developing communities" in Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., and Gary Paul Green's (eds.) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice, and service-learning.* SAGE Publications. Chapter 1: 1-10.

Rothman, J. (1968). "Three models of community organization practice. *Social work practice 1968.* National conference on social welfare. New York: Columbia University Press, cited in Bhatacharyya 2004.

Rotstein, Abraham (1990). "The reality of society: Karl Polanyi's philosophical perspective" in Kari Polanyi-Levitt's (ed.) *The life and work of Karl Polanyi.* Montreal: Black Rose Books. Chapter 12: 98-110.

Sanders, Irwin (1958). "Theories of Community Development." *Rural Sociology,* 23(1): 1-12.

Sanders, I. (1970). "The concept of community development" in Lee J Cary's (ed.) *Community development as a process.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press. Chapter 1: 9-31.

Sehnert, Frank H. (1961). *A fundamental framework for the action process in community development.* Cabondale: Department of community development, Southern Illinois University. Mimeographed), quoted in Sanders 1970.

Smith, M. K. (1996, 2006) 'Community development', *the encyclopaedia of informal education*, Retrieved from: www.infed.org/community/b-comdv.htm.

Smith, M. K. (2001a) 'Community' in *the encyclopedia of informal education,* Retrieved from: *http://www.infed .org /community/community.htm.*

Smith, M. K. (2001b). "Dialogue and conversation", *the encyclopedia of informal education*, www.infed.org/ bibio/b-dialog.htm. Retrieved December 16, 2011.

Spruill, Nina, Con Kenney & Laura Kaplan (2001). "Community Development and Systems Thinking: Theory and Practice." *National Civic Review,* 90(1): 103-116.

Stanfield, J. Ron (1990). "Karl Polanyi and comtemporary economic thought" in Kari Polanyi-Levitt's (ed.) *The life and work of Karl Polanyi.* Montreal: Black Rose Books. Chapter 22: 195-207.

United Nations (1956). *Twentieth report of the administrative committee on coordination to the economic and social council.* Annex III. Document E/2931 of 18 October 1956,

Voth, Donald (2001). "Community and community development: Communities as types of human groups" exerpted in Alfonso Gumucio Dagron's (ed.) *Communication for social change anthology: Historical and contemporary readings* (2006). Vol 2: 849-54.

Warren, Ronald (1970). "The Context of Community Development" in Lee J Cary's (ed.) *Community development as a process.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press. Chapter 2: 32-52.