Manchester Metropolitan University

e-space

Manchester Metropolitan University's Research Repository

Please cite the Published Version

North, Peter, Nowak, Vicky, Southern, Alan and Thompson, Matt (2020) Generative Anger: From Social Enterprise to Antagonistic Economies. Rethinking Marxism, 32 (3). pp. 330-347. ISSN 0893-5696

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2020.1780669

Publisher: Informa UK Limited

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/626331/

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of a paper accepted for publication in Rethinking Marxism, published by and copyright Taylor & Francis.

Enquiries:
If you have questions about this document, contact rsl@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines)

Generative anger: from social enterprise to antagonistic economies

Peter North (Corresponding Author),

Department of Geography and Planning

Roxby Building

University of Liverpool

Liverpool, L69 7ZT

UK

++44 151 794 2849

P.J.North@liverpool.ac.uk

Vicky Nowak

Business School

Manchester Metropolitan University

Oxford Road

Manchester

M15 6BH

++44 161 247 3383

Alan Southern

Management School and Heseltine Institute

Chatham Building

Chatham Street

University of Liverpool,

L69 7ZH

+44151 795 2556

Matthew Thompson

Heseltine Institute for Public Policy and Practice

University of Liverpool

1-7 Abercromby Square

L69 7WY

++44 785 316 6531

Matthew.thompson@liverpool.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper offers conceptual development of diverse economies thinking in terms of its relationship to antagonism. Rather than seeing antagonism as unhelpfully fuelling capitalocentric thinking, closing down possibilities and restricting our ability to conceptualise how we might live well together, we argue it can usefully recognise and engage with problematic forms of power and domination. Building on calls for a closer engagement of community economies thinking with wider anti-capitalist praxis, the paper explores how social and solidarity economy (SSE) practices sometimes reproduce, sometimes challenge, and sometimes build alternatives to the darker, constraining, entrenched and durable forms of power that attempt to shape, obstruct and obliterate – but fail to *determine* – attempts to create better worlds. The paper develops conceptualisations of social enterprise, the social economy, and solidarity economies, before offering the novel concept of the antagonistic economy, which, we argue, can be a site from which angry opposition to constraining power relations can generate a more productive politics of possibility. We develop our conception of the antagonistic economy with a discussion of taking back labour (through recovered factories) and land (community land trusts).

Keywords

Diverse Economies;

Social Enterprise;

Antagonistic Economies;

Recovered Factories;

Community Land Trusts

Generative anger: from social enterprise to antagonistic economies

Introduction

In this paper we offer a conceptual development of diverse economies thinking that refuses to see antagonism as inevitably unhelpfully fuelling capitalocentric thinking by closing down possibilities and restricting our ability to conceptualise how we might live in common for a perspective that recognises the need to engage with and challenge problematic forms of power and domination. We respond to Miller's (2015) call for a closer engagement of community economies thinking with wider anti-capitalist praxis, taking a normative stand against problematic capitalist practices. We want to avoid suggestions that we live in a liberal world of pure possibility, without constraint, in which diverse practices are called into existence through imagination and performative speech acts which can then be made more concrete if people work at them, without too much attention being paid to the counter winds. Can we not, Miller asks, combine critique with experiment, rage with hope (2015:366) thus avoiding caricatures of diverse economies practices as a "naïve, voluntarist reformism that sits comfortably alongside diversity and lifestyle choice" (2015:366) by actively undermining capitalist practices as well as creating alternatives? Should we not embrace antagonism towards capitalist practices, seeing them as outside of what we hope to build, without falling into the trap of contrasting a pure 'politics of denunciation' with a generative 'politics of possibility' that does not critique exploitative practices? Focused in the right direction, we argue, *anger* about injustice, exploitation and the climate crisis, and *antagonism* towards discourses and practices of domination can be a generative, positive force for change which need not always constrain creativity and fuel capitalocentric thinking by ceding power to the capitalist 'monster'. Through a discussion of social and solidarity economies, we identify and

contrast practices which reproduce and which challenge normative capitalistic conceptions about how economic life *should* be organised. We illustrate our argument with a discussion of taking back work and land.

Antagonism in diverse economies thinking

JK Gibson-Graham's (2006a, b) community economies approach argues that we need to identify places where our interdependence – how we can live together on a finite planet while recognising the rights of future generations and non-human others - can be discussed, recognised, acted upon, and developed. Through ethical engagements, they argue, we can come together to develop our understanding of what we need to survive 'well', how we should produce it, distribute surpluses, and maintain that which we hold in common – communities, ecosystems, systems of mutuality (Gibson-Graham and Roelvink, 2010). *How* 'we' might live together any particular setting cannot be identified in advance, in the abstract (Gibson-Graham 2005:121). Instead, we should refuse to know too much, think and act like a beginner, and use a combination of weak theory and thick descriptions (Gibson-Graham 2014) of actually existing diverse performative practices and visions for a better world to understand ways forward in specific, concrete places (Gibson-Graham 2008).

Patriarchal, colonial, feudal, slave and capitalist practices promoting commodification, enclosure, environmental destruction, colonial violence, and exploitative core-periphery relations are acknowledged, but how they work against our ability to recognise our interdependence is not the focus of diverse economies thinking. Gibson-Graham argue that knowing that there *are* ways in which the ability to recognise and develop our capacity to live together well is constrained does not help overcome them as it is one thing to know a problem exists, and another to surmount it. Gibson-Graham (2006a:xxv) consequently argue that our

time is better spent seeing these issues as “challenges, problems, barriers, issues to be grappled with” rather than intractable barriers. Power relations exist, but there are also other stories to be told, alternatives to be nurtured. We are fans of this approach.

In an important intervention Ethan Miller (2013, 2015) argued that while community economies research seeks to identify, construct and defend spaces in which we can have discussions about how we can build better worlds, suggesting action research as a tool for facilitating such discussions (Cameron and Gibson, 2005), the normative content of these discussions is not, and should not be, specified in advance. This, it is argued, would be an attempt to know too much too soon and inappropriately impose a reading from above that could too easily fall into totalising, paranoid, capitalocentric metanarrative thinking. Who ‘we’ are, who is ‘in’ and who is ‘out’, what are and are not appropriate ethical practices, and what processes and institutions might enact them, is left to local actors to decide through ethical negotiation. A number of co-ordinates around which these ethical negotiations can take place were identified in “Take Back the Economy” (Gibson-Graham et al., 2013), but overall there is a resistance to specifying what sort of utopia, with what content, diverse economies scholars prefer. Consequently, while normatively diverse economies scholarship does not want to settle for a recognition that exploitative practices exist while pointing to and focusing on more progressive elements of a diverse economy, deciding what are or are not exploitative practices and overtly challenging their existence is less of a focus. This can be problematic for those who want to identify spaces in which the focus is less on how we can recognise our interdependence, but how we can develop explicitly anti-capitalist sets of economic practices.

In contrast with community economies thinking, Miller (2010) argued that the social and solidarity economy (SSE) advances a broadly accepted normative ethical focus through which statements about how we might live well *are* made, and constraining power is recognised and challenged. He did, however, row back from this optimistic approach in a 2013 paper, in which he expressed concerns about the extent that the sector as a whole lacked sufficient coherence, depth and shared values to be thought of as a site in which strongly articulated and robust practices of resistance can be generated. Rather, he argued that the SSE acts as an "empty signifier" connecting a diverse range of actors with lightly-held shared values focused around the need to 'do good' and address 'social justice' using 'business values', broadly conceived. The sector does not have a strongly identified and shared theory of change beyond that, and there is no agreement about the extent that the sector aims to humanise or confront capitalist practices, promote social justice or system change.

Starting from where we are, i.e. in Liverpool, UK, the global North, and in line with the analytical path suggested by Miller (2013), we wish to make a stand. We *do* want to make normative statements about the society we want to see. While community economies scholars do not see coming together to build better worlds is a totally open process, we wish to inject into the debate a more Gramscian conception of the 'war of manoeuvre' or a Polanyian (Polanyi 1944) 'countermovement' to the destructive capacity of a capitalism that attempts to reduce all relations to the profit nexus, but does not succeed in doing that. We therefore take seriously specifically *capitalist* forms of power that can constrain, but do not determine, the possibilities we and those we work with engage with. This, we argue, is a broadly Gramscian (Gramsci 1971) approach to praxis, rather than a description of diversity.

Actors promoting market-based capitalist solutions aim to commodify spaces characterised by networks of reciprocity and institutions of redistribution to develop new opportunities to make profit, while those in favour of the latter defend them against marketisation. This conflictual dynamic is, we argue, underplayed in diverse economies research.

Thinking through social and solidarity economies

Taking this discussion forward, we want think a little more about those elements of the SSE that reproduce constraining power, or are aligned discursively with capitalist tropes, and those which challenge them. We build on Miller's (2010: 528-31) understanding of the SSE as a politically-orientated ethical project (contrasted with the community economy as a site of open, ever-contested, never closed negotiation) by questioning the extent that diverse economies research should focus on the identification of spaces in which 'we' are *all* included and develop ways to live together 'in community' (2013: 521). Miller (2013) argues, and we agree, that some SSE actors conceptualise those who reproduce rather than challenge exploitative power relations as being 'outside' the shared SSE community. We see the SSE as a diverse space, rather than an empty signifier.

We seek to identify, to read for, the specifically antagonistic nature of SSE discourses and practices that challenge capitalist practices, and which can be counterpoised those that that constitute them. We point to ways that SSE discourses and practices challenge patriarchal and racialized practices of power where we are, and where they reinforce and reproduce them. Some elements of the SSE do, we argue, reproduce capitalist tropes (recall, for example, 'private good, public bad', 'costs must be kept down', 'people should work hard') while others can be seen as part of a Gramscian or Polanyian countermovement. To progress this line of thinking, we offer a four-fold conceptualisation of the SSE sector as follows:

(1) *(Neoliberal?) Social enterprise:* Social entrepreneurs combine business skills, values and organisational methods with a social agenda to create value. Amassing wealth is *not* the prime agenda, but since the early 1980s at least in more neoliberal North Atlantic economies, elite (but contested) ideological claims have contrasted a supposedly 'efficient' private sector (with 'get up and go') with a 'lazy', 'bloated', inefficient public sector subject to producer capture (Peck, 1995). Consequently, as an antidote to what was called sclerotic, bureaucratic state provision social entrepreneurs, cast as special, heroic figures with superior business, social and organisational skills run social enterprises which are lauded as ways to provide better services at a cheaper cost in a responsive manner that the centralised state could never reproduce. The hagiographic, boosterist conception of social enterprise holds that social entrepreneurs use 'business skills' to identify opportunities to do 'good' or meet unmet needs in ways that the state, voluntary sector, communities or individuals cannot. Social enterprise skills can be taught, and reproducible and scalable toolkits and techniques (such as microfinance) can be rolled out in a grand heroic discourse of consensual, harmonious social change through technical processes of modernistic development (Dey and Steyaert 2010).

(2) *The (inclusive?) 'social economy*': This approach looks to promote social justice and ameliorate the worst effects of capitalism by providing work for those unable to get it. Work Integration Social Enterprises (WISEs), Intermediate Labour Markets (ILMs), and customised training and guaranteed interview schemes aim to ensure that individuals that are some way from being able to compete in the labour market can be helped to get 'good' jobs by means of an extended period of sheltered employment through which they learn the skills necessary to gain and hold down employment. Incubators and sheltered workspaces help prospective entrepreneurs to set up small businesses, rather than

leaving it to the market or to heroic entrepreneurs. Community businesses, mutuals, development trusts and other non-profit associations help revive areas of concentrated deprivation. Universities and hospitals are seen as community anchors, keeping wealth local**.**

(3) *The 'solidarity' economy – another world is possible?* Here, the question is less 'how can we individually include those that the profit-driven economy ignores?' (the social economy approach) than 'how can we live in inclusive ways, with dignity, together with social justice, safeguarding the needs of the environment and future generations, given that millions currently cannot do so?' (Barkin and Lemus, 2014). How can we 'thrive', 'flourish' as human beings? This might mean valuing forms of employment that are never likely to be economically profitable given capitalist metrics and definitions of success, i.e. in terms of surplus value retained by the capitalist. Rather, for the solidarity economy, 'success' is the number of individuals, families and communities enabled to live well, collectively, while enabling future generations, other species and non-human nature to do the same. Solidarity economy co-operatives and worker-owned firms do not aim to be *included* in a capitalist economy, but provide *alternatives* to wage slavery (Azzellini 2017; Singer 2007). Argentine piqueteros collectively manage welfare payments to create community-owned co-operatives, schools and kitchens. These activities are prefiguring common, not individual alternatives. They are 'hope movements' (Coraggio, 2017, Dinerstein and Deneulin, 2012).

(4) *The (anticapitalist?) 'antagonistic' economy.* Here activists *overtly challenge* the pathologies of neoliberal capitalism, feudalism and modern-day slavery. They make challenges, going beyond building alternatives. The solidarity economy builds (for example) worker-owned co-operatives, while antagonistic practices see occupations of

capitalist factories to prevent their owners moving production to lower wage countries; establishing new forms of money that put need above profitability; or taking land out of speculation through community land trusts (CLTs), squatting, or land occupations. An exploitative capitalist living in luxury while her workers struggled on minimum wages and insecure contracts would be *excluded* from monopolising the fruits of her employees' production if she refused to see herself as part of a wider interdependent community. Activists create alternative currencies to challenge bankers' monopoly on money issuance from which interest can be charged, meaning we do not have to sell our labour in a disadvantageous exchange relationship to reproduce ourselves. The monopoly of property owners to charge rents and property developers to own and dispose of land for their own private benefit would be fought by people who argue for the right to shelter to come first.

To develop our conceptualisation of antagonistic economies, we focus on the contrast between, on one hand, the well-known critique of the 'heroic' social entrepreneur who (perhaps unwittingly) reproduces capitalist tropes of domination, and, on the other, the specifically antagonistic anti-capitalist practices of 'taking back' two of Polanyi's three fictitious factors of capital: labour (occupied factories re-appropriating production) and land (community land trusts re-appropriating social reproduction, i.e. housing and community assets). Re-appropriating exchange through alternative currencies is discussed extensively elsewhere (North, 2007). We focus less on where 'inclusive' SSE practices such as WISEs that really do 'do good', for example by helping people get decent work, but do not consciously challenge capital, merge into 'solidaristic' ones such as Brazilian solidarity economy enterprises (da Costa 2017). Here, providing valued, dignified, perhaps anticapitalist work is

the focus, rather than moving people into the capitalist market. We do this as a thought piece, in a 'weak' theoretical manner, bringing together our research on alternative forms of enterprise and land and housing ownership without attempting to know or claim too much.

Social Enterprise – a tool for neoliberalism?

The discourse of the 'heroic' social entrepreneur is a subset of the genus of the 'heroic' entrepreneur (Ogbor, 2000) that, for neoliberals, every capitalist market needs to drive innovation (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991). These 'heroes' recognise and 'relentlessly' seek new opportunities to build social value through a continuous engagement with innovation, taking action without accepting resource limitations. They are the leaders, better than the rest of us (Peredo and McLean, 2006). They have an 'innate sixth sense' that means they can identify opportunities that others miss, and possess the values, needs and attitudes that drive them to work hard to build a successful social enterprise (Sullivan Mort et al., 2003). Well established business schools often funded by successful social entrepreneurs tell the 'foundational' heroic stories of a new discipline (Dey and Steyaert, 2010). We all hitch a ride with these 'creative, extraordinary people'. We 'need' these wealth creeators.

Given the hegemonic nature of neoliberal ideology, the 'terms of the debate' and what is seen as 'common sense' are set by what Nicholls (2010:618-620) calls 'paradigm building actors' such as governments, grant making bodies, foundations, fellowship networks (such as Skoll, Ashoka) and social enterprise support agencies. These narratives, it is argued, force social enterprise down a path set by these 'paradigm building actors' in a process of reflexive isomorphism (Nicholls, 2010, Nicholls and Teasdale, 2017) such that, over time, organisations which previously claimed to be 'not for profit' increasingly perform entrepreneurially, as

though they were 'for profit'. Critics of the hagiographic approach argue that this enabled the state to justify the destruction of what they claimed were dependency-generating comprehensive forms of welfare in favour of an ideology of personal freedom and responsibility (Dey and Steyaert, 2016). Scholars taking this approach have built on Foucault's (1991) conceptualisation of 'governmentality' which suggests that techniques of social control and management are exercised by the creation of discursive concepts and ways of thinking about how the 'ideal' citizen *should* act that are then carried out by autonomous, responsible and prudent social actors. Thus social entrepreneurs sometimes reproduce neoliberal nostrums about how services *should* be organised and delivered in ways that combine social value with efficiency in a mixed economy comprising a smaller state and larger private and third sector. Social entrepreneurs should be 'business-like' (Dey and Teasdale, 2016), acting professionally within the 'rules of the game' in competition with others for resources. Work Integration Social Enterprises and Intermediate Labour Markets aim to show those who are not yet disciplined into wage slavery the importance of turning up on time, responding to directions from managers, and working efficiently enough such that their labour is profitable. In the UK, this was the agenda of New Labour (Nicholls and Teasdale, 2017), although with the election of the Coalition in 2010 and subsequent austerity the 'Big Society' saw the abolition of funding streams that had supported social enterprise and a reliance on 'heroic' social entrepreneurs to fill the gaps when the state withdrew (North, 2011). This, critics claim, puts unconscious limits on conceptions of what the role of social enterprise is through a political process that amplifies mainstream conceptions of social enterprise, thus creating and reproducing docile bodies that perform within the limits placed on them as neoliberal subjects (Dey and Steyeart 2016). Thus concepts of 'enterprise',

'entrepreneurialism' and of the heroic social entrepreneur can constrain the critical and counter hegemonic potential of social enterprise.

The dark side of social entrepreneurship must be recognised. We have found through our engagement with social enterprise in Liverpool that many social entrepreneurs – or, quite often, former third sector workers forced to become entrepreneurial in the face of austerity - *do* increasingly, perhaps in under-examined ways, perform and reproduce neoliberal tropes around the need for hard headed calculative rationalism in making business decisions, or in deciding what business ideas, or livelihood strategies, might or might not be viable. Some social entrepreneurs *do* see opportunities for profit-making under an ethical cover, employ their workers in exploitative conditions, and might actually be closer in their ethos to 'for profit' businesses. Others are dependent on government grants, delivering a cheaper, some might say inferior, service than that provided directly by a welfare state. Our discussions with trade unionists have revealed an antipathy to neoliberalising elements of social enterprise discourse, seeing it as complicit in privatisation and outsourcing. We can clearly see how capitalist power could limit conceptions of what social enterprises can and, more importantly, *should* do and diverse economies research needs to be more aware of these pressures.

Antagonistic SSE practices

Moving from the individual 'heroic' social entrepreneur bringing their business skills to bear on solving social problems from above, we now develop our conception of antagonistic practices: first taking back work, then land.

(1) Taking back work?

In revolutionary situations workers have often evicted their bosses, and taken over and run their factories themselves: for example in the Russian and Spanish Revolutions or Italy's Red Years in 1919/20 (Ness and Azzellini, 2011), or Solidarity's struggles for self-management in Socialist Poland (Barker, 1986, Potel, 1982). The capitalist crisis of the 1970s and 1980s led to a plethora of factory occupations: for example, around 200 in the UK alone (Coates 2003, Sherry, 2010:119-128). Some of these occupations gave birth to 'phoenix co-operatives' through which worker-owners aimed to maintain production, while the Alternative Production movement looked to help workers in threatened factories diversify away from military production to more peaceable products (Wainwright and Elliott, 1982). Both inspired the development of a new radical co-operative sector in the UK (Cornforth, 1983, Tuckman, 2011) which was supported by Co-operative Development Agencies in many UK cities (Mackintosh and Wainwright, 1987). Contemporary Brazil (da Costa, 2017, Singer, 2007), Venezuela (Azzellini, 2017), Uruguay (Rieiro, 2015) and Argentina (Sitrin 2012) have a long tradition of workers recovering bankrupt factories and running them themselves which entrepreneurialism scholar Pascal Dey (2016) regards as a form of *destituent* entrepreneurship disobeying the rules of enterprise and prefiguring a post capitalist reality. More recently, struggles in the context of the Eurozone crisis, particularly in southern Europe, have led to the establishment of a number of worker-run recovered factories such as Officine Zero (Rome), Vio.Me (Thessaloniki) and Fralib, (Marseilles) (Azzellini, 2018). Here the economy really is 'taken back', through antagonistic, anticapitalist practices.

In assessing the extent that factory occupations and phoenix co-operatives are a useful technique as part of an antagonistic countermovement to capital, the evidence is mixed. On

one hand, capitalist crisis opens up questions about the nature of work in a capitalist society, while the practices of factory occupations provide a space for progressing these discussions in concrete ways. Occupying a factory, especially one surrounded by walls that could be secured, enabled workers to defend the factory against police attacks while keeping warm and fed while deciding how to move forward. Antagonism towards an exploitative former employer can be the motor to enable the new worker-owners to engage in the hard work of building something new. On the other hand, studies in the 1980s suggested that defensive, phoenix co-operatives established in declining industries out of occupations in crisis conditions struggled with a shortage of capital and deficient demand for their products (Cornforth, 1983). The workers sometimes lacked commercial expertise and, unsupported, found it difficult to manage their way out of their difficulties. This suggests that technical constraints such as the ability to produce a quality product for which there is demand, access to finance to develop your product, and the ability to read balance sheets and ascertain levels of profitability, i.e. the extent that there is a 'surplus' of some kind that can be used to support the livelihoods of the worker-owners matters. It is necessary to distinguish between otherwise profitable but badly or exploitatively managed enterprises with a 'boss problem' (Sitrin 2012) and those which do not produce a surplus, and struggle to.

This suggests that we need to reflect more on when an enterprise *can* be commoned, and if more antagonistic tactics are necessary when an employer does not wish to engage in ethical discussions about production and the sharing of surplus. Here, we might draw on the lessons of class struggle in UK car factories in the 1970s where workers forcibly won a voice in decisions about production, pay and conditions through militant trade union struggle. They encountered resistance from reluctant employers who did not want to share decision making

on one hand, and from trade unionists who thought workers involvement such decisions was a dangerous accommodation with capitalism on the other (Mullins, 2016, Hayter and Harvey, 1993).

Without antagonistic relationships, it *is* possible to recover companies if the employer walks away, perhaps facilitating a worker buy-out or if the state confirms that the former workers are now the new owners. Here the task may be commoning the space of a defunct factory to develop new livelihood opportunities for the worker-owners by identifying new ways to re-use the redundant machinery and factory space. Involving the former workers *and* the wider community suggests this can becomes a struggle over not just *autogestion* – worker self-management – but more expansive processes of 'territorial autogestion' or the 'right to the city' articulated by Lefebvre (2003), becoming more a battle about citizen control of territory than just commoning or democratising the factory itself. Here, dark, constraining forces need to be borne in mind in order to understand the relationship between this recovered/autonomous space and the wider community or neighbourhood. Can new ways of living together be developed without the recovered factory and the wider community being characterised as an ungovernable and criminal example of dual power upon which the state cannot enforce its will, especially given that, in Argentina in particular, the participation of the community in the factory is seen both as a tool for commoning *and* a way of protecting the commons from police attack? Dual power, taken too far, is something that cannot endure for long, and is an issue that Latin American theorists have interrogated extensively (Zibechi, 2012), but which is conceptually underdeveloped in diverse economies thinking. It is instructive to recall that struggles over the claimed 'right of managers to manage', especially in UK car plants, was a constitutive element of Thatcherism. The recovery of Argentina's

economy meant that former *employers* later sought to 'take back' or 'recover' *their* enterprises from the new worker owners, supported by the right-wing Macri government committed to defending the sanctity of private property (Ruggeri, 2016).

(2) Taking back land

Where initiatives for 'taking back work' and 'taking back money' are characterised as movements for the re-appropriation of, respectively, *production* and of *exchange* (DeFilippis, 2004), community land trusts (CLTs) are likewise part of a broader movement of collaborative and cooperative ownership of land and housing for the re-appropriation of *social reproduction*. Subaltern groups contest inner-city deprivation, long-term urban decline, market failure, and public mismanagement and neglect in contexts of, on one hand, capital flight and abandonment and, on the other, gentrification and increasing inequalities. In London (Bunce, 2016), Boston and New York (Engelsman et al., 2016) and Liverpool (Thompson, 2018) they have taken land out of the realm of exchange and financial speculation and re-appropriated it as urban commons through a variety of mechanisms from land and housing occupations to CLTs and democratically-governed and community-owned affordable housing (Engelsman et al., 2016).

CLT activism can be seen as variably reactive (defensive) or proactive (antagonistic) towards neoliberal conceptions of the city. In London, for instance, some groups have sought a more partnership-based approach, working with private developers and the state to ensure that there is some component of community-owned affordable housing in new developments (Bunce, 2015). Others have sought to mobilise the CLT model as a more antagonistic alternative to attempts by the local state to redevelop council housing estates for financial gain and what some frame as state-led gentrification – notably in the controversial

redevelopment of ex-council estates in London's Elephant and Castle (DeFilippis and North, 2004, North, 2003).

In the UK, a more antagonistic stance to 'taking back' land builds on the movement's historical roots in English traditions of commoning and struggles against enclosure (Conaty et al., 2003) while in the US the CLT model emerged through civil rights activism in the 1960s to promote black asset ownership (Meehan, 2014). Perhaps the most antagonistic deployment of the CLT model is in contemporary Jackson, Mississippi, where the predominantly African-American activists working for the city's radical anti-capitalist SSE project, Cooperation Jackson, are struggling to defend – along what they call the 'Fortification Line' - inner-city black neighbourhoods from encroaching state-led gentrification (Akuno and Aku Nangwaya, 2017). Cooperation Jackson activists see these processes of gentrification as part of a deliberate capitalist and white supremacist strategy enacted through state and market actors to quash the rising movement that seeks to transform Jackson into what former Mayor Chokwe Lumumba envisioned as "the most radical city on the planet". Cooperation Jackson's CLT is seen as the 'anchor' or 'cornerstone' of a vision in which worker-owned co-ops, incubation spaces for emerging fourth industrial revolution digital fabrication industries, community-owned eco-energy generation, urban farming, and cooperative housing are seen as tools offering the potential for the socialisation of the means of production and the democratisation of society. To progress this nascent strategy, the CLT has acquired 40 parcels of land on and behind the Fortification Line as a means not only of defending the existing, mostly very poor black population from (largely white) gentrification forces (and thereby advancing the chances of future electoral victories for such radical policy programmes), but also of antagonistically transforming these neighbourhoods into cooperatively-owned spaces

hosting a thriving SSE rooted in principles of economic democracy, eco-socialism and emancipation from racialized colonial-capitalism.

An antagonistic stance also imbues two distinct CLT campaigns in Liverpool in which activist residents successfully used direct action to fight against the state-led demolition of several streets of terraced housing deemed 'obsolete' and ready for revalorisation through the government's Housing Market Renewal programme (Thompson, 2018). Campaigns for Granby Four Streets and Homebaked CLTs in two disinvested inner-city neighbourhoods in south and north Liverpool respectively emerged out of long-term and vociferous campaigning against demolition by the few remaining local residents and their allies (most residents already having been compulsorily evicted by the state and its regeneration partners). This involved street protests, barricading roads against bulldozers, and painting houses that had been tinned up and awaiting demolition with 'anti-vandal' paint to dissuade council workers from entering, in an ironic gesture at the 'civic vandalism' they saw being perpetrated in the name of regeneration.

These campaigns against demolition in Liverpool grew into more sustained projects for utilising the CLT model as a vehicle for democratic, community-led and do-it-together forms of neighbourhood regeneration winning significant financial and cultural support from arts organisations – Granby won the Turner Prize in 2015. They are pointing towards more hopeful and convivial ways of living and working together in managing local life in neglected urban contexts which draw on and in so doing develop the capabilities and assets of local residents. Affordable housing is just one of many important aspects involved in taking back the land in both Granby and Homebaked: both are seeking to transform not just the built environment but also the local economy by supporting community-owned incubation space

for social enterprises and worker-owned co-ops, including Homebaked Bakery and Kitty's Launderette co-op. While in both Granby and Anfield, oppositional tactics are now lauded as outstanding examples of social entrepreneurship by local heroes, the initially antagonistic socio-political practices that gave rise to and fuelled this activism should be recognised. Unlike CLT projects which work purely within the housing system, Liverpool's CLTs initially 'alternative-oppositional' (as opposed to 'alternative-additional') housing practices were closer in spirit to more explicitly antagonistic approaches such as squatting and occupations (Hodkinson, 2012).

Discussion: on the antagonistic nature of the SSE

How you see the SSE depends on where you are looking from. We are writing this in a radical city with a history of class struggle in which people fight back (see Taffe and Mulhearn 1988, Frost and North 2016). Liverpudlians are having to engage with austerity, right-wing governments that ignore cities like ours, and Brexit. People are hungry, use foodbanks, struggle to pay their bills, and are often forced into mind-numbing exploitative work on zero hours contracts. The wasted lives this entails makes us angry, and we want to do something about it rather than (just) organise against that which dominates us. We start therefore more from anarchism than from Althusser, from conflict more than capacity building. Re-appropriating the means of production, exchange and social reproduction can provide access to greater resources for the fight back, for the project of constructing ecologically just economies built on conceptions of how we want to live sustainably with dignity and justice. Antagonistic practices enable social and solidarity economies to actively *challenge*, rather than be complicit in, elements of market economies that are unjust. Generative anger about what is wrong and antagonism towards those that perpetuate it can, we argue, help us move

from forms of anger directed against systems of domination that can reinforce them, towards building on this anger to generate prefigurative alternatives that go from thinking about what 'could be' to developing transformative tools for change.

As long as there is not an *a priori* assumption that theoretically and abstractly pre-identified structural forces – like competition, neoliberalisation, profitability – will always determine what will happen, it *is* legitimate to recognise that discourses like 'private sector good, public sector bad' will have an effect on what people believe is possible, what ethical discussions they are or are not willing to engage in, and what their shared values are. We do not think this is a totalising exclusionary form of moralising on the part of righteous vanguard activists. We argue that understanding who shares our values, who does not, and who can be convinced means they can be seen as "potentially powerful tools of political articulation" (Miller 2013: 529) without this descending into a modernist, perhaps Leninist, hubris. John Holloway's (2002) call for combining the scream 'against' with developing our power 'to' is in a similar light.

We recognise practices of capitalist power but *put capitalism in its place*, as but *one* form of power that shapes, but does not *determine* what happens. In this way we share community economies thinking's understanding of overdetermination, but that is not to say that we see *all* forms of power, generative as well as restrictive, as equal. No diverse economies scholars want to settle for forms of diversity in which capitalist, let alone feudal or slave relations continue. We all want to fight the baleful effects of neoliberal conceptions of market logic that crush human freedom, but we also need to recognise when neoliberal formulations – in the neoliberal heartlands of the global north where we are based at least – can frame people's conceptions of what is and is not sensible or possible, which takes us to

Gramsci and Polanyi. Actors wanting to fight exploitative relations in other parts of the world will find their own path: we all fight from where we are.

We do not want to overdo our critique of social enterprise as inevitably and always a tool for neoliberal govermentality. Many social entrepreneurs often work very locally as unsung, grassroots heroes supporting their local community by setting up community businesses, rejecting comparisons with the heroic myth. Parkinson and Howorth (2008:297) found that the social entrepreneurs they spoke to were more likely to use words like 'community', 'social', 'funding' and 'volunteering' than 'market', 'opportunity', 'profit', 'risk', 'trading' and 'performance' – if they used them at all. They can take being 'business-like' seriously without thinking of themselves as 'businesses', given that it is possible to be 'enterprising' and 'creative' but not self-identify as an 'entrepreneur'. They can go as far as finding the term offensive. The discourse of 'being in charge' can be driven by professional pride rather than acceptance of neoliberal fantasies of the autonomous calculative individual (Cohen and Musson, 2000). Social entrepreneurs' values are shaped by their local context their everyday practices, which are not fixed and can change (Parkinson et al., 2017). They should be studied ethnographically (Mauksch et al., 2017) and cannot be understood in a static or essentialist manner (Dey and Stayaert 2016). These locally-rooted social entrepreneurs are not unproblematically constituted by neoliberal ideologies.

Social entrepreneurs make trade-offs, prioritising financial pressures over meeting needs for their own sake, or balancing the benefits of 'autonomy' with responding to agendas set by funders in different ways. They are fully aware of and combat mission drift (Cornforth, 2014). They are adept at 'playing the game', translating discourses from above into a language they find more appropriate through 'tactical mimicry', and as a result achieving favourable

outcomes (Dey and Teasdale 2016). They focus on delivering a better services to clients in ways that *they* think appropriate, not what funders say (Cohen and Musson, 2000). Often local officials and social entrepreneurs collaboratively develop alternative visions of what is in the public good that do not conform to neoliberal agendas of how things *should* be – business-like, growth focused, stressing financial viability, capacity for job creation and the like (Teasdale and Dey, 2019).

More radical social entrepreneurs rethink what entrepreneurship means, in non-capitalocentric ways (Dey and Teasdale, 2016, Verduijn et al., 2014) through everyday, prosaic micro-resistances. While they might not overtly challenge dominant scripts about how social enterprise should be performed, they re-interpret them so they meet funding criteria and perform outwardly as good social entrepreneurs reproducing enterprise discourses, but in ways that progress their *own* agendas. They challenge austerity, developing local responses to it, focusing on looking after their community and each other (Nowak, 2018). Rather than being uncritical, they retain a sceptical attitude towards dominant ideologies: they critique neoliberal discourses (e.g. modernist development), value care for others (i.e. interdependence), and engage with elements of enterprise agendas on their own terms when they think they make sense (e.g. they agree that it's good to be 'well organised' and 'business-like', and not waste resources) (Dey and Steyaert, 2016). In this context they look to develop their capacity for self-management by which they mean how to run a business democratically and identify new ways to meet unmet needs in solidaristic ways. They reject a narrow focus on 'entrepreneurialism' as wealth creation in favour of dreams about what could be and efforts to create new worlds through processes of discovery, change and value creation. Their social entrepreneurship contributes to emancipation, setting free, disrupting the status quo,

their place in the social order, or even the social order itself. In some contexts, entrepreneuring can be resistance and emancipation (Rindova et al., 2009), not governmentality.

Calás et al. (2009) see *all* forms of entrepreneuring – i.e. the practices that entrepreneurs undertake - as ontologically open. In line with diverse economies thinking, they do not make an *a priori* assumption that entrepreneurs, let alone social entrepreneurs, reproduce market capitalism, arguing that entrepreneurs advance a range of social change strategies leading to a variety of outcomes. Taking a feminist social constructivist approach, they use standpoint theory to examine the extent that any given set of entrepreneurial practices challenge patriarchal practices, creating spaces in which subjectivities are constructed that advance the status of women. Social enterprises thus develop 'practices of freedom' which resist discourses of social entrepreneurs as heroic leaders (Dey and Steyaert (2016), while also attending to conflicting financial, market and commercial pressures as hybrid organisations with multiple drivers (Doherty et al., 2014). This is all in line with diverse economies thinking, and can suggest that totalising capitalocentric discourses of all constraining power and domination constraining radical conceptions of social enterprise can be overstated. It could also provide a palliative to the problems that workers have encountered when they take back an enterprise but lack the skills to run it. We can think more about conceptions of entrepreneurship that support autogestion rather than neoliberalism.

Conclusion

Our four-fold typology perhaps works better as a spectrum than as a categorisation of distinct parts. On one hand, 'heroic' social enterprise can and often does reproduce neoliberal tropes, while WISEs and ILMs can end up as tools for the production of new disciplined wage

slaves rather than co-operators. The solidarity economy looks to show that another world is possible, while antagonistic economies fight for it. That would suggest a cleavage on our spectrum somewhere between the social and the solidarity economy. On the other hand, some social entrepreneurs do have well developed conceptions of the need for something better and fight for it in their everyday practices, while 'solidarity' can also mean 'inclusion' in society as it is, rather than changing it.

This suggests that we cannot simply assume that these disparate SSE initiatives can be easily welded into a *distinctly antagonistic*, Gramscian 'war of manoeuvre' or Polanyian 'countermovement'. We should continue to be sceptical about modernist, Leninist conceptions of building one big millennial movement (Dean 2012), in favour of starting from where you are with what you have to hand, perhaps 'being a Zapatista wherever you are' (Chatterton 2017). It means being open to the generative possibilities of unlikely struggles in unexpected places, including through social entrepreneurship. But it also means, we argue, that getting angry about the blighted lives we see all around us does not make us the unwitting agents of capitalism. It means distinguishing between those practices that reinforce capitalist practices – which should be challenged – and those that seek to confront and transform them.

Bibliography

Akuno, K and Aku Nangwaya, A (eds.) (2017) *Jackson Rising,* Montreal: Daraja Press

Azzellini, D (2017) 21st century socialism? Venezuela's solidarity, social, popular and communal economy In North, P and Cato, M (eds) *Towards Just and Sustainable Economies: the Social and Solidarity Economy North and South.* Bristol: The Policy Press

Azzellini, D (2018) Labour as a Commons: The Example of Worker-Recuperated Companies. *Critical Sociology* 44**:** 763-776

Barker, C (1986) *Festival of the Oppressed.* London: Bookmarks

Barkin, D and Lemus, B (2014) Rethinking the Social and Solidarity Society in Light of Community Practice. *Sustainability* 6**:** 6432-6445

Bunce, S (2016) Pursuing Urban Commons. *Antipode* 48**:** 134-150

Calás, MB, Smircich, L and Bourne, KA (2009) Extending the Boundaries: Reframing "Entrepreneurship as Social Change" through Feminist Perspectives. *The Academy of Management Review* 34**:** 552-569

Chatterton, P (2017) Being a Zapatista wherever you are: reflections on academic/activist practice from Latin America In North, P and Cato, MS (eds) *Towards Just and Sustainable Economies: the Social and Solidarity Economy North and South.* Bristol: The Policy Press

Coates, K (2003) *Workers Control: another world is possible.* Nottingham: Spokesman

Cohen, L and Musson, G (2000) Entrepreneurial Identities. *Organization* 7**:** 31-48

Conaty, P, Birchall, J, Bendle, S and Foggitt, R (2003) Common Ground. London: New Economics Foundation.

Coraggio, JL (2017) Towards a new economics: concepts and experiences from Latin America In North, P and Cato, MS (eds) *Towards Just and Sustainable Economies: The Social and Solidarity Economy North and South.* (pp 15-36). Bristol: The Policy Press

Cornforth, C (1983) Some Factors Affecting the Success or Failure of Worker Co-operatives. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 4**:** 163-190

Cornforth, C (2014) Understanding and combating mission drift in social enterprises. *Social Enterprise Journal* 10**:** 3-20

Cunningham, JB and Lischeron, J (1991) Defining Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management* 29**:** 45-61

da Costa, R (2017) Brazil's Social Economic Incubators In North, P and Cato, MS (eds) *Towards Just and Sustainable Economies: the Social and Solidarity Economy North and South.* Bristol: The Policy Press

Dean, J (2012) *The Communist Horizon.* London: Verso

DeFilippis, J (2004) *Unmaking Goliath.* London: Routledge

DeFilippis, J and North, P (2004) The Emancipatory Community? Place, Politics and Collective Action in Cities. In Lees, L (ed) *The Emancipatory City?* (pp 72-88). London: Sage

Dey, P (2016) Destituent entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 28**:** 563-579

Dey, P and Steyaert, C (2010) The politics of narrating social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 4**:** 85-108

Dey, P and Steyaert, C (2016) Rethinking the Space of Ethics in Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics* 133**:** 627-641

Dey, P and Teasdale, S (2016) The tactical mimicry of social enterprise strategies. *Organization* 23**:** 485-504

Dinerstein, AC and Deneulin, S (2012) Hope Movements. *Development and Change* 43**:** 585-602

Doherty, B, Haugh, H and Lyon, F (2014) Social Enterprises as Hybrid Organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 16**:** 417-436

Engelsman, E, Rowe, M and Southern, A (2016) Community Land Trusts - a radical or reformist response to The Housing Question today? *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 15**:** 590-615

Foucault, M (1991) Governmentality. In Burchell, G, Gordon, C and Miller, P (eds) *The Foucault Effect:.* (pp 87-104). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Frost, D and North, P (2013) *Militant Liverpool a City on the Edge.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Gibson-Graham, JK (2005) Traversing the fantasy of sufficiency. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 26**:** 119-126

Gibson-Graham, JK (2006a) The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): a feminist critique of political economy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Gibson-Graham, JK (2006b) A Post Capitalist Politics. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Gibson-Graham, JK (2008) Diverse economies: performative practices for `other worlds'. Progress in Human Geography 32: 613-632

Gibson-Graham, JK, Cameron, J and Healy, S (2013) *Take Back the Economy* Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Gibson-Graham, JK and Roelvink, G (2010) An Economic Ethics for the Anthropocene. *Antipode* 41**:** 320-346

Gramsci, A (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks.* London: Lawrence and Wishart

Gray, N. (2018). Beyond the Right to the City: Territorial Autogestion and the Take over the City Movement in 1970s Italy. Antipode, 50(2), 319–339.

Hayter, T and Harvey, D (eds.) (1993) *The Factory and the City* London: Mansell

Hodkinson, S (2012) The return of the housing question. *ephemera* 12**:** 423-444

Holloway, J (2002) *Change the world without taking power.* London: Pluto

Lefebvre, H (2003) *The Urban Revolution.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Mackintosh, M and Wainwright, H (eds.) (1987) *A Taste of Power: the Politics of Local Economics,* London: Verso

Mauksch, S, Dey, P, Rowe, M and Teasdale, S (2017) Ethnographies of social enterprise. *Social Enterprise Journal* 13**:** 114-127

Meehan, J (2014) Reinventing Real Estate: The Community Land Trust and the Social Market in Land. *Journal of Applied Social Science* 8**:** 113-133

Miller, E (2010) Solidarity Economy: Key Concepts and Issues. In Kawano, E, Masterson, T and Teller-Ellsberg, J (eds) *Solidarity Economy I: Building Alternatives for People and Planet.* Amherst, MA: Center for Popular Economics

Miller, E (2013) Community Economy: Ontology, Ethics, and Politics for Radically Democratic Economic Organizing. *Rethinking Marxism* 25**:** 518-533

Miller, E (2015) Anticapitalism or Postcapitalism? Both! *Rethinking Marxism* 27**:** 364-367

Mullins, B (2016) *On the Track.* London: Socialist Publications

Ness, I and Azzellini, D (eds.) (2011) *Ours to Master and to Own: workers control from the commune to the present,* Chicago: Haymarket

Nicholls, A (2010) The Legitimacy of Social Entrepreneurship: Reflexive Isomorphism in a Pre–Paradigmatic Field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34**:** 611-633

Nicholls, A and Teasdale, S (2017) Neoliberalism by stealth? *Policy & Politics* 45**:** 323-341

North, P (2003) Communities at the heart? Community action and urban policy in the UK. In Imrie, R and Raco, M (eds) *Urban renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy.* (pp 121-138). Bristol: The Policy Press

North, P (2007) *Money and Liberation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

North, P (2011) Geographies and utopias of Cameron's Big Society. *Social & Cultural Geography* 12**:** 817-827

Nowak, V (2018) A Polanyian approach to understanding entrepreneurship in Liverpool. Liverpool, University of Liverpool

Ogbor, JO (2000) Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial Discourse: Ideology-Critique of Entrepreneurial Studies. *Journal of Management Studies* 37**:** 605-635

Parkinson, C and Howorth, C (2008) The language of social entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 20**:** 285-309

Parkinson, C, Howorth, C and Southern, A (2017) The crafting of an (un)enterprising community. *International Small Business Journal* 35**:** 385-404

Peck, J (1995) Moving and shaking: business elites, state localism and urban privatism. *Progress in Human Geography* 19**:** 16-46

Peredo, A and McLean, M (2006) Social Entrepreneurship: a critical review of the concept *Journal of World Business* 41**:** 56-65

Polanyi, K (1944/1980) *The Great Transformation.* New York: Octagon

Potel, J-Y (1982) *The Summer Before the Frost.* London: Pluto

Rieiro, A (2015) Collective Social Management and Social Classes: the case of enterprises recovered by their owners in Uruguay. In Azzellini, D (ed) *An Alternative Labour History.* (pp 273-297). London: Zed Books

Rindova, V, Barry, D and Ketchen, DJ (2009) Entrepreneuring as Emancipation. *The Academy of Management Review* 34**:** 477-491

Ruggeri, A (2016) Worker-Recovered enterprises at the beginning of the government of Mauricio Macri. Buenos Aires: Callao Cooperativa Cultural

Sherry, D (2010) *Occupy! A short history of workers occupations.* London: Bookmarks

Singer, P (2007) The Recent Rebirth of the Solidary Economy in Brazil. In Santos, B (ed) *Another Production is Possible.* (pp 3-42). London: : Verso

Sitrin, M (2012) Everyday Revolutions: Horizontalism and Autonomy in Argentina. London: Zed Books

Sullivan Mort, G, Weerawardena, J and Carnegie, K (2003) Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8**:** 76-88

Taafe, P and Mulhearn, T (1988) *Liverpool, a city that dared to fight.* London: Fortress Books

Teasdale, S and Dey, P (2019) Neoliberal governing through social enterprise. *Public Administration* 97**:** 325-338

Thompson, M (2018) From Co-Ops to Community Land Trusts. *Housing, Theory and Society***:** 1-19

Tuckman, A (2011) Worker's Control and the Politics of Factory Occupations. In Ness, I and Azzellini, D (eds) *Ours to Master and to Own: Workers Control from the Commune to the Present.* Chicago: : Haymarket

Verduijn, K, Dey, P, Tedmanson, D and Essers, C (2014) Emancipation and/or oppression? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 20**:** 98-107

Wainwright, H and Elliott, D (1982) *The Lucas Plan.* London: Alison and Busby

Zibechi, R (2012) *Territories in Resistance.* Oakland: AK Press