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Social economy community development organizations (SECDOs) are social service organizations that provide poverty relief but do not necessarily inspire a counter-hegemonic anti-poverty strategy against a neoliberal welfare state. Tension between providing human social services and engaging in advocacy is at the core of how SECDOs may be both complicit to as well as working against the neoliberalization of the welfare state. This study explores how SECDOs can nurture a new paradigm for community economic development organizations. Through a case study of a Canadian settlement house, the research demonstrates how transforming work may encourage a culture of organic intellectualism or, a culture of emancipatory consciousness-raising. By re-organizing workplace practices, such as working collaboratively, providing a hub for services and engaging in popular education, transformative SECDOs help provide the conditions for citizens to affect governance. The research theorizes how SECDOs may foster a culture of organic intellectualism to promote the transformative social economy.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In order for the oppressed to unite they must first cut the umbilical cord of magic and myth which binds them to the world of oppression; the unity which links them to each other must be of a different nature (Paulo Freire, 1970, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, p. 175).

Oppression shrouds consciousness and prevails due to deeply held hegemonic ideologies. The purpose of thesis is to explore the ways in which we may disrupt popular ideology and “cut the umbilical cord of magic and myth.” People are born from their beliefs about how the world functions as well as how they function within the world. Paulo Freire (1921-1997), arguably the most prominent figure in popular education, suggests that we must re-negotiate our relationships and discover a different nature- a different way of being, existing and working on the world. This research unpacks the tensions between social reproduction and social transformation by assessing the capacity of social economy actors to take on a transformative praxis to community development work.

Through a case study of Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre (DPNC), a Canadian settlement house innovating new ways to combine social services with social movement education, this research will interrogate the ways in which ideology can be transformed and people can learn a different way of working in and on the world. This thesis re-conceptualizes social economy work as a movement, where transformative social economy community development organizations (SECDOs) are fostering a culture of organic intellectualism- a culture of emancipatory consciousness-raising. The social movement education that occurs within DPNC, a settlement house working towards functioning as a transformative SECDO, encourages people to realize their own ability to affect governance and produce a counter-hegemonic ideology that transforms social life. “Rolling-out the transformative social economy” defines the way the social economy, conceptualized as a movement, must “roll-out” new ideologies that are
counter-hegemonic. These new ideologies are produced through popular education and fostering a culture of organic intellectualism.

1.1 Research questions and significance

Three questions guide the research:

1) How do social economy community development organizations (SECDOs) consolidate a neoliberal welfare state?

2) How do SECDOs accomplish productive anti-poverty work, which leads to social transformation rather than social reproduction of poverty, within the context of neoliberalism?

3) How is social movement education effective in promoting a counter-hegemonic movement for anti-poverty within the reality of a neoliberal welfare state?

Community development organizations within the social economy are an inherent part of reproducing neoliberalism. This critique has been ignored in literature that romances Third sector work as always and ultimately good work. The first question concerns the conceptual argument for this thesis. I explicitly unpack the problem of community development organizations, within the social economy, as contributing to the consolidation of a neoliberal ethic. For the progression of the social economy movement, a critical perspective is necessary to ensure that proponents of the social economy are doing what they can to understand and resolve critiques.

The second question addresses the gap in literature to critically interrogate the significance and effectiveness of “community development” in social economy organizations and networks. The standpoint that social economy community development workers should maintain an anti-poverty agenda, especially amongst current political rhetoric on poverty reduction strategies, is intrinsic to this thesis. A commitment to an anti-poverty agenda is
affirming a transformative paradigm of social change. This research takes on the standpoint that the only way the social economy can transcend its role in constituting neoliberalism is by engaging in transformative praxis. This research looks at social transformation as theoretically significant to the work of a transformative social economy.

Documenting and harnessing the transformative paradigm of social economy work is poorly understood in theory and practice. The third question assesses social movement education as a precursor to a counter-hegemonic movement effective alongside the reality of the neoliberalized welfare state. In Chapter 2, pp. 8-9, I make a distinction between the terms ‘welfare’ and ‘welfare state’. In this thesis, “welfare” refers to the concept of promoting health and well-being, where as “welfare state” refers to a set of practices, institutions and programs that are government-directed. Further, “welfare program” refers to a program that is meant to provide welfare, which does not necessarily have to be government-directed or provided solely by the state. Differentiating these terms is necessary because it emphasizes the argument that the neoliberalized welfare state does not necessarily coincide with the concept of welfare.

The third question is the basis for a case study of Toronto Neighbourhood Centres and, a member agency, Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre. The case study takes the transformative paradigm and interrogates how the “transformative” is achieved and what it looks like “on-the-ground”. Social movement education has been discussed as being the underlying process necessary for transformative social change. This thesis will provide an in depth case study of social movement education in a SECDO and assess the possibility for social movement education to be the underlying process of a counter-hegemonic movement to which SECDOs can contribute.
In addition to addressing these three questions, this research also contributes a unique methodology that is committed to ongoing social change. To study counter-hegemony, it is important to have a methodology that aligns with a complementary political standpoint. Through an action research-informed case study, I interrogate social movement education as well as support it through collaboration. Research participants are not merely informants, but also action researchers who are committed to a collaborative effort for ongoing progressive problem solving beyond this distinct research project. This thesis provides an opportunity to affirm those networks and is important in documenting the process by which SECDOs attempt to transform practice and contribute to social movement. The methodology utilized has an activist-orientation that facilitates and supports ongoing counter-hegemonic praxis.

1.2 About the research

The initial research was a traditional action research project, focused on organizational development, in partnership with Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre (DPNC) to accomplish a strategic plan to increase DPNC’s capacity to do systemic advocacy within their organization. DPNC, in many ways, is a typical settlement house within the Toronto Neighbourhood Centres (TNC) network that does community development work through means of human service provision. However, throughout the research I discovered that DPNC was also a unique organization that presented many interesting departures from traditional service provision. Conrado¹, Coordinator of Community Development and Health Promotion at DPNC, was a key informant who is inspired by engaging community members through popular education techniques. After learning about Conrado’s work, my research process transformed into a project quite different than the original plan (see Chapter Five: Methodology). I delved deeper to

¹ All research participants were given pseudonyms.
understand the history of community development work in settlement houses and became inspired by the tensions within community development work in tandem with the neoliberalization of the welfare state. Further interviews with community development settlement workers helped me arrive at my new research questions on how to accomplish counter-hegemonic work within neoliberalism.

Interested in Marxist dialectics and the relationship between the reproduction of capitalist structures and ideological consolidation, the new research territory contributes to understanding how social economy community development organizations (SECDOs) work to both reproduce neoliberalism as well as attempt to counter its deteriorating effects on the welfare state. In particular, I want to understand the complicity of social economy work in neoliberal organization of the welfare state as well as help provide solutions to find ways to work towards a counter-hegemonic movement for anti-poverty. This research has transformed into a work that will both enhance theoretical literature on social economy community development as well as provide support for action research in the field of anti-poverty learning and organizing.

1.3 Chapter summary

The research is organized into eight chapters. The first chapter is an introduction of the research, questions and significance. Chapter two structures the theoretical framework which reveals the Marxist-humanist standpoint of the research. Capitalism, social reproduction and social transformation are themes that are examined to theorize transformative action. Chapter three is a conceptual argument which critiques the popular trajectory of the social economy as constitutive of neoliberalism. Chapter three also dissects the different paradigms of social economy work and provides an argument towards the transformative social economy as being an
emancipatory praxis to deconstruct neoliberal ideology. Inherent in the transformative social economy, is re-conceptualizing social economy work as a social movement that requires a reconciliation of social economy work with social movement education. Combining social economy work with social movement education segues into theorizing and identifying new types of organizations which the author has termed transformative social economy community development organizations (SECDOs).

Chapter four is a literature review which defines transformative SECDOs as organizations which inherit significant parts of social economy organizations, community development organizations and social movement organizations. The literature review narrows in on human social service organizations as exemplary in the problematic of the neoliberal welfare state. Human social service organizations are meant to reduce and alleviate poverty, however their organizational structure and the nature of their work is alienating to both disenfranchised people and social service workers. The literature review interrogates the contradictions of traditional social service work perpetuating ideologies that are productive to the functioning of capitalism and supportive of alienating social circumstances. The literature review concludes with an example of emerging SECDO work that has the capacity to be transformative through the combination of social services and popular education.

Chapter five describes the methodology utilized for the case study with settlement workers at DPNC. DPNC, a member organization of the Toronto Neighbourhood Centre network, is a modern settlement house in Toronto. Settlement houses have a rich history in community development work in North America and Europe. Therefore, Chapter six explains the history of settlement houses and, in particular, the settlement house model in Toronto. This chapter provides background on a relatively poorly researched community development
movement in Canadian cities. The particular model of settlement work has both traditional and innovative qualities that have the potential to be moulded and developed into a transformative SECDO. The chapter also serves to code settlement houses as SECDOs with transformative potential.

Chapter seven consists of the data analysis for a composite case study of DPNC. It is divided into three sections which develop the constituent parts of creating a supportive environment for social movement education. The first part interrogates the necessity of traditional human social service work to address material deprivation and social exclusion. The second part collects the experiences of settlement workers feelings towards their work and the ways in which human social service work is transforming to change the alienation experienced by staff and communities. The final part of chapter seven assesses the development of organic intellectualism. The sprouting presence of organic intellectualism is described as an initial development of emancipatory and transformative movement for both staff and communities towards an anti-poverty strategy.

Chapter eight is a discussion of the significant features of organizational development at DPNC, which include development into a transformative SECDO and fostering a culture of organic intellectualism. Recommendations for future research and next steps are included to further develop how individuals, collectives and organizations can roll-out the transformative social economy.
CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical framework

Introduction

Welfare programs as instruments of manipulation ultimately serve the end of conquest. They act as an anaesthetic, distracting the oppressed from the true causes of their problems and from the concrete solutions of these problems (Paulo Freire, 1970, p. 152).

The welfare state is fraught with tensions between provision for the poor and the oppression of the poor. Theoretically, welfare is meant to provide. Practically, welfare is disintegrated into programs that act as an “anaesthetic” on oppressed people. This theoretical chapter will explore the capitalist welfare state through a Marxist lens. Tracing the development of entrepreneurialism in public goods and common rights as a critical disjuncture in true welfare, this chapter will explore how social transformation can be attained through the agency of civil city governance. The practice of the current entrepreneurial welfare state is like the numbing of the body, but alienated limbs can be rejoined through a counter-hegemonic movement.

2.1 Marxist theory of capitalism, the entrepreneurial welfare state and civil society governance

Dialectical materialism forms the basis of classical Marxist theory. For Marx, the economic mode of production (base) determines social relations (superstructure). Thus, the material world is what mediates social relations and consequently, culture. Karl Marx famously explained that, “Capital is not a thing but a social relation” (Marx, 1977, p. 932). The capitalist mode of production, therefore, forms oppressive social relations because the economic system is idealized for profit and private wealth, rather than equal distribution and providing social good. The term ‘welfare’, the set of actions and procedures to promote health and well-being, is a concept that can almost be understood as separate from the modern welfare state. According to
T.H. Marshall (1950), the welfare state is a distinct combination of citizenship, capitalism and welfare. The modern welfare state exists in a “capitalist society in which the state has intervened in the form of social politics, programs, standards and regulations, in order to mitigate class conflict and accommodate certain social needs” (Teeple, 2000, p. 15). The welfare state, then, exists to solve an imbalance and exists as reactionary to an economic mode of production, or capitalism, known to create disparity. The modern welfare state, however, is neither static nor enduring in its capacity to actually provide welfare.

The welfare state implies the state-directed provision of welfare. However the modern welfare state relies heavily on public-private partnerships (P3s) which place welfare in a precarious position amongst competition for entrepreneurial activity (Harvey, 1989). In David Harvey’s influential article, “From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism” (1989) he forecasted the unfolding of the entrepreneurial-turn in urban growth and development strategies. Notably, he states that:

> [E]ven the most progressive urban government […] when embedded in the logic of capitalist spatial development in which competition seems to operate not as a beneficial hidden hand, but as an external coercive law forcing the lowest common denominator of social responsibility and welfare provision within a competitively organised urban system (ibid., p. 12).

The shift to entrepreneurialism, from managerialism is due to a crisis of capital where, large cities in advanced capitalist countries face “widespread erosion of the economic and fiscal base” (ibid., p. 4), therefore urban government must find innovative ways to explore welfare provision. Managerialism, concerned with the redistributive welfare and idealized in the 1940-1970 Keynesian welfare state, shifted towards entrepreneurialism in the 1970s and constituted a restructuring of relationships of organizing, operating, and assuming risk to accumulate capital (see Lightman & Irving, 1991; Graefe, 2006; Vis, 2007). The modern welfare state in the United States is especially noted for heavy reliance on the private sector and targeted social service
delivery for those who are “assessed” as most “in need” (Clarke, 2004; Ginsberg & Gibelman, 2008; Anheier, 2009). The Canadian welfare state, while leaning towards a more universal approach, follows the trend of P3 development (Olsen, 1994; Myles & Pierson, 1997; Clark, 2002; Hebdon & Jalette, 2008).

Social welfare is thus left in the hands of a competitive growth strategy (Molotch, 1976). However, while entrepreneurial activity is a hegemonic strategy, it is usurped by social activists. Harvey is keen to identify that it is important to understand “who is being entrepreneurial and about what” (1989, p. 6). Notably, his instincts are towards the role of urban governance, rather than government:

[U]rban "governance" means much more than urban "government"…[T]he real power to reorganise urban life so often lies [in governance] or […] within a broader coalition of forces within which urban government and administration have only a facilitative and coordinating role to play. *The power to organise space derives from a whole complex of forces mobilised by diverse social agents.* It is a conflictual process, the more so in the ecological spaces of highly variegated social density. Within a metropolitan region as a whole, we have to look to the formation of coalition politics, to *class alliance formation* as the basis for any kind of urban entrepreneurialism at all (emphasis added, ibid., p. 6).

While government is the formal organization of political power, governance is a greater concept of conflicting groups and alliances in civil society that interact with government. The power to organize is present within a set of conflicting social agents and contentious politics (Tarrow, 1998; Tilly & Tarrow, 2007). The term “class alliance” is notable because it forms the basis of hegemony. While hegemony usually refers to a class alliance of the ruling class, Harvey leaves room for a contentious politics from below or, a “complex of forces mobilized” through governance (see, also, Harvey, 2001).

Governance refers to the capacity of civil society to shape government. Civil society, conceptualized several different ways over time. Civil society as associational life, popularized by Robert Putnam (1995; 1996), stresses the importance of voluntary associations promoting networks of trust and cooperation which are understood as skills for the promotion of democratic
life. Civil society conceptualized as “the good society” privileges participation in neighbourly endeavours and charitable action in civil life (Edwards, 2009). “The good society” is the most akin to “civility”, rather than “civic” society that is often used synonymously. Finally, civil society as public sphere conceptualized best by Habermas (1985a; 1985b), society and social good is enhanced when people participate in the discursive space of the public sphere where critical thought and free debate ensue. All three conceptualizations have a common thread of the capacity of associational democratic life as a component of formal politics (Edwards, 2009).

Edwards stresses the role of collective agency in all three conceptualizations:

In all three schools of thought, civil society is essentially collective action – in associations, across society and through the public sphere – and as such it provides an essential counterweight to individualism; as creative action (2005, para. 26).

Edwards’ stance on agency is, however, in tension with the economic determinism of Marx’s concept of materialism. Therefore, the role of agency and change, as constrained by materialism, requires further exploration.

2.2 Social reproduction, agency and change

The role of agency is contentious in Marxist philosophy which views the material world and its institutions as powerful structures of social reproduction. In fact, most Marxist and neo-Marxist theoreticians claim social change comes from a change in the mode of production, or economic base. Put simply, social relations will change when economic relations change. The Marxist intellectual Antonio Gramsci is instructive on the role of agency within the capitalist mode of production. Gramsci’s skepticism of economic determinism led him to theorize “cultural hegemony” as the key feature of reproducing capitalism and capitalistic relations. Gramsci posited that there are a set of cultural superstructures which maintain ideologies and institutional endurance which reproduce ruling-class hegemony. Therefore social change must
originate in a “war of position”, or a culture war, before a “war of manoeuvre” can occur, or a political restructuring. Gramsci credits cultural hegemony for promoting a false consciousness over the proletariat and oppressed classes (see Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000).

Cultural hegemony, therefore, represents the most banal of contradictions for oppressed classes: the collectively held belief of the individualization of life. Individuals navigate life through ideologies that promote ruling-class hegemony and, collectively, this reproduces society. Therefore, a consciousness-raising technique to promote “a class in itself to a class for itself” is the foundation of liberation and social change. However the power of cultural hegemony is a durable part of both consciousness and the institutions which replicate everyday social life. The question of agency is embedded within the meso and micro sociologies of Bourdieu’s *habitus* (1977) and Judith Butler’s theory of performativity, respectively. Habitus, a set of dispositions which generate and reproduce practices and perceptions, is a combination of historical material conditions and cultural practices. Much like cultural hegemony’s hold over the minds and practices of individuals, Bourdieu proposes the notion of habitus which recognizes that, “human agents are historical animals who carry within their bodies acquired sensibilities and categories that are the sedimented products of their past social experiences” (Wacquant, 2009, p.1). Similarly, Judith Butler posits that humans (re)produce themselves through performances and speech acts that maintain hegemonic norms. Performativity is the “reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains” (Butler, 1999, p. 236). Within theories of cultural hegemony, habitus and performativity, there is a clear theme of reproduction on macro, meso and micro scales, respectively. However, each has a different theory of action and agency to break the cycle of oppression.
Gramsci’s theory of change and agency is premised upon education from community leaders or what he terms, “organic intellectuals” (see Chapter 3.3). Consciousness-raising education is the cultural subversion that is proposed for counter-hegemonic movement. This technique, however, is a broader principle of disrupting ruling class hegemony, rather than a concrete practice of social movement. Gramsci’s instruction is a theoretical understanding of counter-hegemony and not one of specific action. Bourdieu, has a doubtful outlook on social change as he describes the power of habitus on people:

The relation to what is possible is a relation to power; and the sense of the probable future is constituted in the prolonged relationship with a world structured according to the categories of the possible (for us) and the impossible (for us), [...] The habitus is the principle of a selective perception of the indices tending to confirm and reinforce it rather than transform it... (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 64)

Bourdieu’s stance is that social, cultural and institutional schemata tend to reinforce, rather than transform, social life. However he does give indication that relations of power are historical but also, in part, constituted by the “probable future”. While “probable” likely translates to experience and what people expect to occur, it could also be reformulated as what “could be” when coupled with Gramsci’s educative imperative for social change. Habitus frames reproduction, but also helps frame the possibility of a counter-hegemonic reproduction.

Supporting this, Butler’s micro-sociology conceptualizes a practice of breaking the boundaries of hegemonic performance. Using gender, Butler incites the use of “Queer Performativity” (1993; see, also, Sedgwick, 1993) where:

[B]inding power is to be found neither in the subject of the judge nor in his will, but in the citational legacy by which a contemporary “act” emerges in the context of a chain of binding conventions (Butler, 1993, p. 17-18).

Butler sets forth a theory of agency through the device of being, practicing and uttering difference. Similar to Bourdieu, Butler understands power as located in an historical context. Yet Butler also makes clear that a contemporary “act” can be considered an individual transgression that cannot be understood separate from the chain of practices and conventions that
precede and follow that individual act. Performing “Queerness,” for Butler, is the way in which we can alter the hegemonic norms of heteronormativity. Therefore, one act of “deviance” is exemplary of the series of acts it assists to “bind” in future counter-hegemonic actions. Through this theory of agency and change, enduring material constraints can be challenged and it is possible to consider a theory of change whose material basis precipitates in and through agency.

2.3 Transformation through historical bloc: A counter-hegemonic anti-poverty movement

Butler’s invitation to identify the power within a small act of agency is a micro practice that has the collective potential for macro consequence. Gramsci began to address this possibility through what he called an “historical bloc”. Gramsci reworks economic reductionist interpretations of Marxist theory and stresses the importance of cultural practices driven by ideology (Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 192-194). Historical bloc is a particularly useful concept that designates the dialectical unity of coercion and consent; the historical bloc is a necessary form and dialectical tension (ibid., p. 195) between base and superstructure, theory and practice and intellectuals and masses (ibid., p. 424). The unity of seemingly opposing forces is instructive to the ways in which hegemony is not only a combination of cultural, moral and intellectual leadership (see, also, Lears, 1985), but is a conflictual process that is determined through civil society governance.

Civil society is a site of consent, hegemony, direction, in conceptual opposition to the state (political society) which is a site of coercion, dictatorship and domination. Civil society is […] the political terrain on which the dominant class organizes its hegemony and the terrain on which opposition parties and movements organize, win allies and build their social power (emphasis added, Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 224).

Wherein the state is the sphere where domination is exercised, Gramsci believed the real battleground was ideology that formed within civil society. Here, dominant classes organize but so do oppositional movements where social power is attainable. Therefore, hegemony is defined
within the sphere of political direction through a system of class alliances and it is possible to
attain proletarian hegemony or the hegemonic alliance of disenfranchised people.

Through the historical bloc, change originates through ideological transformation through
the governance of intellectuals and masses in a way where feeling, knowledge and passion are
“alive” in civil society relations:

If the relationship between intellectuals and people-nation, between the leaders and the led, the rulers and
the ruled, is provided by an organic cohesion in which feeling-passion becomes understanding and thence
knowledge (not mechanically but in a way that is alive), then and only then is the relationship one of
representation. Only then does there take place the exchange of individual elements between governed and
governing, between led and leaders, and one achieves the life of the whole which alone is the social force,
one creates the ‘historical bloc’ (ibid., p. 350).

Transformation is inherently educative because, “every relation of hegemony is necessarily an
educational relationship […]” (ibid., p. 348). The educational moments come through formal
education, an institution led by elites (see, for example, Aronowitz & Giroux, 1987; 1993) but
also, more importantly, through the people, or a “popular element”:

The popular element ‘feels’ but does not always know or understand; the intellectual element ‘knows’ but
does not always understand and in particular does not always feel (Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 349).

Gramsci alludes to the tenuous relationship between the people who “feel” and the intellectuals
who “know”. Neither group necessarily “understands” their oppression but, dialectical unity can
bring these groups together for the capacity of understanding. This has implications for
conceiving a counter-hegemonic anti-poverty strategy that constitutes a transformation in
historical bloc.

Devising an anti-poverty strategy has been taken to task by local, regional and
international committees. However, not all these plans utilize counter-hegemony as a necessary
ingredient. As Gindin describes, “What Marx understood so well was that if you try to build
around, rather than against global power- you ultimately offer illusions rather than hope” (2002,
para. 22). Counter-hegemony should be understood as the direct force “against”, uprooting
structural oppression. This translates directly into a definition of “anti-poverty” that should be transformative, rather than one that presupposes reform of current systems and policies.

Understanding anti-poverty, however, first requires an unpacking of the term due to its popular use in a multiplicity of confounding ways. Anti-poverty is a term that has been used alongside “poverty reduction”, “poverty alleviation” and “poverty eradication” with little paradigmatic clarity (Mittelman, 2008). The term poverty reduction has been used to refer to a reduction in a quantitative level of poverty (see Osberg, 2007; Habibov & Fan 2007). Poverty alleviation connotes the act of providing aide to the experience of poverty (see Solignac-Lecomte & Smillie, 2003). Poverty eradication came into favour with global bodies, notably the United Nations and Oxfam, for a commitment to not only improving conditions but solving poverty in the Global South, or the majority world (ibid.). The practical problem with poverty eradication is that, because it is used in the politics of the Global South, it is concerned with absolute measures of poverty, which does not capture relative poverty (ibid.). Similarly, poverty eradication is almost never associated with the poverty in the Global North, which includes absolute and relative measures, but also those that result in social exclusion, a measure much more difficult to determine using the threshold of “eradication”. In reality, poverty eradication strategies are synonymous with the old poverty reduction plans, despite a more “radical” sounding orientation (see Wamala, Kawachi & Mpepo, 2006, p.234).

The preferred term used in this research will be a “counter-hegemonic anti-poverty” scheme. Counter-hegemonic anti-poverty carries with it the assumption that it is a part of an anti-poverty social movement as well as an explicit strategy towards counter-hegemony. Where poverty reduction, poverty alleviation and poverty eradication all rely on economic and social integration (Solignac-Lecomte & Smillie, 2003; Wamala et al., 2006), counter-hegemonic anti-
poverty is a direct stance against integration within the hegemonic order, both structurally and ideologically. A counter-hegemonic anti-poverty scheme, I contend, is an understanding that poverty originates from the organization of the historical bloc. It comes from the separate sources and combination of material and ideological consequence. Therefore, a “counter-hegemonic anti-poverty” is an anti-poverty strategy which questions hegemony and demands fundamental change or transformation (as opposed to reform) of the historical bloc.

2.4 The transformative “species being”: Alienation and conscientization

Under capitalism, private profit was not the only banal quality. The capitalist mode of production also enabled the splintering of aspects that naturally belonged together. Marx called this concept *Gattungswesen*, often translated as, “species being”. Humans are, naturally, distinctive and are capable of free and conscious activity:

[M]arx generalizes "thought" to "free conscious activity" as the species-characteristic of human beings…. [T]he human being is the specific creature it is in virtue of possessing a specific character… only in virtue of this species character can the human being be seen as the distinctive type of creature which it is (Wartenberg, 1982, p. 79).

Alienation is the mechanism by which the species being is threatened (ibid.). The theory of alienation is central to the ways in which natural unity is made disparate in the capitalist mode of production. Marx describes four types of alienation: alienation from the labour process, alienation from the product of labour, alienation between our fellow human beings and alienation from our own human nature. The four types will be briefly described below.

Alienation from the labour process describes the way workers have no control over their own work. For Marx, work is a creative and conscious activity. The division of labour in capitalist work means that the work process is determined by others and not by the ones actually executing the work.
He does not fulfill himself in his work but denies himself, has a feeling of misery rather than well-being, does not develop freely his mental and physical energies but is physically exhausted and mentally debased. The worker, therefore, feels himself at home only during his leisure time, whereas at work he feels homeless. His work is not voluntary but imposed, forced labour. It is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs (Marx, quoted in Fromm, 2004, p. 82).

In this theorization people naturally work on the world understanding the reasons why and being reflective about their activity as social beings. The alienation from the process of work is the structural barrier that disintegrates social consciousness.

Alienation from the product of labour denotes the way workers have no control over what they produce. When goods are produced, they are exchanged, consumed and disposed of by other people. Workers often produce items that they do not, or are unable to, purchase themselves.

All these consequences follow from the fact that the worker is related to the product of his labour as to an alien object. For it is clear on this presupposition that the more the worker expends himself in work the more powerful becomes the world of objects which he creates in face of himself, the poorer he becomes in his inner life, and the less he belongs to himself. ... The worker puts his life into the object, and his life then belongs no longer to himself but to the object. The greater his activity, therefore, the less he possesses. What is embodied in the product of his labour is no longer his own. The greater this product is, therefore, the more he is diminished. The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labour becomes an object, assumes an external existence, but that it exists independently, outside himself, and alien to him, and that it stands opposed to him as an autonomous power. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force (ibid., p. 80).

The product itself is valued outside of the workers’ production and all artistry and expertise is stripped away from the worker’s ability through division of labour.

Alienation from fellow human beings recognizes that social relationships are turned into relations of commodity exchange. People, and their role in society, are defined in relation to exchange-value rather than in relation to each other’s social development.

A direct consequence of the alienation of man from the product of his labour, from his life activity and from his species-life, is that man is alienated from other men. ... man is alienated from his species-life means that each man is alienated from others, and that each of the others is likewise alienated from human life (ibid., p. 85).
Marx believed that humans are social beings and naturally work on the world collectively for social good. Capitalistic work disassociates people from one another and demands individuals to apply themselves to produce capital, rather than to each other.

Finally, alienation from our “species-being” is the theorization that individuals are stunted from reaching their human potential or, humanity. Species being is a theme which runs throughout all other types of alienation and is particularly profound because it underpins the humanism inherent in Marx’s writing.

Since alienated labour: (1) alienates nature from man; and (2) alienates man from himself, from his own active function, his life activity; so it alienates him from the species. ... For labour, life activity, productive life, now appear to man only as means for the satisfaction of a need, the need to maintain physical existence. ... In the type of life activity resides the whole character of a species, its species-character; and free, conscious activity is the species-character of human beings. ... Conscious life activity distinguishes man from the life activity of animals (ibid., p. 83).

The “free, conscious activity” is natural to social beings. The alienation from our species-being simply means that capitalist work forces people to function more as “cogs” rather than human beings.

To be free and conscious is a strong theme in Freirian pedagogy and is associated with the effect of conscientization. Conscientization is the active process whereby disparate parts are unified; consciousness raising is the practice of being able to read the social world and understand one’s own oppression through socio-political structures. Consciousness-raising, or popular education (see Chapter 3.3), is the technique of reconciling the individual within the social world.

**Conclusion**

The human being is in the most literal sense a political animal, not merely a gregarious animal, but an animal which can individuate itself only in the midst of society (Karl Marx, 1857, quoted in Marx & Nicolaus, 2005, p.84).
This revolution also presupposes the formation of a new set of standards, a new psychology, new ways of feeling, thinking and living that must be specific to the working class, that must be created by it (Gramsci, 1985, quoted in Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 70).

The capitalist mode of production is oppressive in two ways. First, capitalism instigates economic oppression, placing the proletariat in economically precarious situations. Further, precarious situations are maintained through the entrepreneurial welfare state which practice leads to numbing circumstances that promote a cycle of poverty. Secondly, capitalism structures everyday life to entail alienating work which not only alienates people from their social situations, but also from themselves, their own humanity. This dialectic reinforces itself as people are under the influence of cultural hegemony, a set of ideologies and practices that reinforce everyday life. However, this problematic is not without solution.

The work of Gramsci, Bourdieu, Butler and Freire uncover the ways in which people can reclaim their social consciousness and reconcile their human potential to combat poverty. A close reading of Gramsci identifies that a proletarian-hegemony is possible. Ideological leadership, or cultural hegemony, can be taken by the proletariat; politics can be influenced by the oppressed and the oppressed can emancipate themselves through the governance of everyday life. The practices of everyday life are essential in producing and reproducing the world. Through Bourdieu’s habitus, it is possible to re-theorize a transformative practice of everyday life that provides a social and embodied memory. Butler’s performativity is most revealing in how hegemonic practices that affirm cultural hegemony can be transgressed through one speech act. Butler theorizes how transgression begets transgression and a chain of counter-hegemonic work slowly re-educates social practices; there is hope for the reiterative practice of transformative-governance.

Through these strategies of counter-hegemonic work, anti-poverty may emerge through the emancipation of ruling class hegemony. Freire’s concept of conscientization, or
consciousness raising, is the practice that reveals individuation within society. Individuation is both a process of solidarity within a counter-hegemonic society, but also the process of rejoining one’s ‘species being’. The transformative process of conscientization is a revolution of the way we feel, think and live. Through a transformative pedagogy, we may change the world that we are created by.
CHAPTER THREE

The social economy movement: From reproduction to transformation

Introduction

Although the social economy has had a long history in Canada, the term itself has only come to prominence within the last decade in a throne speech in 2004 where it was stated that “The Government will help to create the conditions for their [the social economy’s] success, including the business environment within which they work” (Speech of the Throne, 2004). The term has only come into its own as a field of work and study in the past decade as research and policy have quickly emerged to better-define the social economy. This chapter will serve to unpack the different conceptualizations of the social economy as well as outline the context for criticism of the social economy as a constitution of neoliberalism. Through this exercise, this chapter will outline the path from the social economy as constitution and reproduction to the social economy as transformative social movement.

The first section will start from criticism and understand how the social economy interacts with the welfare state and, in particular, how the social economy is produced in relation to neoliberalism. With recognition that the social economy works within a wider context of the political economy, the second section will look at perspectives of the social economy and, drawing from Smith & McKitrick (2010), delineate the ways in which values and goals matter to the constitution of a reform welfare state or a movement for a transformative welfare state. Finally, the last section will explore the role of a transformative social economy as a social movement for counter-hegemonic anti-poverty.
3.1 Social economy, community development and neoliberalism

The Canadian Social Economy Hub, a network of six regional nodes that coordinate social economy research to build the social economy, places “Building and Strengthening Communities” at the forefront of their goals; community development is the main focus of strategy. In fact, prior to the fruition of the term “social economy”, Community Economic Development (CED) was the preferential term for the activities of not-for profit organizations and networks. Renewed interest in the social economy in North America arose in tandem with Robert Putnam’s (1996, 1996, 2001) theory of social capital. Community building through civic engagement and building social networks became popularly conceived as a “best practices” approach to community development techniques. It is worth unpacking the use of social capital as a community development technique to understand its relation to anti-poverty.

Community development and the social capital

Social capital has received a lot of purchase in community development theory and practice (Portes, 1998; Halpern, 2005; Palmer, 2006) and it requires further critique as to what building “social capital” accomplishes. The concept of social capital has varied and developed, with some of the most influential thinkers being Pierre Bourdieu (1986), James Coleman (1988) and Robert Putnam (1995). However, Putnam’s conception of social capital has been particularly powerful in shaping the discourse of modern community development practice and, community building techniques have been most popular within networks of what we could understand as a ‘community development industry’ (Palmer, 2006).

Social capital, as conceptualized by Putnam, "refers to the collective value of all 'social networks' and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other" (OECD, 2003, p. 298). Building social capital is a technique where community development
organizations and practitioners help increase civic participation and promote spaces for engagement in local community. Community development, both appreciating communities of interest as well as communities of shared geography, has been energized in recent years with Putnam’s theory that engagement in civil society, particularly within voluntary associations, will breed engaged citizens who will be more likely to be politically engaged through networked cooperation and developing heightened senses of political efficacy. This theory, however, is not without its critics.

Social capital is a problematic lens because it is ahistorical, lacking the analysis of inequity and power relations within society and communities (DeFilippis, 2001). It also conflates civic participation with political power and economic well-being (see Halpern, 2005; Marwell, 2004; Grabher & Ibert, 2006). This is a real issue in terms of having the ability to transform community conditions. In fact, only focusing on social capital building for community development may be a hegemonic project whereby there is solicitation of consent, or what Gramsci (2000, p. 355) calls “cultural hegemony”. By “integrating” communities within existing political structures without, we provide them the ideological basis to “feel” part of a community, but we do not give them the economic or political viability or power to actually be full citizens. Therefore, community building techniques which seek to “improve collective well-being” should not solely be a process of giving individuals a sense of socially constructed place in “community”. Rather, community building should be centred on giving communities the ability to increase their economic and political power to transform their economic and social circumstances.

DeFilippis, in “The myth of social capital,” keenly notes that, “Bridging capital” is really needed only if a community’s residents are poor and therefore on the losing end of a set of power relations. What needs to change are those power relations, not the level of connections (2001, p. 790).
Social capital remedies seek to aide poor residents with civic connections to other community member who have economic capital. The strategy is condescending and indicative of a hope that wealthier residents will imbue economic capital on to poorer residents. The inability for Putnam’s social capital to recognize that there are inherent inequities that are reproduced during social capital building exercises is a weakness. Further, the lack of causal research linking participation in civic associations to political participation perseveres (see Portes & Landolt, 2000; Muntaner, Lynch & Smith, 2001; Das, 2004). Thus, a strategic plan beyond building social capital is an important goal not only to inspire the social economy but also for a counter-hegemonic anti-poverty strategy.

Community development and the social economy

Community development work is best represented as a sector in the social economy. The growth and the emergent success of the social economy is important to analyze to understand how this “Third way” economy works in tandem with public and private sectors. Further, understanding how community development is constituted by neoliberalism requires due attention to the simultaneous withdrawal of the welfare state. The following section seeks to interrogate these simultaneous processes to understand how they work in relation to one another, instead of previous analysis which has studied them as separate political processes.

Amin, Cameron & Hudson (1999) interrogate the role of the social economy as “gap-filling”:

[T]he social economy [i]s ‘centred around the provision of social and welfare services by the not-for-profit sector.’ The social economy is presented as a holistic solution to these problems: it encourages collective self-help and capacity building through socially useful production; it enhances democracy and participation through the decentralization of policy to local communities and through the joint construction of supply and demand between users and providers; and it creates employment by responding to unmet needs (p. 2033).

The social economy is an economy based on meeting social needs by social means:

More broadly, the social economy provides goods and services to the wider community as part of a commitment to sustainable development as demonstrated, for example, by the large number of social
A prominent critique of the social economy is that it represents an appendage of the state. The creation social capital as a tool for the “integration of citizens” into political participation within the best circumstances yet leaves something to be desired and this missing piece is best described by John Friedmann’s call to recover a “political community”:

Reintegrating...the population with an existing political community in which they exercise their rights... cannot be done in any meaningful sense, unless the systems-in-dominance- authoritarianism... capitalism and patriarchy – are themselves changed in fundamental ways (quoted in Goonewardena & Rankin, 2004, p. 137).

Friedmann’s criticism of the romances of marginalized citizen participation helps us understand that localized forms of social capital development and encouraging integration of marginalized people does not fundamentally transform the systemic oppressions from which marginalization originates.

Reconceptualizing the field of community development is important. Particularly, understanding what the purpose of “community” is within the existing capitalist state is central to understanding how reinforcing “community” also has a role in constituting capitalism, and vice versa. In other words, while “community” has been understood as emancipatory, it can also be understood as a technology of capitalism itself. In Goonewardena & Rankin’s (2004) article, “The desire called civil society”, the authors assert that the distinction between civil society and the state developed hand in hand with capitalism, from the 18th century (p. 120). Similarly, Calhoun (1995) describes, civil society as “the capacity of a political community to organize itself, independent to the specific direction of state power” (p. 239). This definition makes clear that community development strategies to increase civil society participation and social capital building projects are aimed to withdraw the state itself from regulating. Particularly, questioning the circumstance of the state from withdrawing the regulation of welfare is a looming possibility.
To understand the implications of such circumstances we must turn to the history of neoliberalism as it has transpired in the Canadian welfare state.

*Consolidating neoliberalism through the social economy*

Neoliberalism is a complex concept which has developed over the years to describe more than just a process or end result, but also an ideology. The first incarnation of neoliberalism was “roll-back” neoliberalism, emerging from Thatcher and Reagan era, which sought to “roll-back” the welfare state and withdraw from social services. This era resulted in two circumstances. First, public-private partnerships (P3s) became the prominent way to structure welfare provision. Concurrently, private competition was becoming the face of the provision of social and public services. This began the phenomenon of paying (double) for “public” services or transforming social goods which were seen as “rights” into private goods and marketization. The second transition was the downloading of social services. It is this latter point that is of particular importance to community development organizations which will be explained further below.

Community development organizations began to see a rise in reliance upon them being the service providers. In fact, there was a blurred line between non-profit organizations and government services. Many organizations on the ground were hybrid organizations. The reality, however, is that the withdrawal of the welfare state provided opportunities for these non-profit community development organizations to exist but also created the circumstances where those with less centralized funds had to take on more work and responsibility with less financial ability to do so. This problematic situation has led to much lobbying to “reinvest” into community development nonprofits which inhabit the social economy. But the existence of these organizations itself means a reinforcement of the ideology of roll-back neoliberalism.
The second form of neoliberalism, which Jamie Peck & Theodore Tickell (2002) identify as taking place shortly after the mass roll-back trend, is “roll-out” neoliberalism: the intentional consolidation of an ideology which is supportive of the maintenance of the roll-back welfare state. The general belief that non-profit CDOs are in the best position to provide social welfare is a social construction and romanticization of “community building” capabilities of the potential of social capital formation. In the article, “Neither romance nor regulation: Re-evaluating community,” DeFilippis, Fisher & Shragge (2006) speak about the need to look at ‘community’ as an ideological formation of how it serves capitalism. Similarly, Goonewardena and Rankin describe how “civil society” as we know it, did not exist until the growth of capitalism as an “organizing force” (2004).

The careful nuance hidden within this question of the social economy as a technology of neoliberalism can be unpacked by understanding the difference and evolution from the “roll-back” welfare state to the “roll-out” welfare state. Where roll-back neoliberalism sought to disinvest in the welfare state and “roll-back” social welfare institutions, “roll-out” neoliberalism” sought to reinforce and consolidate ideology and governmentality of the existing neoliberal order. Neoliberalism, in this sense, is a flexible phenomena which alters capitalism and allows it to be virulent in response changes in state or social institutions.

By appreciating the criticism that the existence and the growth of the social economy is endemic to roll-out neoliberalism, more research is required to understand how social economy institutions, especially in the community development field, exist in the reality of a roll-back neoliberal state but are both fighting and reinforcing roll-out neoliberalism by being relatively successful at providing social welfare and at the same time being competitive with a centralized state and providing social welfare, by way of contracts. In this sense, community development
organizations are both proving to adhere to the logic of roll-out neoliberalism as well as be a force vehemently against the roll-back state by attempting to produce a social service which is necessary for the poor and marginalized. Thus, instead of understanding community, in and of itself, as a good thing, we must delve deeper into what do notions of community serve, and what do community development efforts serve?

3.2 Perspectives of the social economy

Smith & McKitrick (2010) help delineate the various vocabulary used to describe the social economy in their article, “Current conceptualization of the social economy in the Canadian context”. In this article they describe three predominant conceptualizations: Reformist/Community Economic Development; Inclusive/Broad-Based; and Transformative/Civil Society. The categories are based on primary locus of activity; primary associative function geographical roots of approach; and primary objective or mission (ibid., p. 24-25). These three approaches will be used to address the problematic of the social economy’s constitutive role in roll-out neoliberalism as well as analyze the capacity for anti-poverty activity within that conceptualization.

The three approaches: market reform, social inclusion, and transformative public governance

The first approach has the primary objective of “gap-filling” and filling the roles that public and private sectors are unable to fill. The “Reformist-Community Economic Development” paradigm, which has been prevalent in the Anglo-North American context, is an introductory definition that is subject to the neoliberal critique. This definition aligns closely with Amin et al. (1999) definition of welfare provision by not-for profit sectors outside of the public sector. Market reform is prioritized where the advantages of social economy activity in
market value, effectiveness and productivity are measures of comparative market success (Smith & McKitrick, 2010, p. 25). Anti-poverty approaches include local-place-based community development centered upon capacity building techniques based on grassroots community control and power.

Smith & McKitrick write, “One of the principal aims of Reformist action is to work toward redressing inequalities caused by the capitalist model of economic activity” (ibid., p. 27). According to this perspective, counter-hegemonic anti-poverty activity is limited in scope; rather than changing the system that creates inequality, market-reform social economy perspectives seek to mitigate the results of capitalism (McMurtry, 2002). The social economy as “Third Sector” is thus, a reactive gap-filling technique to solve existing social problems caused by a capitalist economy and neoliberal policy (ibid.). The impetus for action in market reform is not to question capitalism, but to respond to its resultant inequality.

The second approach, social inclusion, also has co-dominance in conceptualizations of the Canadian social economy. Social inclusion is a people-centered approach and focuses on redressing issues of social exclusion and, to a large degree, institutional economic exclusion (Smith & McKitrick, 2010, p. 25-29). The social inclusion impetus alludes to Amin et al. (1999) latter description of the social economy meeting social goals by social means. This conceptualization of the social economy is best understood as bonding and bridging social capital as conceptualized by Robert Putnam. Here, the social economy is concerned with voluntary association and self-governance as goals in and of themselves, both achieving social inclusion and self-efficacy in participation.

The social inclusion approach attempts to utilize social networks and social governance as a means to include individuals who are socially and/or economically marginalized from
participating in public or private sectors. While this model aims at social and economic inclusion of individuals, it still does not challenge the hegemonic structures of capitalist organization. Further, while this approach may improve the quality of individuals’ lives, it has yet to acquire an anti-poverty stance that is not full reactionary. This approach reacts to the exclusion and inequity, but does not promote structural equity. Further, much like the market reform, this approach seeks to either, 1) create a new venue for marginalized people or 2) prepare or temper individuals to integrate themselves into the privatized economy. Therefore, the social inclusion approach is still an agent of neoliberal organization.

The final conceptualization is the “Transformative-public governance model” which seeks to democratize power. It seeks to not only view the social economy as an “alternative” but also as a means to reconceptualize the political limits of public understandings of governance and (re)distribution. Individual and community power are evident in the values of this model and priority is given to “questioning of what constitutes economic activities” rather than learning how to work in the niche within the existing market-based system (Smith & McKitrick, 2010, p. 31). Here, communities transcend any one spatial community or identity-based community and broadly conceives of the interplay between a myriad of interests and scales within a global community (ibid.).

Smith & McKitrick write:

[T]he transformative approach prioritizes societal change over solely the market and social functions of the Social Economy. The Social Economy is defined by its potential as an alternative and can be seen as oppositional in the sense that it represents a challenge to the “status quo” of neo-liberal capitalist expansion and neo-conservative socio-political policy. The Transformative approach also views Social Economy as providing and expressing alternative conceptions of globalization (emphasis added, 2010, p. 32).

The possibilities for a counter-hegemonic anti-poverty strategy are wider with the Transformative approach. The dimension that makes it counter-hegemonic is the social learning-encounter that is implicit in “providing and expressing alternative conceptions of globalization”.


Expressing alternative conceptions, beyond spatially local community, as well as push for more than mere localized experiences of social inclusion is a process of reimagining the world from what it is to what it could be. Reimagining means to expand the limits in which we may speak (Foucault, 1971) and consider a structural arrangement that begins with equity.

This conceptualization of the social economy has yet to reach prominence in Canadian literature or become actualized in North American practices of Social Economy work. The Transformative approach is much more prevalent in Europe, Latin America, and Francophone Quebec’s Social Economy networks where a the social economy is directly aligned with an orientation towards the welfare of people, rather than a Third or separate sector (Smith & McKittrick, 2010, p. 31-33). In places where the transformative social economy is considered stronger, there is a more prominent political restructuring which demands solidarity between the welfare state and the mainstream formal. To move towards this transformative, approach where a counter-hegemonic re-conceptualization is possible, it is worth visiting transformative and social movement education. These fields are at the forefront of theorizing transformative social change.

The social economy as movement

The social economy has not been properly understood as a movement. Morrissey & McIvor suggest that a different model is required to “[permit a different kind of conversation about …the role of the social economy”… and stress that reorganization also “places a certain premium on the idea of a social economy movement rather than a collection of social enterprises where such a conversation can take place (2008, p. 14). Internationally, social economy organizations have had much more success in garnering attention to the radical paradigm of
social change (Ailenei & Moulaert, 2005; Vaillancourt, 2009; Guy & Heneberry, 2009) and goes by many names:

This movement is being referred to internationally as Social Economy (EU, Quebec) Solidarity Economy (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Quebec), People’s Economy (Asia) Associative Movements (Senegal, Turkey), Civil Society (South Africa), and Community Economic Development (Australia, New Zealand, USA, Anglophone Canada). Despite the growth of this movement, much remains to be done in order to create the necessary enabling environment to support the development of Social Economy organizations, and to mainstream the sector in economic and social policies in order to maximise its impact on the economy (Tremblay, 2009, p. 10).

Similar to Morrissey & McIvor (2008), Tremblay (2009) continues to lament about the direction of the social economy movement. Canada (excluding Francophone Quebec), however, has yet to identify the social economy as a movement.

Within the sparse academic literature on the social economy as a movement in North America, there has been a distinction between the “old” and “new” social economy movement (Mendell, 2000; Neatman, 2002; Restakis, 2006; Diamantopoulos & Findlay, 2007; Gyarmati, de Raaf, Palameta, Nicholson & Hui, 2008). The old social economy circumscribes the formation and associational activity of organizations such as cooperatives and mutuals especially in blue-collar and agricultural work (Neamtan, 2002; Diamantopoulos & Findlay, 2007). Old social economy organizations are structured on material practices of “one member one vote” that assisted in the formation of social economy governance practices (Restakis, 2006). The new social economy, emerging in the 1970s, is “large and inclusive” (Neamtan, 2002) of many types of non-profit organizations and where community economic development highlights “relational and sociological” factors (Restakis, 2006). Mendell (2000) describes the “new social economy” as emerging strongly in Quebec as based on:

[T]he broader conceptualization of ‘embeddedness’, in which social utility displaces purely economy criteria of profitability, and in which economic activity reflects and responds to the needs of the community in which it is situated (p. 101).
The new social economy also tends to emerge as focusing on building community capacity for identity groups considered to be the most marginalized (Ninacs & Toye, 2002 and see, for example, Diamantopoulos & Findlay, 2007; Toupin & Goudreault, 2001)

Similar to the discourse on old and new social movements, the “old social economy movement” (Birkhölzer, 2009) is known for innovation in social enterprise and reform through institutionalization of social economy structures (i.e. governance and membership) and the “new social economy movement” is about values and ideology of civil society, participation and democratic values. The “new social economy movement” can be credited for promoting “social economy values”. However, also similar to the “old” versus “new” debate there are critics to how “new” this movement truly is and, furthermore, how this distinction is useful in terms of the dialectical tension between material practices (base) and ideological cultural values and practices (superstructure). The historical bloc created by the dialectical unity and tension of reform of current structures and transformation in ideology is an issue the social economy movement must take to task, regardless of “old” or “new”. An explicit counter-hegemonic stance for a social economy movement is what must be conceptualized to rejoin old and new social economy movements (i.e. Alcorta, 2009; Defourny, Develtere & Fonteneau, 2000).

Defourny et al. (2000) has called it a “condition of necessity” for Latin American countries to take such a strong stance on social movement rather than the social reform seen in North America. A deteriorated welfare state, an already strong social movement base and a particularly strong civic society, help bolster the social economy movement in Latin America (ibid.). Similarly, Quebec’s relative strength in the social economy has been through grassroots action.

In Quebec […] community organisations, local development groups and social economy enterprise all have a heightened awareness of needs […] principally because of their solid roots in the community, but also because of their proximity to social movements (for example, the environmental movement). In a larger
perspective, social and solidarity economy businesses are able to be innovative due to their preoccupation with sustainable development. Moreover, local governance institutions provide an important forum for consultation and discussion, in order to determine a model of economic development which corresponds with the quality of life of the community or communities concerned (Neamtan, 2002, p. 5).

Quebec institutes a careful balance between material institutional change and grassroots community action. The transformative dimension, therefore, is through social movement which makes material and policy changes that are informed by the grassroots communities. Grassroots action in the social economy movement boils down to an educative practice which also makes use of the historical bloc— the community (masses) teaching the people who form and institutionalize policy (intellectuals) how to make the social economy thrive. Teaching and learning the social economy as a movement is, therefore, roots of forming a counter-hegemonic ideology that is necessary for the reproduction of the transformative social economy.

3.3 Social movement education and fostering organic intellectualism

J.K. Gibson-Graham suggest that a transformative economy requires a reconceptualization of the limits to which we exist as economic actors who constitute, individually and collectively, local snapshots and global processes (see Gibson-Graham, 2002; 2006). Gibson-Graham’s (2006) work on post-capitalist politics argue that individuals and collectives are not mere pawns in a monolithic capitalist system but, rather, more or less, part of “diverse economies” where capitalist practices exist in concert with many other types of exchange, which include barter, communal enterprises, cooperatives, voluntary labour, household production and gift giving (Gibson- Graham, 2005). It is worth noting that although capitalism is hegemonic, it is not the monolithic power that permeates every economic exchange or inspires every social interaction.
Gibson-Graham describe the academic exercise of naming globalized capitalism as the blanket process that will always subsume our individual or localized experiences of anti-poverty social movement as capitalocentrism. While capitalocentrism may be critical scholarship, it is constituted by “the hegemonic representation of all economic activities in terms of their relations to capitalism” (ibid.). The effect is that scholarship rarely sees beyond into the possibilities of post-capitalism and, therefore, is trapped within the discourse of “what is” rather than “what could be” (ibid.). This section will unpack the potential for the hegemony of a transformative social economy and reconceptualize the social economy as not merely a “Third way” but as a movement in and of itself.

*Imagining what could be*

What would it mean for the subject to desire something other than its continued “social existence”? If such an existence cannot be undone without falling into some kind of death, can existence nevertheless be risked, death courted or pursued, in order to expose and open to transformation the hold of social power on the conditions of life’s persistence? The subject is compelled to repeat the norms by which it is produced, but that repetition establishes a domain of risk, for if one fails to reinstate the norm “in the right way,” one becomes subject to further sanction, one feels the prevailing conditions of existence threatened. And yet, without a repetition that risks life- in its current organization- how might we begin to imagine the contingency of that organization, and performatively reconfigure the contours of the conditions of life? (Butler, 1997, p. 28-29).

Butler’s quote illustrates the problematic of thinking and practicing in an alternative way when one inhabits the subjectivity and organization of the dominant discourse. If, as a society, we are so entrenched in capitalistic production and cannot escape the ideologies that support capitalism, then to transgress our “social existence” is like “falling into … death”. To ‘remake’ our society through a transformative social economy means to expose ourselves to “some kind of death”; moving towards the “death” of the current conditions in which we exist and moving towards an alternative, is the start of imagining what could be.
The social economy is an opportunity to practice the world differently. Ash Amin, a critic of the promises of empowerment to the social economy, concede that there is something “extraordinary” about the social economy:

[The social economy] is extraordinary because its values and motivations are neither reducible to, nor commensurate with, those that prevail in the market economy or in bureaucratic organizations (2009, p. 47).

In this way, the social economy is not only a means to practice an alternative economy, but also a means to instil an alternative set of values and motivations that are inseparable from socially (re)producing collective well-being (see McKitrick & Amyot, 2010). The social economy traverses the ordinary into the extraordinary when we consider the actors and their commitment to social justice.

Reconceptualizing social economy work as not only economic work but also having the potential for informing a new ideology is the “transformative” aspect. Gramsci expanded upon the interpretation of Marxist economism to stress the importance of ideology and formed the basis for an educative theory of social change and transformation. His theory of cultural hegemony, the ideologies, beliefs and practices that buttress capitalism, described the power of “common sense” belief systems which allow, or give consent to domination and oppression. Similar to Judith Butler’s concept of “death” – Gramsci also believed that current ideology must come to a certain death. Gramsci theorizes that ideology must be transformed through the work of consciousness-raising techniques. The following section explores the facets of social movement teaching and learning.

*Social movement education*

Social movement education comes from a history of popular education theory, or consciousness raising (Dykstra and Law, 1994) and social change literature (Holst, 2002), or educación popular, the education of the working class people. It is placed within non-formal
categories of learning, as opposed to the formal education system which was, traditionally,
created for bourgeois elites. Formal schooling, an institution that was created for and by elites is
a hegemonic institution. Popular education, meant to be accessible to everyone, was a
consciousness raising technique meant to educate everyone, particularly the working class or
otherwise marginalized people (see, for example, Hake, Kal & Noordenbos, 1985; Ismail, 2003;
Walker-Estrada, 2003; Pyles, 2009; Paradis, 2010). Popular education is informed by praxis-
oriented learning; it is the coupling of theory and practice and it is the process by which we enact
the theories we learn. Taken particularly from working class oppression, praxis serves as the
link between learning and doing. Dominated by repetitive hands-on work (see Seligman, 1965;
Munshi, 1979), alienation was foreseen as a typical outcome for the worker. Praxis, with stress
on reflection and consciousness-raising, re-couples the sociological imagination (Mills, 2000) to
immediate work. People harness critical thinking to transform future possibilities to change their
reality, which is the foundation of praxis. Freire (1970) refers to praxis as reflection and action
upon the world in order to transform it. It is the process through which people materialize the
new theories, ideas and skills learnt. Social movement education is not merely about learning
something, but using that new idea to reflect upon the world differently and enact change.

Praxis offers a new way of understanding the transformative social economy. The social
economy can be considered both as an alternative way of practicing the economy as well as a
mode by which people learn new and enact new values. With the expansion of the social
economy, there is also an expansion of opportunity to enact social economy values and “act upon
the world” differently, en masse. In a study of teaching the social economy in formal education,
Amyot, McKitrick, Smith, Cormode & Fong (2010) delineate the difference between social
economy values and social economy content in education curriculum. Values pertain to
principles and standards intrinsic to the social economy that are taught through activities or lessons. Values such as collective and social responsibility are recognized as social economy values. Social economy values are the basis for counter-hegemonic life-wide education, education taught beyond formal schooling content. While current content about the social economy is limited, social economy values have begun to permeate the formal education system, leading more people to participate in social enterprise (ibid.).

If a society will tolerate the continual dialectic of reformist social movements and social-movement education in opposition to existing structures and education, you will have the opportunities for realization of man as both a structural and an anti-structural entity, who conserves through structure and grows through anti-structure (Paulson, 1980, p. 65).

The opportunity to participate in social enterprise and learn social economy values are dialectical; enacting social economy values perpetuates social economy work and the existence of social economy work allows spaces for people to learn and develop social values.

Teaching and learning are aspects of social movement education that cannot be uncoupled. In popular education, Freirian critical pedagogy typically promotes learning circles where peer teaching and learning is facilitated through discussion of immediate issues to bring out critical consciousness of their greater social impact (Morrow & Torres, 2002). The lateral terrain of knowledge transfer (Beach, 1999; 2003) and production is a unique characteristic of popular education techniques, as opposed to hierarchical knowledge transfer in formal schooling structures. Lateral terrain also implies non-hierarchical relations between the educator and educated; teacher and learner are one in the same in horizontal systems of knowledge production (ibid.). Research on the role of the popular educator and the learner has contention underlined by power differentials in the lateral learning processes. The multiplicity of roles of the educator as teacher, facilitator, and liberator offered by literature implies the importance and power of a single person over or amongst a group (Blackburn, 2000). The tendency for paternalism in
liberatory exercises has been well-documented (ibid.). Gramsci’s schema differentiating traditional intellectuals and organic intellectuals, is central to conceptualizing the roles of popular educators.

Organic intellectuals are people who originate from the dominated classes. They are people who emerge from the community in which they work and is deeply rooted in the communities’ local issues and struggles. Gramsci saw the role of organic intellectuals as crucial in counter-hegemony. For Gramsci, organic intellectuals were crucial in fostering a grass-roots movement to promote counter-hegemonic ideology. Further, Gramsci cast a wide net of who could be an intellectual. Gramsci writes, “All men [sic] are intellectuals but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 9). Gramsci is quite clear on this that everyone has the capacity to be an intellectual, but not all people are intellectuals by social function. Similarly to Marx’s concept of alienation- the process by which the proletariat disassociates their daily work with the larger (humanistic) goals of social progress is an antagonism of daily life for people who do not function as intellectuals. However, the unfulfilled capacity for people to become organic intellectuals has yet to be addressed; literature has not explored how people may become organic intellectuals by social function. Also, while many scholars have looked at community organizing and developing existing leaders within a community, few have discussed how to develop a culture of organic intellectualism. The following section will describe how to move the focus from the “organic intellectual” towards a culture of organic intellectualism.

A culture of organic intellectualism

Now we are interested in the mass of intellectuals, and not just in individuals […] (Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 185).
Intellectuals are educators, organizers and leaders (ibid., p. 425). Gramsci writes, “there is no organizing without intellectuals, that is without organizers and leaders” (ibid., p. 334). Unpacking what “organizing” means is most important. Organizing could mean, specifically, organizing the people politically and collectively, or community organizing (Alinksy, 1989). The “organizing function” however, can also be conceptualized as “civil society” organizing (see Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 179; p. 306). Intellectuals are people who help organize ideas and influence the ways in which the masses, associational life and organizations function, or are organized by the masses.

[1]Intellectual defines a function as much as it defines the concrete individual who fulfils this function. Gramsci is thus able to envisage a situation in which, as part of the revolutionary transformation of society, the intellectual function is massively expanded- in other words more and more people share the tasks of mental activity, organizing, deliberating and leading, both politically and within the sphere of economy production. For Gramsci, this would also be a process of democratization … (emphasis added, ibid., p. 425).

It is clear then, that the problem does not lie in identifying intellectuals but, rather, identifying how every individual may function as an intellectual or, participate in the mental activity which transforms civil society. In other words, Gramsci alluded to supporting an environment of “organic intellectualism”.

This is no simple task, however. Developing an intellectual class is a slow and historically embedded process:

Intellectuals develop slowly, far more slowly than any other social group by their very nature and historical function. They represent the entire cultural tradition of a people, seeking to resume and synthesize all of its history […]. To think it possible that such intellectuals, en masse, can break with the entire past and situate themselves totally upon the terrain of new ideology, is absurd (ibid., p. 184-185).

It is clear that the organizing function cannot be unleashed merely through an occurrence of collective action. Consent is much too historically embedded within everyday and practical activity (ibid., p. 321). Gramsci refers to ideological consent as embedded in the body. This type of “embodied learning” that is practiced through our everyday work (see Chapter 2.4).
However, the nature of hegemony is inherently educative and every relationship of hegemony is learnt (Gramsci, 1971, p. 350). If every relationship of hegemony is learnt, then new relationships of subaltern hegemony can be created for a revolutionary transformation. Gramsci refers to this briefly and evokes an embodied learning approach:

[M]odifying its relationship with the muscular-nervous effort itself, in so far that it is a practical activity, which is perpetually innovating the physical and social world, becomes the function of a new and integral conception of the world (Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 321).

Gramsci suggests that intellectuals may be made, or in Freire’s (1970) terms, the masses may be conscientized through praxis, a critical reflection of learning by doing.

Accordingly, intellectualism may be fostered organically, or wholly and systemically through dialectical relationships of feeling, understanding and knowing:

The popular element ‘feels’ but does not know or understand; the intellectual element ‘knows’ but does not always ‘understand’, and in particular does not always ‘feel’ (Gramsci & Hoare, 1971, p. 418).

All of these relationships of feeling, knowing and understanding are required for “acting” (Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 427) and, therefore, it takes the part of both organic and traditional intellectuals to work together. Participating in this alliance is the educative process of acting on the world in the same manner in which J.K. Gibson-Graham and Judith Butler urge. Gramsci continues,

He [sic] participates in particular conception of the world, has a conscious line of moral conduct and therefore contributes to sustain a conception of the world or modify it, that is, to bring into being new modes of thought (ibid., p. 321).

All people, thus, can become organic intellectuals once they realize their “conscious line of moral conduct” and work towards transforming the world by precipitating actions that are inspired by consciousness.

The achievement of popular education is the ideological organizing element which buttress feeling with understanding and, consequently knowledge to act. Organic intellectualism is manufactured and transmitted through educational moments (Brown-Pulu, 2007, p. 134) which
link organic (whole system) and conjectural (historically specific) moments for change (Gramsci & Forgacs, 2000, p. 427). Gramsci advises that an overemphasis on the “organic” will lead to economism and an overemphasis on the “conjectural” will lead to ideologism (ibid.). Therefore, to foster intellectuals and creating social change, there needs to be a balance between understanding how ideological formation at any given time is part and parcel to the formation of the economic system. Conceptualizing the transformative social economy, therefore, balances this by promoting transformative social economy values with new and formative practices of a social economy.

Practicing the social economy therefore, is a counter-hegemonic activity which forms an environment where educative moments may take place. Since counter-hegemony is a process by which coercion must be subverted by consent to a different kind of system, we may conceptualize how working within the social economy may be a subversive and counter-hegemonic act.

Counterhegemonic activity must be educational and not simply an attempt at forcible replacement of the capitalist class (Entwistle, 1979, p. 148).

Supporting the transformative social economy can provide a material space where educative moments to transform hegemony occur. Education provides the means for fostering the inherent role of organic intellectuals (see, for example, Sumner, 2005; Boyce, 2008). Through the cooperation of people practicing social goals through social means, the social economy adjoins feeling, understanding and knowing for social change.

Conclusion

In the beginning of this Chapter the problematic of the social economy for the provision of welfare services was outlined. On one had the social economy’s strength is buttressed by roll-
out neoliberalism and the constitution of the social economy follows the same ideological lines of roll-out neoliberalism. This challenging situation does not unravel simply. If one renders the social economy merely as a constitution of neoliberal capitalist policy then we discount the good social work that is underlined by “triple bottom line” techniques which create plurality in current hegemonic politics. Therefore, unpacking the different conceptualizations of the social economy is necessary to understand a path that counters hegemonic neoliberal politics. Smith & McKitrick’s (2010) three part typology of reform, inclusion and transformative social economies help delineate which conceptualizations and goals of social economy work continue to perpetuate roll-out neoliberalism and which is a conduit for social change. While the reform and social inclusion perspectives only affirm roll-out neoliberalism, the transformative perspective embraces the potential for praxis-oriented work to redefine the economy altogether.

The final section began to conceptualize the necessity of ongoing social movement education to foster a culture of organic intellectualism. Separate from identifying organic intellectuals, organic intellectualism goes the further into conceptualizing the transformative species being (Chapter 2.4).

Common sense is not something rigid and stationary, but is in continuous transformation, becoming enriched with scientific notions and philosophical opinions that have entered into common circulation. 'Common sense' is the folklore of philosophy and always stands midway between folklore proper (folklore as it is normally understood) and the philosophy, science, and economics of the scientists. Common sense creates the folklore of the future, a relatively rigidified phase of popular knowledge in a given time and place (Gramsci, 1985, p. 421)

Social movement education interrogates common sense ideology and challenges the oppressed to reconsider thoughts, practices and the folklore of everyday life. Freirian popular education challenges people to create a new common sense and promote an emancipatory form of popular knowledge.
CHAPTER FOUR

Literature review on social economy community development organizations (SECDOs)

Introduction

The tension between social service provision and social change has been widely documented in an array of disciplines. Little, however, has gone into theorizing transformative social economy community development organizations (SECDOs) as distinct organizations which struggle with these issues. This chapter will begin with defining social economy community development organizations. Following, will be a literature review on pertinent research on the tensions of social service provision and social change as well as a review of work that has tracked pursuant popular education programming for social change efforts within transformative SECDOs.

4.1 Defining social economy community development organizations (SECDOs)

Chapter three already interrogated the different conceptualizations of the social economy and the problematic of community development techniques. However, some work is required to explicitly define “social economy community development organizations” for clarity. The definition of “social economy” is highly contextual (Elson et al., 2009) but for the purposes of this study the social economy will be conceptualized holistically, as opposed to specific requirements of ownership, control and positionality in relation to private and/or public sectors. Jan Myers (2009) does much of this work to assess the range of definitions used and condensing them into six dimensions which include a social mission; democratic principles and values; a list of types of organizations; self-governance and organization; non-profit distribution; and rooted in civic and citizen engagement (2009, p. 15-19). Social economy, for the purposes of this
research, will be understood as the sector of organizations and networks that have a social mission and accomplish them through social investment, democratic governance and citizen engagement. The definition of the social economy here will focus more about the ethic, values and purpose of the social economy rather than the specific types of organizations and quantitative requirements which qualify their social economy status.

“Community development organization” is another term which has especially broad limits in academic literature. The word “community” itself could mean, and even have a range within, geographical community or identity-based community. The word “development” could range and include a composite of economic, social or cultural development. Finally, even the word “organization” comes under scrutiny. Organization, legally understood as a corporation or union that has a membership acting or united for a common purpose (OED), may be too strict a definition when many community organizations are small, loose knit with varying degrees of regular memberships. For the purposes of this research, however, “community development organization” will refer to any non-formal group or formal organization that has a common goal to the benefit of a spatial or identity-based community.

A “social economy community development organization” (SECDO) inherits both definitions and is considered to be a community development organization that has the mission, structure and governance guided by social economy values of social investment and democratic governance. One differentiation this research makes is between SECDOs and transformative SECDOs is the relations of work. Transformative SECDOs work with and engage socially, economically or culturally disenfranchised people. Social economy organizations do not explicitly serve or engage the disenfranchised. For example, credit unions, which are non-profit co-operatives, serve as alternatives to mainstream institutions and only serve members. A
SECDO, defined here, is explicitly in the business of serving marginalized or economically, socially or culturally oppressed people.

The definition of SECDO also closely align with community development corporations (CDCs) that have been popularized throughout the United States for neighbourhood-based social and economic development organizations:

Community Development Corporation is a broad term that refers to not-for-profit organizations incorporated to provide programs, offer services and engage in other activities that promote and support a community. CDCs usually serve a geographic location such as a neighborhood or town. CDCs often focus on serving lower-income residents or struggling neighborhoods; are involved in a variety of activities including economic development, education and real estate development; are often associated with the development of affordable housing (River City Community Development Corporation, n.d., para. 1)

Similar to SECDOs, CDCs offer programs and service provision meant to address social and economic inequality. CDC’s in the United States have greater ability to affect housing developments, as they are often key players in originating home loans, where the Canadian experience has had less impact on development and, at most, acting as a stakeholder in collaborative community planning initiatives. Transformative SECDOs also differ from CDCs because, while CDCs often do “community development” work, such as acting as a developer for affordable housing, they work for disenfranchised people rather than with disenfranchised people. CDCs provide alternative solutions to ease the experience of poverty but they do not always work with disenfranchised people. Thus CDCs cannot be considered SECDOs either because, although they often act as CDOs, they are not SEOs or governed by the dimensions of the social economy.

U.S.-based CDCs and Canadian CDOs, nevertheless, struggle through similar tensions between social service provision and transformative social change. Most of the literature on the tension between service provision and social change is also rooted in CDC literature in the United States. Therefore, the following sections will use literature from both the experience of U.S. CDCs and Canadian CDOs.
4.2 Tensions between social service provision and social change: A recipe for alienation

Social service provision in community development work has been a contentious issue in social work and non-profit agencies for good reasons. Service provision, while addressing needs for services, is often more responsive than preventative as an anti-poverty technique. This section will explore four structural aspects that prevent the ability for social services to be an avenue for social change: funding, types of accountability, hierarchy of relations and the individualization of problem-solving. These four aspects will also be framed within the discourse of alienation (Chapter 2.4). Using alienation as a framework demonstrates that the prevalence of social service provision practice, alone, is an alienating form of work which estranges anti-poverty work from social change.

The first issue that is widely cited is funding practices. Funding for CDCs and CDOs are often provided by government contracts (Eakin, 2004; Clutterbuck & Howarth, 2007). U.S. CDCs tend to make public-private partnerships (P3s) whereas Canadian CDOs tend to have their funding base within a combination of municipal, provincial and federal contracts also supported by grassroots fundraising (CCPA & Brown, 2000 and Eakin, 2004). Contract based work, however, is specific in outcome and service or program (see Clutterbuck & Howarth, 2007). The restrictions on contracts constrain the ability to use money fluidly and where necessary, therefore funding reduces the ability for program flexibility (ibid.). The structure of funding forms the basis of alienation from the labour process. Front line service provision workers is not fulfilling because they may only be engaged with an individual on a particular issue when, in actuality, a person needs to understood in context of their social situation and will working with them may require multiple sites of assistance. In this way, directed services can be understood as forced
labour where division of labour in community development work means the incapacity to help the needs of the whole person.

Due to external funding, accountability reports become necessary. Piecemeal funding, however, often means multiple sites of funding and a multiplicity of small grants (Eakin 2004). The effect, is the requirement to write dozens of accountability reports which can be a full time job. Therefore, accountability reports also do not have the capacity to take longitudinal data of holistic anti-poverty efforts. The effect is a distilled report that does not, and cannot, capture the ways in which service providers do interstitial work beyond just the basics of the stated service. Further, it denies the ability to do the necessary interstitial work because only a set of distinct outcomes are valued and funded. The result is alienation from the product of labour. If the product of labour is to contribute to anti-poverty, then the requirement to do myopic accountability reports makes the product the accountability report, rather than the development of the people or community.

Hierarchical relations within the social service workplace are commonly problematic in terms of power differentials where egalitarian community development is typically valued. Most tenuous is the gradual professionalization of social services which reproduces the “expert” and “recipient/client” relationship. This model reinforces top-down approaches to community development by valuing a professionalized body of knowledge and often results in a paternalistic service provision regime. The hierarchy of relations results in alienation between fellow human beings. It provides a structure for a false hierarchy and produces people in relation to their provider or recipient of help role. Rather than working collectively to understand systemic oppressions, social work often situates providers and recipients in antagonistic ways.
Finally, the individualization of problem-solving refers to the ways in which service provision is often organized to analyze individual need. Problems are individualized in assessment forms and individuals are understood as “lacking” something, rather than a relationary analysis of social assets and needs. Problems are taken out of their setting and placed upon the individual’s inability to attain social or economic security. Problem-solving results in individual solutions and is myopic to the need of institutional or social change required to stop the conditions which create those individual experiences. The individualism inherent in these problem solving techniques form the basis of alienation of our species being, or greater human potential. Disassociating individuals from their role in wider social change efforts is deleterious to our social emancipation.

The work in CDCs and CDOs was not the work Marx was describing when he theorized alienation. However, it becomes applicable when the structure of modern social service provision is assessed. Ferguson & Lavalette (2004), who argue that Marxist lenses are very relevant to social work practice, identify that [social work] is “constantly reorganized- never with any consultation- and there is a constant focus on ‘budget management and control’ and far less tome with clients (p. 303). The result is that social workers are alienated from their work and the communities they serve (ibid.). “The system increasingly places barriers between the social worker and the client” (ibid., 2004, p. 304). Alienation is inherently oppressive. It oppresses people from the way they work on the world and it creates divisions between human beings and our human potential. Identifying the different forms of alienation in CDC and CDO practice structure is important in reconceptualizing the work for emancipatory practice. The next section will explore work the Building Movement Project, a campaign-oriented organization which does public education on achieving social change in social service organizations.
4.3 The Building Movement Project: Inspiring activism in the non-profit community

The U.S.-based group, “Building Movement Project” was conceptualized in 1999 as a way to commit educational resources to assisting service-based non-profits to transform their practice to a wider social change effort:

The Building Movement Project was conceived out of a meeting with twenty people working in small social change nonprofits from across the United States. The meeting… examined the role of social change nonprofits in the larger sector, and the constraints they faced in meeting their goals. The results of these discussions led to the Building Movement project, which is designed to explore and challenge (1) the current assumptions and expectations of how US-based social change non-profit organizations should operate and (2) their impact on building larger movements for change (Building Movement Project, n. d.).

In the last decade there has been a deterioration of social services and a natural reaction from social service workers and advocate has been to take an activist approach to both address the problem and maintain the dignity of their work. The Building Movement Project employs the activist strategy by engaging a range of service organizations in a campaign to use popular education, community mobilizing and action research techniques to build their service-based organizations into organizations which can maintain their service provision role but also address the systemic issues related to poverty. This movement also intends to increase the resiliency of service organizations during a lean welfare state.

The Building Movement Project in unique in that it has a popular following from a range of CDCs, CDOs, CBOs, and non-profit service organizations in both the United States and Canada. The popularity of the Project is indicative that they are achieving the goals evident in their apt name. The project engages a range of organizations through a campaign of education and advocacy for combining social service and social change. In 2006 the Building Movement Project published a manual, “Social service and social change: A Process Guide”, which outlined step-by-step process for organizations to follow if they wanted to incorporate social change. Developed by staff for staff, the guidebook has a specific stance on social change:
Progressive social change aims to transform the underlying systemic problems that result in inequalities in the distribution of power and resources—inequalities that directly affect the lives of those served by the vast majority of non-profit service organizations (Building Movement Project, 2006, p. 5).

And it describes the alienation of social service workers between their work, their clients and the state:

[N]o matter how hard staff members try to help their clients they are often stymied by the larger systems that seem to work against the people they are trying to serve. The individuals who staff these organizations recognize that there is more to their clients’ problems than self-destructive behaviour or poor personal choices. Addressing these larger systemic barriers is a daunting task, especially at a time when so many service providers face growing demands and reduced funding.

We believe that a way must be found to meet clients’ day-to-day needs as well as to change the circumstances that currently reinforce inequality, injustice, poverty, and lack of access (ibid., p. 5).

The Building Movement Project describes a “transformation process” that includes six steps: learning about root causes of issues and problems and how to address them using an activist social change technique; awareness of power relations both external and internal to the organization; vision to imagine what realized goals look like and an examination of the route to get achieve them; strategy outlining the step that need to be taken and implementing the vision while also be cognizant of power-relations, representation and participation of constituents; action for identifying and implementing a method which suits the organization and its constituents while maintaining the organizations’ core services; and reflection for evaluating the results and the process taken to improve upon the plan in ongoing and future strategies (ibid., p. 8). These six steps are similar to an action research design which employs reflective problem solving techniques (see Chapter 5).

The benefit of this process guide has been realized in several organizations which have used this strategy in the Building Movement Project. The common thread over successful case studies is a twofold lesson. Firstly, organizations have had to make material organizational change and restructure capital and work to make social change a central function. Secondly, organizations that have instituted a participatory action research method which asks their
constituents to identify their own needs have found sustainable ways to identify causes for political action and make political impact by supporting their constituents’ capacity to act on behalf of themselves (Building Movement Project, 2009, p. 4-5). The combined role of resources and education is an important part of the stated success of the organizations which have employed the strategy for transformation. Human service agencies and organizations are embedded within an institutional structure where funding is usually provided through public government but only “awarded” to agencies that complete “contracts”. The infrastructure of social services, therefore lack flexibility for an activist orientation. Transforming the material structure and denying funding are, at times, what has worked for organizations to maintain its commitment to activism (ibid.).

The Building Movement Project is, in fact, partly a promotion of the development of transformative social economy community development organizations (SECDOs). The methods of restructuring the organization through capital and work is similar to the “old” social economy movement and the methods of analyzing power relations and the process of supporting and democratizing social action for constituents is similar to the “new” social economy movement. The melding of social purpose-social service agencies and the democratization of governance both within the organization and promoted by the organization are steps towards building transformative SECDOs.

**Conclusion**

Attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in the act of liberation is to treat them as objects that must be saved from a burning building (Freire, 1970, p. 65).

While no one liberates himself by his own efforts alone, neither is he liberated by others. (ibid., p. 66).
Social economy community development organizations combine social economy values with community development work. Transformative SECDO work, however, highlights social movement literature and requires that SECDOs engage and work with disenfranchised communities. This democratic and participatory practice is not always explicitly identified or realized in either social economy organizations or community development organizations. SECDOs experience underfunding, and workplace conditions that place holistic development into splintered silos of bureaucratic programming. Alienation, originally theorized for manufacturing work, is aptly applied to human social service work as social workers and community members are divorced from working with one another towards an anti-poverty scheme. When community members are removed from their own emancipation, it perpetuates the disempowering circumstances of alienation. It is, as Freire states, as disempowering as the welfare state treating people like objects who must be saved from a burning building. Community members and social service workers must work together. The alienating circumstances within which social service workers are placed deny their ability to actively partner with community members. Services become a one way “delivery”.

The Building Movement Project is exemplary in the development of the transformative SECDO. The Building Movement Project is committed to the organizational development of human social service agencies. The Project’s goals are to help human social service agencies enable their transformative potential by supporting advocacy and activism amongst staff and residents. The Project demonstrates the attempt to procure traditional social service organizations and launch them into transformative SECDOs.
CHAPTER FIVE

Methodology

The conception and execution of this thesis are done from a Marxist-humanist perspective. Taken from the worldview that people are inherently social beings that work on the world collectively, my methodology is a substantive technique to collect experiences of alienation and experiences where people are rejoined with their “species-being”, or the ability to shape their own futures. This worldview is used as a lens to interpret social movement education as a way to produce transformative change. With this, I wish to further clarify how SECDOs are materially constrained within capitalism but also work towards a transformative praxis by providing spaces and opportunities for work that nurtures the species being.

The methodology for this research is presented in three sections. First, I will describe the structure of the case study, second I will describe the informants and the researcher’s relationship to the informants and finally I expound the data through collection, analysis and product.

5.1 Case study of Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre (DPNC)

A case study is chosen as a method because the goal is to provide a detailed picture of a particular social economy community development organization (SECDO). Case studies also enable the audience to understand how the theoretical (Chapter 2) and conceptual (Chapter 3) challenges laid out are experienced in an organization struggling with the issues that were expounded upon. The case study model is also particularly important to give greater exposure to settlement houses and the settlement house movement throughout Canada.

The research is made possible through partnership with DPNC, a settlement house member of TNC. DPNC was chosen because of a pre-existing commitment in the organizations’
strategic planning agenda to build upon advocacy work within their, principally, service provision platform. The DPNC case study explores the popular education initiatives occurring in the organization. It assesses workers’ experience of the effectiveness and re-organization of DPNC throughout the process of building ongoing popular education programming as a part of DPNC’s structure. The case study provides a composite understanding of settlement workers’ perceptions of their role as organic intellectuals. Further, I look at the practices and efforts that are favourable to encouraging a culture of organic intellectualism.

Collaboration with case study organizations was opportunistic (Chapter 1.2). Partnership with Toronto Neighbourhood Centres is also a politically important sample of a network of organizations that are working independently, but have organized themselves as a coalition to maintain a united front through strategic planning. The in-depth case study of DPNC presents both a typical and critical sample. DPNC has typical case criterion to address the question of the capacity for social change in a social economy community development organization. DPNC is an incorporated non-profit, significantly neighbourhood-based work but also works with translocal groups who align with identity-based communities and does a significant amount of service provision work as a basis for their funding. DPNC also presents a critical case because they are piloting social movement education programming that can be effective in many social economy organizations. The case study is meant to analyze current conditions of SECDO work as well as inform future work in social change efforts.

5.2 Informants: Sampling, recruitment and praxis

My central informant is Conrado, Coordinator for Community Development and Health Promotion at DPNC. His work is central to the thesis as he is the worker responsible for piloting
popular education techniques at DPNC. Conrado is responsible for coordinating the strategic
direction to work towards greater advocacy within DPNC. Conrado’s role and work are also
central to clarifying the research’s direction to look at organic intellectualism. The eleven other
informants were sampled through the technique of snowballing. Each informant was able to
suggest or refer additional informants for the research. Informants were recruited either by direct
contact referral, or by affirmative response to a call for participation sent out through the Toronto
Neighbourhood Centres internal e-mail listserve to Executive Directors or Community
Development Coordinators of thirty two member agencies in the Toronto area. Nine informants
were recruited through referral and three responded to the electronic call for participation.
Informants interviewed represented or were connected to nine different settlement agencies.

All interviewees were informed that this thesis would contribute to an action research
project for DPNC. Action research, a reflective process of progressive problem solving, is led by
those who identified the problem. Action research, often a method for organizational
development, is employed in this thesis conceptually, rather than systematic progressive problem
solving. A progressive problem solving technique would include cycles of problem
identification, plan to correct, action, collecting evidence of effectiveness and reflection of the
both the result and the process of problem solving. This thesis research addresses a “snapshot”
of the progressive problem solving technique by self-identification of a problem within the
SECDO followed by creating a plan for action. The researcher, in action research, acts as a
facilitator through the organizational development process. As a facilitator, my role is to help
actors in DPNC understand their common objectives and assist them to plan and achieve their
self-identified goals. This thesis will serve as an artifact of the process of identifying the
problem and identifying common goals of the future of their organization as a SECDO.
5.3 Data: Collection, analysis and product

The partnership with DPNC started in January 2009. Conrado, Coordinator of Community Development and Health Promotion sent a call out to the Community Development Collaborative Program at the University of Toronto for the assistance of a researcher for community-based research at DPNC. I replied to the call and together we formed a process by which I would facilitate the problem posing and facilitate drafting a course of action with DPNC. Interviews were conducted between the months of March 2009 to December 2009. Interviews were semi-structured (see Appendix C: Interview schedule) and 45 to 60 minutes long. Semi-structured questions allowed for consistency in questions as well as an open-endedness which was necessary to capture the different locations and work of each person interviewed. A semi-structured format also allowed for the “action researcher” role to emerge as informants were able to “become” action researchers by giving them the opportunity to pose problems and generate their own solutions.

Questions aimed at collecting settlement workers’ experiences of settlement work and advocacy. Informants were also invited to talk about what was relevant to their experiences and discuss, more specifically, their own ideas of social change and how to achieve a transformative approach in a social economy community development organization. Although no group interviews were completed\(^2\), the majority of the informants communicated with one another on a regular basis and work together in meetings held several times a year where they organize the strategic direction of their particular SECDO network. While traditional action research methods typically consist of collaborative facilitation, this particular research elicited responses from

---

\(^2\) Group interviews were not undertaken to ensure the anonymity of participants. While participants are all collectively involved in existing action research within DPNC, their participation as informants to this research thesis is separate and anonymous.
individuals’ reflections. Data from the organizations’ respective websites and published reports were also collected as supportive information.

The product of the research is equally important to the research process. One of the goals of an action research methodology is to institute a mechanism for double-loop learning, as opposed to “single loop learning” in organizations or systems. Argyris & Schöon (1978) describe the difference:

When the error detected and corrected permits the organization to carry on its present policies or achieve its present objectives, then that error-and-correction process is single-loop learning. Single-loop learning is like a thermostat that learns when it is too hot or too cold and turns the heat on or off. The thermostat can perform this task because it can receive information (the temperature of the room) and take corrective action. Double-loop learning occurs when error is detected and corrected in ways that involve the modification of an organization’s underlying norms, policies and objectives (p. 2-3).

Double-loop learning occurs when a system’s conditions are transformed such that the problem cannot arise again. This process of “auto-correct” is inherent in the continual practices of progressive problem solving. To organically identify problems and have a process by which solutions are offered, rather than perpetuated and ignored, is one way to achieve modification of an organizations underlying norms, policies and objectives. The product of this thesis, therefore, must be conceptualized as not a completed report or definitive answer, but rather as an opening for discussion and further development. This thesis as a product will serve as a “snapshot in time” and evidence of an ongoing movement.
CHAPTER SIX

The settlement movement and settlement work in Canada

Introduction

The settlement movement in Canada is under researched and not well known in either popular or scholarly literatures. Even in social work, the settlement movement is on the margins of research since most social workers are clinicians and practitioners. The result is a myopic and ahistorical literature that has been amassed within the, highly professionalized, field of social work. This chapter introduces the settlement movement and the features of settlement work that are formative to modern community development work. This chapter will conclude with settlement houses being coded as SECDOs and also describe the intersections which can launch the settlement house model into transformative SECDOs.

6.1 The settlement movement

Neighbourhood Centres are descendents of the settlement movement which originated in London, England at Toynbee Hall, the first settlement house (Sandercock & Attili, 2009). Toynbee Hall worked on values of cooperation and viewed community as the basic unit of social functionality (History of Toynbee Hall, n.d.). Toynbee Hall, still running today, opened its doors in 1884 and their original sets of programs were based in poverty relief from a community cooperative ideal (ibid.). The model of settlement houses was soon exported into the New World, most prominently in the United States and in Canada (Sandercock & Attili, 2009). And while there is a wealth of information in the United States about the settlement movement, there is significantly less discussion on Canadian settlement houses which took on unique characteristics that were formative for urban centres, especially Toronto (James, 2001).
Toronto’s settlement houses have played an influential role in laying the groundwork for the modern welfare state and social work professions (James, 1997). In fact, it was the settlement movement which helped form the current University of Toronto School of Social Work in 1914, then Department of Social Services (James, 2001). Following, the School of Social Work and social workers have become an integral part of the delivery of welfare services. The institutionalization of social work, however, developed quite separately from the sentiments of the initial settlement movement. There are three aspects of the initial settlement house movement that are worth exploring which are unique to the historical development of the modern settlement houses in Canada: university settlement for aspirations of “social mix”; community integration on a multi-program platform; and adult education and advocacy.

University settlement for aspirations of “social mix”

The original settlement movement in London, England grew out of ideological developments at Oxford University. Arnold Toynbee, a young Oxford academic volunteered his vacationing time with poor families in the East End of London (History of Toynbee Hall, n.d.). His example of ‘giving back to the community’ was what inspired university settlement movements (ibid.). His model-citizenry was transformed into a program for university graduates by one of the benefactors of Toynbee’s volunteerism, Reverend Samuel Barnett (ibid.). The model consisted of middle-class graduates embedding themselves within communities so the young men would “learn something of what it meant to be poor- an important lesson for those who were likely to go on to careers in the Civil Service or politics.” (Toynbee Hall- A brief history, n.d.). The idea was popular and a similar model was adopted in Canada.

Toronto University Settlement embedded university students within communities. The purpose was for the students to help dispel myths of the poor and also develop cooperative
attitudes regardless of social class. Young university students, who did social service work, often regarded people from the community as members or neighbours rather than clients of their services (James, 1997). The relationship between human beings, to which they held high standards, is described in the passage below:

There can hardly be anything more opposed to conventional charity than the social settlement ... The settlements are not charitable institutions. They are, on the contrary, illustrations of social equality and democracy. The settlement workers do not go down from their homes of prosperity with philanthropic condescension to aid the poor. They simply live among the poor, and their relation with them is that of neighbors and personal friends. They dismiss altogether the notion of social classes. They recognize but one social circle, – the comprehensive circle of human sympathy and need. (emphasis added, F.G. Peabody, ‘Social Settlements,’ Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth National Conference of Charities and Correction [1897] (Boston: Geo. H. Ellis 1898), p. 329, quoted in James, 2001).

Settlement work carried the sentiment of egalitarianism through social interaction and integration which is elucidated by the gesture against hierarchy of going down to help the poor. Social mix in terms of class is a prominent piece of the initial settlement movement where living together as neighbours and friends becomes an important piece of learning for the university student, or social worker. The University student learns about the everyday experience of poverty by living amongst the poor.

However, “social mix” in the settlement movement went as far as dismissing the notion of social class altogether. The lack of recognition of class difference does not lead to the erasure of class difference; the privilege of, traditionally young-male, university students does not materially disappear merely because they behave as if social class does not exist. Therefore, while aspirations of social mix may come from good intentions, the real effect to transform material deprivation for poor people and rectify power imbalances which create impoverished conditions may not be addressed by social mixing of class.

Settlement houses in both Canada and the United States also broke the tradition of catering exclusively to young, university educated males and had predominantly female settlement workers in communities. Female settlement workers were sourced through
association with universities (James, 1998). By World War 1 Toronto had the largest concentration of settlement houses, having six out of the thirteen in Canada, where women from Christian colleges at the University of Toronto paid a small sum for room and board within the settlement and volunteered their time in the evening to do community development work (ibid.). Early settlement work was volunteer-based but later, employed full-time workers who helped coordinate programs during the day, helped direct the activities of volunteers and members, taught settlement classes, and initiated community service (ibid., p. 59). Voluntarism of the middle class fulfilled a key component to narrowing widening gaps between social classes (ibid., p. 60). Philanthropy aside, settlement work was meant to give young women a “practical and socially beneficial experience” for their academic training whether or not the workers truly sympathized with settlement members (ibid., p. 61).

Community integration on a multi-program platform

Evident in the settlement movement was community integration on a multi-program platform. The settlement movement was geographically-oriented on a settlement house in a community which housed several programs at a time. Under the management of university students, the settlement house would identify needs of the community and deliver services accordingly. During the early days of the original Toynbee Hall settlement, they developed several services which engaged everyone but especially targeted women, youth and seniors (James, 1997). This multi-service model worked similarly in the Canadian context also targeting groups that settlement workers identified as under-engaged or “at-risk without engagement” (for example, James (1997) identifies that women were targeted because they were thought to be at-risk of social stigmas like sex work).
Most settlements were centred on a series of social clubs which most settlement members (settlement residents) were involved (James, 1998). Clubs were led by volunteers and had, on average, fifty members who practiced rituals of song and engaged in games and activities to encourage pride and belonging (ibid.). Recreational activities were meant to be educational and informally teach lessons of cooperation (ibid.).

**Adult education and advocacy**

Recreational games were designed to teach informal citizenship values of cooperation to encourage cohesion amongst community residents but also had a role in forming techniques for early adult education and advocacy strategies. Settlement houses were centres for adult education where programs such as adult literacy education and work placements were common in both the old and new world alike. Settlement workers organized classes to give residents the opportunity to learn content from workers’ privileged university education. Workers holding high-level university degrees were in a favourable position to develop programming from their own experience and schooling in philosophy and natural history was not uncommon (History of Toynbee Hall, n. d.). Settlement workers also encouraged residents to conduct experiential research on poverty, often encouraging advocacy research (James, 2001). This advocacy piece maintained that all residents were a part of the communal solution to battling poverty. Toynbee Hall also delivered legal services when they had the expertise from a university student-resident. Canada’s settlement houses followed the advocacy route and also delivered legal advocacy to the extent they had the resources (ibid.).
6.2 Settlement work: Institutionalization and professionalization

Dwindling resources of early Toronto settlement houses led to debates about whether to keep it based on a community worker model (practically volunteer based) or to professionalize the workers within a formal institution (James, 2001). At the centre of the debate was the potential for lost comradery if institutionalizing were to occur (ibid.). The initial sentiment was for university workers to live amongst the poor as neighbours and social equals. However the institutionalization of settlement work could then be interpreted as an expert versus recipient/client relationship and denigrate the original goals (DeFilippis, 2001). This model reinforced top-down approaches to community development by valuing the body of knowledge from the expert university educated worker and diminished critical assessment of the countering the structures which create and maintain poverty.

University of Toronto’s Social Services Department soon became the Social Work Faculty in 1914, as there were many proponents of professionalizing the work. Cathy James’ historical vignette describes the ironic result,

> Ironically, by participating in the creation of professional experts and specialists, settlement workers eventually undermined the authority of their more generalist approach to social work, propelling instead the expansion of an increasingly atomized, hierarchical, bureaucratic local state (2001: p. 17).

The more bureaucratic state further undermined communities’ ability to do self-development and community building. Institutional changes combined with lack of public exposure to the good work of original settlement workers, settlement work became compartmentalized into several professions of social work and reduced the strength and legitimacy of the holistic worker who lived within the community.

Modern settlement work has worked “back to its roots” and made a departure from the professionalization of social work. Very few modern settlement houses employ professional social workers. In fact, modern settlement houses are staffed with a range of people who have
front line experience working with communities as well as have coordinators and executive
directors who have post-secondary degrees in a range of social sciences and professional human
social service fields. Modern settlement houses are more likely to staff experienced community
organizers and adult educators to deliver programs and services, which is quite separate from the
modern profession of social work. While settlement houses are still often funded by government
bodies, closely associated with various grants from Federal, Provincial, Municipal levels of
government, they provide a wealth of indirect services that are assessed through their presence
within the neighbourhood.

The initial settlement movement had a mixed strategy of charity and there were
undertones that promoted the ideology of the “underclass” (Wilson, 1987), utilizing the idea that
poor people are ghettoized and produce a “culture of poverty” or cycle of poverty that cannot be
broken without social mixing of more affluent residents. However, there was also something
noble about the idealistic sense of over privileged university students working in partnership
with impoverished community residents. The initial settlement movement was an ideal which
may not have challenged power relations, but did recognize that there was an inequality which
needed to be redressed. The professionalization of the movement institutionalized the practice of
community work. Pressure felt from the lack of funding was primary to the bureaucratization,
but also resulted in the unfortunate circumstance of alienating workers and community
inhabitants by vertical (expert versus non-expert) and horizontal segregation (bureaucratizing
roles and segmenting with the division of labour). Modern settlement work, however, has
rerouted back to initial attempts of grassroots program provision. While modern settlement work
has taken a departure from professionalized social work, they are still tied to government funding
bodies which govern their formulation of government sponsored programming with their own community-identified programming.

_Toronto Neighbourhood Centres_

Toronto Neighbourhood Centres (TNC) is the network of thirty-two Toronto Area modern settlement houses. Settlement houses in Canada have shed the term “settlement house” and most TNC member organizations are called Neighbourhood Centres. TNC’s mission statement demonstrates the commitment to social justice for the most vulnerable:

_Toronto Neighbourhood Centres is an association of non-profit multi-service organizations dedicated to strengthening local neighbourhoods and enabling diverse communities to work together to promote justice and a healthy life for all. We share a vision of a Toronto that:

- Provides healthy and caring communities for all of its residents, especially those who are most vulnerable.
- Celebrates diversity, welcomes and supports people from across the globe.
- Enables all individuals in all sectors of society to participate fully in the processes that shape their communities (TNC, 2009).

TNC’s mission statement demonstrates the traditional aspects of the house model with a particular stress on social justice towards the most vulnerable. This political stance represents an anti-poverty stance. Membership is granted to existing multi-service organizations who work within the neighbourhood centre model. TNC member organizations are encouraged to serve under-serviced communities to promote community health. The benefit of membership is being part of a network that mobilizes knowledge and provides peer support (ibid.). TNC member staff have access to a set of similar multi-service organizations which are all developing towards an advocacy model and to work with communities for an anti-poverty strategy. Monthly meetings and strategic planning help member organization co-ordinate and share knowledge. The process of co-ordination and acting as a collective of organizations also give TNC greater influence to address common issues and concerns with respect to government policies and programs.
Individual member organizations range in terms of size, funding, spatial scope of neighbourhood and community served and variety of services. All members, however, share the volition towards changing the conditions of Third sector social economy work. In the report, “Heads up Ontario! Current conditions and promising reforms to strengthen Ontario’s non-profit community services sector,” (Clutterbuck & Howarth, 2007), TNC consultants interrogated the current conditions of social service provision delegated to social economy community development organizations. In particular, the report states the harrowing circumstances of the reduction and restrictions of funding, the increased and downloaded responsibilities (the “gap-filling” roll of the neoliberal welfare state) and the alienating work conditions faced by neighbourhood centre staff. Most importantly, TNC utilizes community service agency solidarity, across a large geography, to mobilize and advocate upon a distinct stance against the roll-back welfare state. Additionally, by producing and disseminating research, the TNC network is acting to procure a new roll-out ideology that expresses the reality of the strains put upon social service organizations. TNC communicates the collective experiences of community development workers and communities to expose the disempowering and alienating reality of the roll-back state.

6.3 Coding settlement houses as social economy community development organizations (SECDOs)

Chapter 4.1 defined a social economy community development organizations (SECDO) as any non-formal or formal organization that has the three qualities of a) Having common goals for the benefit of a spatial or identity-based subaltern, or non-hegemonic, community; b) Pursuing the mission, structure and governance guided by social economy values of social
investment and democratic governance; and c) Working with and engaging socially, economically or culturally disenfranchised people to access power to combat poverty. In this section modern Canadian settlement houses will be assessed to the standards of SECDOs and code settlement houses as an emergent model for a SECDO.

**Common goals for the benefit of a spatial or identity-based community**

Settlement houses serve a specific geographical community and currently remain linked to facilitating “settlement” in the broadest sense of creating a neighbourhood and producing a feeling of community in a spatial locale. However settlement houses have a special presence in the community:

[Settlement houses] are embedded within the community. They interact with it. They have a relationship locally. There is a real need to be here every day. We build a relationship with people who live and work here (Chris, Settlement House Worker).

Settlement houses interact with the community and are not merely physical locales for resources. People who work in settlement houses know the neighbourhood and know community members. Being a “local” organization is a necessary aspect of how settlement houses are functional. They house expertise and memory of a location and, because they are embedded and interact with a locale, they know community needs.

These houses are important in mobilizing a community identity sometimes. There are some houses that are older. They are an integral part of how the community was planned co-created that sense of identity. But the newer ones [settlement houses] are really interesting. The newer ones are from the community. They start literally from the ground up. An existing group doing community development work in their own community can decide that they want to become a settlement house. And they ask the older ones for our help to do it (Marie, Settlement House Worker).

Many settlement houses in Toronto are as old as the city itself and their presence has been a formative part of neighbourhood development and explicit strategy to deliver social services and community support. However, as the settlement movement grows, many settlement houses, such as rural areas outside of metropolitan cities, are just developing. Newly developed settlement houses arise out of an existing community mobilization, or a group that has a common
goal for the neighbourhood. Settlement houses are not organizations that are placed in areas where government assesses need or deficit. Rather, settlement houses are an organization of common interests and goals which arise from the existing community.

Finally, while being embedded locally is an important aspect of serving a spatial community, settlement houses also do not turn away people in need who are outside of geographical boundaries.

It is true that some people come down here just for our services and that’s it. But it’s because we are a location that exists in a place of need. And people know we are here. We develop programs based on need. So yes, if there are a lot of people coming here that are not people actually from this neighbourhood we will still have a program. We do it because we see a pattern and respond. We are flexible like that- we are flexible in all of our programming. And because we are part of a networked organizations [both as a part of TNC and a part of other organizations in the same location] we know how to address the other side of it too. Like if there are a lot of homeless drop-ins. We have to address it because they are coming here for services, but we can also use our networks to find out how to systemically reduce that need and find food and shelter for them before they ever feel hungry or cold to begin with. We do the best we can from the knowledge that we have on the ground (Chris, Settlement House Worker).

Settlement houses take on issues for communities of interest. Although there is an official “catchment area” no settlement house denies service to a person outside of the neighbourhood. Communities of interest become especially prevalent in some service work that also becomes advocacy work. Issues such as homelessness are taken on even if the homelessness population “originated” from elsewhere in the city. Settlement houses are flexible and are organized to fulfill needs and goals that are presented to them. While homelessness may not start as a particular mandate for a settlement house, it soon will become a focus if it presents itself as an issue. Furthermore, settlement houses are in good positions as a networked organization to communicate with other neighborhoods and organizations about problem solving.

We rarely take on any issues outside of our neighbourhood. But... well, it is difficult because in a lot of ways we have a large scope for that and very low standards for what “concerns our neighbourhood.” We will basically be interested in any issue that has any association with our neighbourhood but that could either mean nothing or a lot. For example, we got interested in sex work awhile ago. It was actually some residents that were talking about the rise in the amount of sex workers they saw in the area. We took that up and looked into what was happening. It seemed like street prostitution was coming up our way because of the unsafe conditions in their usual neighbourhood. We then held a community meeting where we talked about the issue. People came in with all different ideas and agendas. For some it was to talk about how to get rid of them [the sex workers]. For others, admittedly the minority, it was about how to alleviate
the problem of violence against sex workers. I come from a harm reduction background so this community meeting turned more into the root causes or motivations for sex work and sex workers' rights and safety. It was not productive for everyone, but it helped us realize that we needed to take this to a wider forum. So now I am working with several other groups, both from community and government, to advocate for sex workers’ right to be safe, but at the same time ensure that residents’ concerns are met and they understand why prostitution is visible in their neighbourhood. So we take issues outside of our neighbourhood but it really isn’t outside of our concern, you know what I mean? (Cynthia, Settlement House Worker).

Being embedded locally gives settlement houses the opportunity to understand the way neighbourhoods change over time; settlement houses are an institution that serves as “memory” for a locale. When dynamics of a neighbourhood change, settlement workers are astute to the changes due to interactions with people in the neighbourhood. Concerns that are raised turn into issues that settlement houses will take on and will often serve a community of interest. Although settlement houses traditionally focus on newcomer services and, therefore, serve in part as cultural centres, there are many other communities of interest that are represented. In the above quote, sex workers are a community of interest whose shifting geography was brought to the attention of the settlement centre. Settlement workers understood the residents’ concerns but did not perpetuate NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) attitudes and were also concerned about the safety issues faced by sex workers. The Executive Director of this settlement house took the conflicting issues, where some residents disliked the presence of sex workers and some were sympathetic to the safety of sex workers, and turned it into an educational forum where common goals could be determined. While conflict might not be fully resolved, the settlement house plays an important role in brokering communication about the broader issues of sex work rather than an acute diagnosis of sex workers in the neighbourhood as a problem.

Mission structure and governance guided by social economy values

Modern settlement houses are have a structure that is guided by social economy values of democratic governance; advocacy and agency; and social investment. Settlement houses demonstrate democratic governance not only through their organized structure as a registered
non-profit and charity organization, but also within their presence in the community. All actions arise from residents; all programs either arise from social service needs assessment or community interest. As a non-profit that is funded by the provincial and federal government, settlement houses regularly gather data on community needs through a combination of demographic data and front-line workers’ knowledge of community need.

Services provided are developed based on the combination of data and experience of workers embedded in the community. Programs also develop when residents express a need and that need might be an explicit request or a pilot program to gauge interest.

During the recession we had a fear that people would not be able to make their basic needs. We thought about what we could do to help and what the residents would want. Basically, we put on a community dinner. It was just to see if there was interest in it. We did free community dinners and the interest was huge. So many people came into our doors. It was successful, but also demonstrated that there was a lot of need in the community. I think people came because of the free food, but it also gave people a chance to socialize, talk and connect with one another. We kept track of the numbers and talked to some residents about why they were coming. They told their stories of losing their jobs, having difficulty paying bills and things like that. We used their stories and the numbers recorded as evidence for advocacy. I wrote a letter to the minister to show him the problems and how people are affected in the community (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

Programs and activities are ongoing developments and flexible by community need. Activities such as community dinners meet a need in the neighbourhood but also are used to mobile people and give them space to tell their stories for advocacy. Settlement houses take individual need, such as hunger, and expose them as social problems that require political attention. Settlement houses identify individual problems and turn them into politically productive campaigns for advocacy which adds another layer to the ways in which knowing the neighbourhood and community participation is integral to determining programs and services to deliver. Settlement houses have been active participants in improving food security; public transit access; and volunteerism and politically important participation through democratic governance structures which engage the community.

It’s because of the community that we know what to do. It’s because we engage people and ask them what they need. We could do the regular stuff that every other organization thinks people need. We do that a
lot. But we know how to adjust to something more useful for people. I remember we used to do all candidates meetings. And those were just really unsuccessful. Like, people knew exactly who they were voting for and it became a staged sort of act that we were doing for just ten people. Basically, there were only ten people that didn’t know who they were voting for. We were wasting resources for something people were not interested in. It became a stage act. We asked people what they would like more; we asked them what they needed. We ended up having more of an interactive approach where we had different candidates in the house talking about different issues and those people go around the house and actually interact with politicians and talk about the issues. That was more useful (Howard, Community Development Worker).

The flexibility in settlement houses makes it easier to provide politically important participation. Communities of interest determine what is most productive and settlement houses can respond.

Advocacy and agency has also been an important piece mainly through their settlement services that are government funded, but also through the frontline work of emotional supports and mobilizing for empowerment. Settlement houses provide adult education for newcomers and it is tiered in two ways. First, they provide the basic services to support newcomers with language, culture and employment. These basic services in adult education are to help acclimatize newcomers. This alone, however, does not demonstrate transformative work and is merely based on reform or social inclusion strategies. The transformative work is done in popular education exercises which exist in the interstitial spaces of settlement houses. Popular education is not a formal part of any settlement work. Rather, it is an aspect which arises from constant contact and community involvement with residents.

It’s really important that we are here daily and we are like a neighbour they can come see for help, to talk, to socialize or whatever. Our permanent presence and people knowing of us is important. Some houses are less known in their [respective] communities than others. But for us, people know us. And it is important that we are here just as a multiservice gathering place because it’s the informal spaces where things happen. When people are coming out of programs they catch me in a conversation and we talk about things that are important to them. When we know about this sort of stuff we know what issues people are facing and take it up. A lot of people were coming in with employment issues. Various workers were hearing similar stories. At our regular staff meetings they found that this was quite common and narrowed it down to status [migrant worker] issues. We decided to form a committee to address just that. It has been useful in sharing information between our workers and helping a bunch of people with similar problems. A lot of the education goes on in a more small scale thing. Like the seniors do issues based organizing. They meet regularly and take up an issue. Bring it to a forum. It is the small every day interactions- and there are some real “a-ha” moments that you can’t really capture. You just have to have those spaces to give opportunities for that kind of synergy to occur. The best workers don’t organize or intentionally do popular education. The best workers look for opportunities in their daily work. The flexibility of our work is what makes us work (Chris, Settlement House Worker).
Through day to day contact and providing a safe space to gather, front-line workers get the opportunity to dialogue with community members about their problems and providing that space for dialogue is a platform in and of itself for further mobilization.

Finally, settlement houses also practice and demonstrate social investment by mobilizing and supporting the creation of material and social supports that benefit the community.

Community funds are a small sum of money, about five hundred dollars, that we give to individuals or groups that want to do a project of some sort. It’s flexible as to what they use it for. We’ve had people use it to fund community social groups or there were a few residents who used it to delve into their families history in the community. There was this one project that was really cool. A group of elderly folks created a book about their experiences coming to Canada. It was really beautiful and very moving. Their stories were compiled in this beautiful book that is a real resource for the community. What’s also really cool about the community funds is that it is a barometer for how much community connectedness already exists. If people don’t know their neighbourhoods they can’t write this [an application for the funds]. You either have to go out and get to know their neighbours or you have to already have the connections. The highest uptake is this site where there is co-op housing. It’s because people already know each other (Laura, Settlement House Worker).

Member settlement houses use their organizational presence; their associational membership; and their personal and professional networks with other individuals and organizations which have an effect on creating politically important alliances, partnerships and coalitions on behalf of their constituency. They also utilize their resources to create connections within the community. The community funds project invests small sums of money, but residents may only access them if they apply in partnership with other community members. As the informant states, it is a barometer for how much community connectedness exists, and once that is known the settlement house knows where connections need to be built. Settlement houses get to know local situations, such as the connectedness that exits in cooperative housing, and use that local knowledge as assets to help plan the neighbourhood.

Working with and engaging disenfranchised people

Most settlement houses are incorporated non-profits and they are governed by a democratic board. However a SECDO must also demonstrate transformative governance
structures beyond the democratic governing board. A SECDO must demonstrate that their stakeholders (i.e. community members and disenfranchised people they serve) are active participants in the democratic structure of decision-making and play an important role in determining the actions and direction of the SECDO. Settlement houses have a commitment to the poor, disenfranchised and discriminated against peoples; immigration, women’s rights, and advocacy, respect and support for Aboriginal economy development are central aspects of day to day anti-oppression work within which settlement houses are actively involved.

The majority of settlement houses, in particular, take on strong advocacy measures for newcomers. Newcomer programs and advocacy are central to the work of settlement centres. They also create enabling circumstances where newcomers are encouraged by front line staff that can often speak the same language and come from the same cultural community and empathize with newcomer experiences. DPNC has front line workers that are hired to serve the community, but they do not dictate the content of the programs and work with, rather than for, residents to maximize community control. The key work of a settlement house is that they do not work just on behalf of people who are disenfranchised. People work on behalf of themselves, and settlement centres assist them with the resources that are required to do so.

**Conclusion**

The settlement model, emulated from England at Toynbee Hall, was an innovative community development model which combined social mix, adult education and advocacy. The first settlement workers were educated to take a departure from charity but, rather, work and live with the poor as neighbours and fellow community members. The model, transported to North America, was meant for newcomer immigrants. While settlement houses certainly existed to do
community development, it was also geared towards working and middle class newcomers, especially women. Settlement houses were literally, houses which would help people settle in the New World.

Although class played an important role, as settlement workers were often of a privileged class, class differences were downplayed in the ideological mission of the community development strategy. Settlement workers were encouraged to live amongst the community and participated in programs, education and advocacy with community members. Settlement work came to a clear crossroads when the movement to professionalize social work succeeded to create the School of Social Work at the University of Toronto. The professionalization of the social work profession became the arm of the welfare state and splintered from the original concept of grassroots community development work. The professionalization of social work further launched the institutionalization of welfare and social service provision, thus creating alienating conditions of work and welfare.

Modern settlement houses still hold the model of social mix, community integration on a multiservice platform and adult education and advocacy. Modern Canadian settlement houses do not employ social workers, but rather, employ generalist workers with community development interests and work experience. Canadian settlement houses are spatially organized and are present in every metropolitan city in Canada. Each Metro city has an Association or Network that connects settlement houses in the area. Toronto Neighbourhood Centres (TNC) is the oldest and largest network of settlement houses in Canada. The TNC network provides a great opportunity for individual membership organizations to have a collective voice for social service work. By publishing research, TNC communicates popularly and with government about the reality of the roll-back welfare state. The opportunity to publish the collective experience of a
set of social service organizations and their constituent communities allows them to reveal their own standpoints and their own realities, which have the power of producing and reproducing new roll-out ideologies on the reality of the welfare state.

Canadian settlement houses provide a typical case of SECDO work. They are non-profit organizations within the scope of the social economy and they focus on community development work. Due to the particular model which combines egalitarian and democratic-oriented community development practice; multi-service social service provision which meets material deprivation and social exclusion; and a developing adult education and advocacy role, settlement houses are ripe locations to conceptualizing transformative SECDOs.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Social movement education and DPNC

Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre (DPNC) is a typical settlement house located in Toronto’s West end. It is clear from DPNC’s mission statement that they are committed to a series of services which address the root causes of poverty. The multi-service centre is modest in size, but is at the forefront of innovation in terms of advocacy.

For over two decades, DPNC has played an important role in the lives of people in Toronto’s west end. Committed to addressing the cycles of poverty, violence and social alienation, our multi-service centre has created a wide range of services and programs for those who are most vulnerable – low income children, teens, families, single mothers, refugees and immigrants, isolated adults, and seniors. In 2007-2008 we served 3,000 children, 300 youth, 5,000 adults and 900 seniors. In the same year, 240 volunteers assisted in program delivery, providing 14,500 volunteer hours. We employ approximately 85 staff per year.

We build individual and community capacity by providing health and social programs that foster positive relationships among community members, develop skills and knowledge, and enable people with limited resources to improve their prospects for the future. Funding for DPNC’s ongoing services comes from a variety of sources. We strive for excellence, and have earned a reputation within the City of Toronto as an effective and innovative service provider (DPNC website).

DPNC is particularly innovative because it 1) Addresses material deprivation and social exclusion under one roof and 2) Resolves alienating work for human social service workers. The combination of strategies within one organization provides enabling circumstances for an anti-poverty strategy which fosters a culture of organic intellectualism. The model that DPNC is currently developing, as demonstrated by this in-depth case study, may serve as a model for other existing and future new settlement houses.

7.1 Addressing material deprivation and social exclusion under one roof

Social service agencies predominantly address material deprivation, however settlement houses have a special model which addresses the social exclusion facet of poverty. DPNC is a typical settlement house which demonstrates an atypical social service provision model. DPNC,
and all settlement houses, serve as a centralized hub of social services and programs that ease stress of disenfranchised people seeking help.

Neighbourhood houses are sort of one stop shops. They are central hubs where you can put all services within one context. Most social service agencies work in one area. You have the immigrant services society, seniors-411, youth programs, kids programs, childcare etc. But a neighbourhood house puts everything together and people can come in to find those services on one convenient location and they can build on their issues. Sometimes families come in. They all require different services. Think about running around the city and attempting to capture all these services. In fact, finding them is even difficult! (Marie, Settlement House Worker).

DPNC serves a community represented largely by families and newcomers. Centralizing services and programs under one roof ensures families are not expending energy to find services and travel to different services. All services a community member within DPNC’s catchment would likely need are housed under one roof and are considered a “one stop shop.”

When a variety of services and programs are agglomerated in one geographical area, those in need can access them easily. Interestingly, people access services they did not intend to access when they first come to DPNC’s reception.

The best part about the settlement house model is that people get services they don’t even know they need. Sometimes we get people seeking immigration services. They aren’t quite sure what they are looking for—we get a lot of new residents that are just looking at some of the community social groups or the job postings on the board outside [in the public area]. We welcome them, talk to them and then we may find out they have status issues that may get in the way of their employment. We have services for that and once we’re done helping them get through the issues with status they might need help creating a resume and knowing how to translate their employable skills onto paper. We have a program for that as well where we help people with their resume-building and interview skills. They also find a ton of services that will help them with ESL, if that is an issue or find childcare so they may venture out to actually go to an interview. All of these are housed in one place and it can get frustrating for some people to get a referral for the “next step” and then have to run across the city (Perry, Settlement House Worker).

In this case, front line workers receive people at the front desk to hear what their needs are. Front line workers have the experience and training to know the series of other services a person may require and are able to refer them right away, within DPNC. Another case may be that a person comes in to access assistance from employment services and after the first meeting the resident realizes they may need to access resume building assistance, which DPNC also offers. Once the person finds employment, they may require access to childcare services. DPNC helps
the resident through the entire problem solving process and assists them across an issue that may have several components to solve. DPNC follows them throughout that timeline and encourages a community space, rather than an office to receive services.

The community space is so familiar and “neighbourly” that DPNC has tried to resist the tendency for others to label them as “community centres”. DPNC is more than a community centre because they engage in advocacy for marginalized people and create safe spaces to combat the social exclusion of poverty.

It feels more like a community centre- it is…but don’t say community centre! We’re not a community centre. It’s more like a community home. Sometimes it is hard to say why we are not a community centre and I think it is because we offer so many programs like a community centre. What is rare in a settlement house is the type of activity space community centres typically have, such as gyms, park space etc. We’re not an athletic centre or social space like that. Although those things are important. We function much more as a meeting space for issues and advocacy. So if a marginalized community group comes in to say they want a meeting space to talk about some issues then we can provide that. It may be basic, but we provide the starter materials for people to begin to organize and I think those kinds of resources are important. We also serve many people who are typically identified as “in need”. Here people in need can meet each other and share their concerns with one another. I think one of our most important resources is the lobby. It’s central, our staff is friendly and people come here and recognize each other. They come here and they talk to one another and it’s an open and friendly space. We try to keep it that way. It’s very important to us (Marie, Settlement House Worker).

DPNC does needs assessments of their neighbourhood from in-house surveying, discussion with residents to seasonal door-knocking to find out what types of issues need to be addressed. Further, work is organized such that Front line workers are organized by issues. Workers set up sub-groups to address problems they see coming up frequently in their everyday work. Front-line workers are in tune with the issues residents face and ensure programming and services are flexible to community needs. Although settlement houses are also spaces for anybody to access services in the neighbourhood, DPNC recognizes that the residents who frequent DPNC are the ones who are identified as most in need. Therefore, an advocacy strategy is encased within their services and programming. All services and programming DPNC offers also take in data of people using them. DPNC collects demographic data as well as stories from residents. While demographic data is often collected for funding purposes, stories are qualitative pieces of
information that buttress the statistics. These stories are taken in order to compile in-house research for campaigns or issues they may bring to the attention of politicians. The advocacy stance is an aspect of community centres and social service organizations that are not frequently undertaken due to underfunding. However, DPNC restructures work to make this a priority which they view as a long term benefit to their ability to gain funding for more comprehensive programs. This combination of work is what makes DPNC and the settlement house model unique.

7.2 Resolving alienating work

DPNC spearheads a series of work practices which resolve alienating work. Staff describe their work as being more flexible than traditional social service work. Flexibility, peer support and respect for the relationship between settlement worker and community members reduce alienating work and enable circumstances where relationships and collaborative work can flourish. This section is organized into the four facets of alienation and uses staff stories of their work to describe how alienating work is being transformed into work that builds relationships for social change.

Alienation from the labour process

DPNC hires generalist workers rather than professional social workers. Although settlement houses originated the social work profession, the TNC network has departed from the professionalization of social work. The pressure to systematize the service provision role through a process of bureaucratized steps is reduced through hiring generalist workers. Generalist workers are less likely to be subject to a division of labour that focuses on a narrow aspect of an individual’s needs and, rather, enables a holistic view of how to assist that person.
Generalist workers at DPNC also form working groups to ensure common issues within the community are met.

Most of our front line staff have just had a lot of experience in the work that they do. Staffing is really important. To have a vision of social change you have to also have staff that see that vision too. We have monthly organizational wide meetings. And then we have them divided into different teams depending on what programs they run etc. It’s very important for staff to meet with each other and discuss what is going on. What they are seeing. What they need and how they can improve upon a program. The staff are really the eyes and ears for what is going on. They know the residents. They know them really well (Chris, Settlement House Worker).

Our staff are connected within the house. We don’t work in silos here. We don’t work in individual offices. The best part of a neighbourhood centre is that we work as a community with a community. Staff get to know people who come here. People who come here get introduced to other people who work here and other people in programs. Settlement workers see residents through the entire lifecycle of a problem they come in with and we keep those relationships long after (Cynthia, Settlement House Worker).

A stress on relationship-building is evident from the stories of Coordinators at DPNC. Staff work collectively to form relationships. The repeated theme of “building relationships” in interviews demonstrates the implicit value in the long-term engagement of community members with DPNC. DPNC staff work through the problem, rather than through a section of a problem, and work in groups to communicate better and do ongoing organizational development. Working groups denote the importance of workers communicating with one another to ensure every staff member knows more than just one aspect of “community development work” and understands, and works, on multiple facets.

Most front-line staff are not professionals and, rather, experienced with community development initiatives or originate from the communities themselves. Many people who help the functioning of the settlement house are also volunteers from the community who have interest in pioneering their own programs. A settlement house as a facility provides the space for community members to pilot their own activities.

We had some Chinese residents come in and they were a language minority within the Chinese community here. We actually have a lot of Chinese speaking residents, both newcomers and second generation residents. However these particular residents wanted to start a language club of some sort...they didn’t have anyone to speak to because their dialect was not well represented here. We gave them space to do it and now there are dozens of people, both Chinese and non-Chinese descent coming in. I’m incredibly
impressed. This is a big deal for a neighbourhood house or any organization to have residents spear head this sort of thing (Laura, Settlement House Worker).

Work is left undefined and flexible to needs and initiatives. The people who make DPNC function are a series of coordinators, front line staff, volunteers and community residents who come together to deliver services, programs and activities. The flexibility of the labour process enables creativity within the work process and empowers all people interacting with DPNC by giving them access to direct their own programming.

*Alienation from the product of labour*

Settlement house workers express a lot of control over their work. At times they express frustration with the way in which funding is structured and how accounting can be a time consuming task. However, DPNC workers demonstrate creativity to combat rigid funding structures. Beyond direct service delivery, DPNC also provides programming that is flexible to community needs. Through the flexibility of programming, workers generally express great control over the work that they do when they can move beyond strict funding structures.

The centres that do better are the ones that have a steady flow of money. These are usually ones who run like businesses or are attached to CHCs (community health centres). This way they have a steady income and can siphon off some of the money to other programs. It’s really about flexibility to make things happen. We have the vision a lot of the time. The point is to make sure that vision comes to life with the right resources that we are given. The business model is tricky because you end up taking big contracts that, sometimes, make it less into a “neighbourhood” organization. The centres that are CHC’s-they do better at maintaining their agenda for social change (Kris, Settlement House Worker).

Some funding is rather strict. All of that goes directly to the specific services we house (i.e. Immigration services, Health Services). But housing those basic services also means that we are a good [organizational] candidate for services and programs that support those basic services. For example, we have some strict newcomer services that help newcomers fill out forms that are required, you know, the bureaucratic documents- and employment services that are more or less strictly, and really- underfunded. But because we house that we also win other contracts that are so necessary to supporting that kind of work within the same organization. We have adult services which provide a series of supports for residents and newcomers that traditional service delivery doesn’t specify. I mean, what I’m saying is that narrow service delivery without the supports don’t work. You can’t just show people where jobs are, give them the forms to fill out and leave. It’s all the in between support throughout their journey that they really need help with. And that’s what I love about this job. You get to do that for people... with people. And the challenges to work with the funding you have are there, but we have an amazing group of people here that make it happen. Meetings here are always fun and we solve the problems together within the centre and then we also have association with a bunch of different neighbourhood organizations and TNC [Toronto Neighbourhood Centres] (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).
The products of labour for DPNC staff are not simply just the direct service provision funded by service contracts. They are a process of relationship building. There is no distinct product that is not within the workers’ everyday experience; DPNC staff work with each other and with residents to work through a process. The stress on providing ongoing support is the center-piece of the work DPNC staff are attempting to produce. It is clear from the quote that the DPNC staff is less concerned with the direct service and more interested in how to sustain what that service is trying to achieve through a series of social and material supports. Planning and implementing supports is also a collaborative process with which staff takes pride. It is the collaborative process which staff express enjoyment from their work and the process-related nature of their work that really places the product of social service work back into the hands of the worker.

*Alienation from fellow human beings*

DPNC’s is guided by principles of community partnership and participation to accomplish their goals.

Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood Centre (DPNC) supports people in its neighbourhood, especially those who face economic and/or social barriers, to enrich their lives and the life of the community. We do this by working in partnership with community members and organizations to offer a range of health, employment and social support initiatives that are flexible, responsive, non-discriminatory and barrier free. We strengthen individuals and groups through cooperative action that responds to the political, social, economic, cultural, and spiritual life of this community (DPNC Mission Statement, n.d.).

We envision a community in which DPNC fosters respect and mutual support, celebrates diversity, and works collaboratively to achieve a safe, healthy and accepting society for all (DPNC Vision Statement, n.d.).

The work process is humanizing; staff work in collaboration and cooperation. The settlement house model is about community partnerships rather than professionalized opinion for human social service. While DPNC does offer government funded human social services, many program leaders are the residents themselves. Feedback from residents about community need is a large part in how programs develop.
We work closely with the residents. Without coordinating with them we wouldn’t have most of the programs we do. We wouldn’t have the community dining nights, we wouldn’t have the sustainability program, we wouldn’t have the diversity in programs either (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

We are trying to do more participatory data collection. What I mean with that is we often talk to people within the programs and services to see what their needs are. This is a work in process. With some groups that we have known for longer it is an easy process- we have built the relationships there. With some, it is a process to build mutual trust. It’s a two way street. Service provision can’t be about just dumping a bunch of services in a place and then having a revolving door. That wouldn’t be community capacity building at all. Settlement houses are about using our assets as community workers and melding it with community assets. Asset mapping is a big way in which we determine that reciprocal relationship of putting in our value as community workers so the community can use us as a resource to build on their assets (Howard, Settlement House Coordinator).

Staff members express respect for the amount of interaction they have with community residents.

Mutual participation from DPNC staff and the community is an ongoing process; the development of DPNC as an organization is one in the same with creating community capacity.

The staff are cognizant that they bring unique skills as community workers. They have to invest their own skills into the existing community through participation and not merely “rolling-out” service contracts.

The community decides what we do here, for the large part. All of the stuff that’s not a strict service contract, which is only parts of the newcomer services and parts of the Health Centre, is done in collaboration with the community… that’s how it’s supposed to be, or how services should be delivered, actually. How can you tell people what they need and just plop it down? You can’t really know unless you are communicating with them on a daily basis. You can’t really know unless you see the need every day and you know what is happening on the ground. I think that is my biggest critique- that you can’t just deliver a model of services because there is no one size fits all. We work closely with people every day to tailor the experience. It’s like those reading programs “in a box” in schools. You know, the ones where they have a story, they ask you questions about that story and then they have the answers on the back. How well do you really think that will teach you something? No everyone absorbs information in the same way. Same as services that are supposed to be “anti-poverty”. The one size fits all scheme is just silly- you can’t just say, fill out these forms and all of a sudden things will be fixed. No, each program here works closely with people, we listen to what they need, their situation and without that hands-on nature you can’t meaningfully enrich people’s lives. Without that daily interaction you wouldn’t even know where to begin and you wouldn’t have the most valuable resource- our residents- to do the kind of work we do (Howard, Settlement House Coordinator).

Programs also only thrive through community participation. Ensuring that there is a balance between material service provision and community-inspired programming ensures that paid staff, volunteers, residents and a range of communities interacts with one another in mutual support. The metaphor the DPNC staff member uses of the systematized reading program as a model of most service delivery is a recognition that traditional social service provision is known
for a rigid process with an expected positive outcome. The metaphor is used to describe how
different people interact with bureaucratic models differently and there is no single process that
can guarantee a final outcome of “poverty alleviation.” In opposition to a single model, staff
members at DPNC are practiced workers who learn by continual contact with the community
they serve. Staff members interact with residents on a daily basis and learn the unique culture of
the community and, because DPNC’s participation is sustained through the lifecycle of problem
solving, DPNC staff understand individual learning styles and build associations amongst the
community for ongoing support.

*Alienation from our “species-being”*

As an activist I don’t care if I’m radical. I don’t care how radical I am and I don’t care how radical you are. Activism is not about mobilizing a bunch of radical people. It’s about communicating a message that will radicalize people. If I talk to the same “radicals” I’ve failed as an activist. If I can radicalize one person. If I can have that conversation with them and build that relationship with them to make them think and feel differently about something? Then I’ve accomplished something (James, Toronto-based activist).

I don’t expect settlement centres to be radical. That’s not what they are for or where they came from. But they service a very important niche amongst the middle levels. The interstitial work that happens is very pertinent to a comprehensive anti-poverty strategy. Settlement houses provide actual spaces to organize and from here the community can partner with other organizations and do more radical things. That makes space to do more radical stuff and so on. Settlement houses themselves are not radical, no. But what do we do here? We let people become radical. We give the space and resources for workers and communities to mobilize. We help them improve their experience for their quality of living so they can go out and have the energy to fight for themselves. We are not radical. But the people that emerge from this place are (Howard, Settlement House Coordinator).

Most important to the work of DPNC is the space it provides and the journeys through
which people go. This informant admitted that the settlement house model is not meant to be
radical in terms of radical political action. What DPNC provides, however, is the journey to
radicalism and the opportunity to become radicalized. The first quote from a Toronto-based
activist describes the way “activism” should be approached; he describes the goal to not speak to
the same radical people but, rather, to extend to new people to deliberate about new ideas. The
goal should be the active process of radicalizing people. A person becomes radicalized through
learning. The second quote from a Toronto Neighbourhood Centre Coordinator explains how
people emerge from the settlement house prepared to be radicalized. Community members who face material deprivation and social exclusion come to DPNC for help. DPNC addresses those needs and, through the journey, introduces people to ways to become involved in activism. The settlement house model facilitates activism; DPNC provides enabling circumstances for people to surface as activists. People emerge from the settlement house experience with a better opportunity to engage in thinking and learning when their needs are material and social needs are met.

Both workers and community members come closer to reaching their “species being” or human potential, when settlement workers and community members work together within the settlement house. Social service work becomes less alienating when settlement workers get to engage their experience and use their facilities to engage people. DPNC staff, who have experience in community development work express that they do more meaningful work within the organization of DPNC, despite barriers:

We try hard to do anti-poverty work. It’s not easy… from either end. It’s hard for me to bring it back to doing work with people with the funding proposals, the accounting and the accountability reports that capture just numbers. It is not easy for residents because prior to coming here they have likely come across a bunch of other social workers and agencies who have just gave them paperwork. They almost have to remember what it is like to work with an organization who is interested in them… interested in creating community capacity. We [DPNC] try to do justice to grassroots work as much as possible… we try to do justice to the community (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

DPNC staff are generalist workers with experience in community development work. This quote describes the experience of bureaucratic and professionalized social work practices. The DPNC staff person describes how disappointing it is as a community development worker to inhabit a profession where community members have had poor experiences and fatigue from social workers and agencies. As workers, DPNC provides a refreshing challenge that combines flexible work to re-engage themselves into community development work as well as community members.
My job here is health promotion and community development. It’s a very broad job. Which is both good and bad. It can be bad because I can get caught up very easily into the …bureaucracy. But because it is so general… I get to do a lot of creative things. I get to really think about how to do health promotion and community development in a meaningful way. I became interested in popular education and I am trying to incorporate it in my work (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

Staff members get the opportunity to think freely and openly about their work and re-engage themselves into their work.

The “species being” is about doing transformative work or, work that re-engages learning and action for social good. This paradigm is counterintuitive to traditional social service provision which has been about addressing the symptoms of poverty rather than countering the root causes of poverty. Transformative work gives people access to power to transform the structures which create poverty. Transformative work gives people the opportunity to think critically about the experience of poverty and become conscious of barriers. Settlement houses are unique because they support popular education within programs.

Programs are set up for “targeted groups”. Sometimes we target them, such as single mothers; literacy and language classes or even seniors. And sometimes they come to us already mobilized with an interest- some seniors groups, community-supported childcare, or social groups. Either way we have staff which helps run the program but, most of all, act as facilitators. We dialogue and we give each other the opportunity and permission to voice our concerns. Sometimes it takes a really long time to get to the root of the issue. But once it happens do some pretty innovative stuff. For example, the seniors really mobilized to get a transit line un an underserviced area. We had so many people from the community to come out to an action where there would be political leaders. The energy was amazing. I feel like that was a really successful experience. When people see that they can win they keep doing the work. They keep gathering and they keep engaging each other, talking to each other and pushing for more wins (Cynthia, Settlement House Worker).

In this quote the informant is talking about the steps they take to support organic intellectualism. Settlement houses give the community material resources first, and, because settlement houses act as a coalition as an association and in relation to other aligned organizations, they have power to access political officials. Community members become community mobilizers. Within the walls of DPNC, residents have time and access to dialogue and discussing their problems with fellow residents and staff members which lead them to mobilize and become organic intellectuals themselves. Without this multi-service flexible space, community members would
just access single services and leave without further opportunity for popular education. With a culture of organic intellectualism, “They keep gathering and they keep engaging each other, talking to each other and pushing for more wins.”

7.3: Organic intellectualism

Organic intellectualism describes the natural intellect inherent within people. People feel and experience the world, but Gramscian intellectualism means to not only feel, but also to know and understand how to read the world. In addition, organic intellectuals are conscientized leaders who constantly learn, reflect and act on the world to help transform it; enabling praxis is an important aspect of fostering organic intellectualism. This section is organized into three parts which describe how settlement houses and settlement workers help foster a culture of organic intellectualism. The first part is about how DPNC and settlement workers support conscientization. DPNC facilitates an environment for residents to know and understand and to connect what they are feeling and experiences to understand the world. Secondly, DPNC provides a physical environment and workers help mobilize collaborative learning opportunities where residents can practice their learning. Finally, organic intellectualism is about producing intellectuals by social function. Supporting organic intellectualism is about supporting people’s ability to become mobilizers in everyday life and giving people access to the power structures that enable their participation in the governance of everyday life. DPNC facilitates the ability for communities to advocate on behalf of themselves.
Conscientization: to feel, know and understand

Communities feel their material deprivation and social exclusion when they access DPNC’s services. The majority of people DPNC serves are people who have the lived experience of being in need:

The majority, if not all come here or hear about us because we can offer them something. They need something from us. I don’t know how well we are known outside of groups in need in this neighbourhood. Even though we’re here for everyone, a fraction of the neighbourhood knows about us. That fraction is the part that is in need.\(^3\) When people come here it is because we can help them with something. They stay because they find people here that understand them. We take the neighbourhood centre model seriously. We are part of the neighbourhood and we want to be part of the experience of living in this neighbourhood. There are definitely people who will come in and we will never see again. And we are here for them too. But there are definitely a number of people who have found a community here and will come back not only because they need our services or access our programs, but because they like being here. They like dropping in and talking to people. It’s a nice community we have here. We’re constantly building it (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

Residents who come into contact with DPNC are in search of a service or program DPNC offers. While some people may use DPNC just for that service, many people become part of a community at DPNC. The DPNC community is built through developing initial interactions and engaging people further into a neighbourhood. However, neighbourhood has to mean more than just building upon ideologies of the desirability of neighbourliness and community. Staff at DPNC are constantly in the process of creating relationships for the purpose of mobilizing. Mobilizing for political action must happen over time through a constant process of collaboration and negotiation.

Programs conveniently gather residents into common interest groups. DPNC staff take advantage of similar interests and needs in each program to deliberate on common issues. DPNC’s programs are created and designed on the base of need and, therefore, they are ideal places to begin conversations about why that need exists in the first place. DPNC gathers

\(^3\) This is a DPNC experience, specifically. Many settlement houses in Toronto are known and are accessed outside of communities in need. In Vancouver, the settlement house network is integral to neighbourhood planning on a municipal level and is utilized by people from a range of socio-economic status.
communities to deliberate and consider what practices are part of creating that deprivation and exclusion.

We began modestly…maybe it was last year when we started doing dialogue circles? It’s not something I know very well but I’ve been trying to research it and work with the existing programs to see how to do it better. A couple times a month I’ll go to each program and we’ll do a kind of discussion circle. We get a range of topics and its sometimes difficult to focus it on any one particular subject. Over time, though- it has got better. We know each other now. People bring their friends and family and they hear about us and are interested (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

Paid staff and volunteers who lead or facilitate programs express an uneasiness about how they started. In the above quote this staff member describes the difficulty of trying a new model of dialogue, rather than a traditional service delivery method. The staff member describes it as a learning process for themselves. Over time, however, ease sets in not because the staff member perfects the process, but rather because people begin to become acquainted with one another. Through this process, people come to know each other and it is through that familiarity which can build better discussions, greater safety and confidence in participating in dialogue circles.

Once people got comfortable with one another it was easy. I forgot that I was even facilitating or leading! When one person talked the other would listen. Everyone had their turn and we got a into a nice rhythm of talking. It’s really cool when there is a beat in the group. You know what I mean? Like, when there is a nice momentum and people just take the converse together easily (Cynthia, Settlement House Worker).

Once there was trust and safety is developed in a group, conversation became more organic. The staff member recalls that they “forgot that [they] were even facilitating,” and the description of a “rhythm and beat” to the conversation is indicative of a comfort and respect to listen to one another and give everyone their space to express themselves.

Facilitators learn how to let the group members lead the conversation. While facilitators may know the residents, they might not know how community members feel and may not understand the experience and needs of the group members. This is also a learning process whereby this particular staff member recounts the way their own role was shaped by a program for single mothers:
I started facilitating discussions in the programs. I was with a group of single mothers. This was memorable for me. I don’t know their experiences at all [I don’t know what it is like to be a single mother] but I get what kind of supports they would need. We have a bunch of childcare, joint after school programs, social groups for mothers here…. What I didn’t realize is that they were not interested in talking about the topics I came to the group with. I thought I was supposed to be talking about oppression of women and the hardships et cetera et cetera. But that wasn’t what they wanted to talk about at all! They wanted to talk about other things… I remember this one time we got talking about the HST and how it would impact them. Then it led to grocery costs. It ended up that two women started hosting get-togethers in their homes. This area- it is quite isolated for many people. This was a great thing! Now they cook together and are quite active in calculating their changing costs in living. That group [the single mothers’ group] was one of the biggest advocates for the special diet campaign. They started being active after they started talking about their children and how they are going to raise them healthy and feed them nutritious food when groceries are so expensive. I learnt something there. I realize that I don’t need to go to them with a list of things I need to teach them or help them think about. They have their own interests and needs and getting them together to talk was the only thing I had to do (Sam, Group Facilitator and Community Worker and Mobilizer).

This staff member wanted to direct the discussion more in the beginning and felt like there were some prescriptive topics to cover for, specifically, these single mothers. The staff member soon learned that they did not truly understand the group members and their experiences. This staff person did not understand what “triggers” would make these women want to mobilize and take action. Through this experience, this staff member learned that they could not “lead” the topic of discussion because they did not know what issues and route of discussion would arouse the group members into action. If the staff member had stayed on the topic of what they felt the women “ought” to know, there never would have been any action taking place. This is an example of staff members learning how to democratize power in the workplace. Although staff know that they should not take paternalistic roles, they must learn how to practice it in a social services environment.

DPNC begins to facilitate a discussion where residents lead their own development for critical consciousness. Program participants take advantage of the program DPNC offers, but at the same time, by discussing common issues decided by their own interests they begin to learn how to “read the world” around them; through constant dialogue there are moments where they become deeply immersed in macro political and economic structures in which they are
embedded. Here this staff member recounts this experience of “conscientization” from the small relationship building phase to the critical thinking phase.

I’m struggling with how to do popular education sometimes. I’m learning as I go along and so are the residents I talk to. When I first started there was some nimbyism [not in my backyard] that I didn’t know how to react to. Like… we would be talking about unemployment and the economic crisis and all of a sudden somebody would talk about how their neighbour was bringing down property value by having a messy yard and not taking out their garbage properly. I didn’t know what to do… so I left it for awhile. In hindsight I now know there were deep issues with people not knowing others in the neighbourhood and some disconnectedness. It was easier to place the blame, even if it didn’t really make sense, on somebody they knew. But they didn’t really know them [their neighbour]. And now we’re trying to develop those relationships more to get a sense of solidarity in the community. I’m finding now that, especially with this one person who had issues with his neighbour, he starts wanting to discuss the disinvestment from the public areas now. He’s still very concerned about the space of the neighbourhood and the look, but he talks a lot about the beautification of public parks and playgrounds. And we talk about how that gets funded (Laura, Settlement House Worker).

The staff member is reflecting upon their experience with initial Not-In-My-Backyard attitudes amongst residents. Analyzing the way the resident felt, the staff member was identifying the initial learning phase of the resident. In this specific instance, the resident expressing NIMBYism was at the observation stage, however only able to observe their immediate surroundings or the actions that they could see right away. This quickly led to blame of the neighbour and the issues with the neighbour being of immediate importance. Later, upon reflection, the Laura could see the larger issue of “disconnectedness” in the community. Once the anomie of the resident was addressed, attitudes had changed and different areas were of concern. The resident, still interested in aesthetics and green space was more concerned with communal good.

In this next quote, a facilitator describes what happens as the process progresses and when reality may become stark:

People are smart here. They know their problems and they can follow the chain to where their problems come from. What to do from there is a different story. During the height of the recession we had some really invigorating discussions but kind of this… “so what?” moment at the end…. “What now?” Part of popular education is also knowing the right steps to take so that people don’t get to that point when they feel like it’s so big and they can’t do anything about it. That I am still figuring out… for myself and with people here (Marie, Settlement House Worker).
The DPNC facilitator is describing the learning that they must overcome in terms of using their own expertise as staff to collaborate on manageable action sequences and empowering activities. In this quote the facilitator describes the difficulty of the “popular educator” as somebody who needs to learn praxis too. Thinking and understanding alone do not necessarily enable action and can be disempowering if the problem is framed in as unmanageable. Therefore, popular education needs to be a process that not only incorporates planning and discussing issues, but also putting into practice social movement learning.

*Popular education: Collaborative learning and practicing social movement learning*

DPNC staff act as facilitators but have also learnt that they need to use their resources to provide ideal spaces and create ideal environments for popular education. Most importantly, creating the non-formal learning spaces that organize thoughts and the informal interactions to teach and learn, DPNC provides the ingredients to collaborate and engage on progressive and politically important action projects. Staff and residents engage in activities such as movie nights, arts and crafts and community dining that all utilize social gatherings to begin politicized conversations. Facilitating staff help make connections between the security of income, housing food and education.

We had a showing of Kite Runner (2007). It’s nice, the residents come in with their families and we have popcorn and they can watch a movie together. There are a number of reasons why this is a good movie and there are a lot of good openers for good discussion afterwards. I wanted to show this because of the themes of immigration, refugee, culture differences, class issues… all stuff that we face in this community, you know? And it’s a new movie so it’s nice to show something that is current and on topic to what everyone is talking about. We have lively discussions after… and these kind of movie nights seem to be popular so we will keep doing them. When we can make connections to their own lives by showing them a film it really helps start a discussion. People talk about the movie and then they don’t even realize that they begin talking about themselves. We have long discussions about the experience of refugees in Canada. Cultural differences for newcomers. The way native Canadians treat us when we come here as newcomers.

The community dining was very successful. We just invite people to come and keep track of the numbers but also this gives us a chance to talk about food together. And it gives everyone a chance to get to know each other while they are talking about food. The Stop hosts the dinners half of the time and they are very good with advocacy. It really helps that they are next door. They are very knowledgeable about food security issues. And we come full circle when we have discussions. So residents talk about their basic costs, food, rent, buying things for the kids. And it all adds up. And people will usually take care of their
rent and kids first to keep a roof over their heads and their kids happy. And food will come last, especially
food for parents. So we have these dinners to fill a food security issue, but we also use it as a social
gathering…and also as a way to talk with people about how they are doing with their food budgets. This
way we know better what people are feeling. And we have residents that want to sign in support of the
special diet campaign, raise in social assistance. From there they learn about other campaigns and become
very interested (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

DPNC provides non-formal spaces, such as movie nights and community dining evenings
for people to gather comfortably. Further, giving the community a social event is a more
congenial way for neighbours to get to know one another and begin an unthreatening space for
dialogue. Using popular culture media and current event topics, DPNC facilitators can elicit
discussion that community members can relate to. Further, the same discussion can lead to
advocacy efforts where community members are informally exposed to their communities’
thoughts and feelings and informally introduced to campaigns that they can get involved in. The
social spaces that DPNC creates provide an environment for neighbours to teach and learn from
each other. DPNC is a site for interaction, socializing and learning with other community
members. As community members become engaged their regular attendance further elicits more
intrigue and participation into advocacy efforts. Without the physical space, social environment
and opportunities to engage on politicized issues, community members may not ever be exposed
to the non-formal groups and informal learning interactions that would lead them to consciously
pursuing advocacy or even activism. When community members know and understand the
issues and become introduced to avenues for action, the next step is to encourage ongoing
collective action.

*Producing intellectuals by social function: Learning, practicing, reflecting and acting for social change*

Collective action is an outcome of social movement education and political education.
However, it is building and learning a culture of ongoing collective action which DPNC is
beginning to foster. While any single person can be part of a mobilization at only one time in
their life, the goal is to produce citizens as “intellectuals by social function.” This aspect is the part that signifies active citizenship of politically important participation and not merely tokenistic participation. Developing a culture where it becomes natural to constantly mobilize turns individual, neighbours and communities into more than ideological tools and transforms them into people whose thoughts and ideas have a very real impact on the governance.

We do a lot of community work. So whatever residents want to do we usually have the resources to make happen. They are usually small projects to advocate for early childhood services, some community gardening projects… but that’s just the beginning; it’s just practice. We have created those collaborative structures in TNC. [Toronto Neighbourhood Centres]. Within each neighbourhood there is a hotbed of activity, so to say. We collaborate with other organizations within the same neighbourhood. Outside that we have the advantage of being part of the TNC network. We have that network strength across the city so even if our neighbourhood centre is relatively small to some of the bigger locations downtown, we can harness that power of association. We try to guarantee that kind of power for our residents so that this goes beyond things like neighborhood beautification plans and more towards working towards a systemic advocacy (Perry, Settlement House Worker).

We’re doing the special diet campaign now. It is an important campaign for community residents because of our discussions about social assistance rates and food security. We also have partnerships within the neighbourhood like The Stop and community gardens. So this is a topic of interest in this neighbourhood because it is present. People see it and face it every day. But these issues…it’s just not in this neighbourhood it’s in all of Toronto. The other neighbourhood centres make it easy to work together on these type of campaigns. Especially the ones downtown who are more oriented to street homelessness and other very visible poverty. We use TNC to that advantage as a resource to network. And then beyond that we are supporting the 25 in 5 Campaign and that is a provincial initiative. See? It keeps on building. Residents see the scope …they see the capacity of their participation and that helps people want to be more involved. What we’re trying to do is more than just build a sense of community and people a group of people who are educated and engaged in politics (Conrado, Settlement House Coordinator).

DPNC has access to a dense network of social services, community organizations and political campaigns. DPNC utilizes their organizational presence within TNC and their network influence to help community members achieve their goals. Staff at DPNC are cognizant of the fact that they have to help provide results. Qualities of social capital, like building neighbourhood and community, are present in DPNC’s work, but staff know that to make an impact on poverty, people have to access power.

Of course it starts small. We have to have trust or else people don’t organize, right? [It is] what they like to call “social capital” in a community…. But we also have to make changes. People are smart. If they don’t think we can do anything for them they won’t come back. And that’s what we’re here for- to make things happen for them- give them access to something they wouldn’t have. We have to pull our weight too. We have to help people access power- we have the connections and they have the capacity, you know? It’s just about communities knowing how to be strategic… creative at times. And so we have to work
together or it won’t happen. I don’t know any other neighbourhood organization in Toronto that combines that sort of thing. The social services with the advocacy. And that’s what we’re trying to develop… to do both (Howard, Settlement House Coordinator).

The staff member describes mobilization as a two part process. First, people must gather, get to know one another and talk about the issues that matter to them. Secondly, they have to experience success. Fatigue can set in if people constantly mobilize but never make gains.

DPNC as an organization, and the staff members within it, have to use their connections and their resources to ensure people are not expending their time and energy in vain. Making real gains is part of how people gain confidence to continue to learn, engage and mobilize to take action. DPNC has a role in turning social movement education into collective action, struggles and successes

Community members also learn how to become mobilizers as staff help residents actualize “community will”:

We help some ESL residents and newcomers with their written and spoken English. This program is offered basically because if their literacy skills are higher they can accomplish more things. From a social service standpoint it’s about getting people employable skills. While this is the truth increasing literacy does more than many people know…. I remember one resident… he was very excited to read. Loved to read aloud. He had quite the gift for a way of speaking and, of course, he was a very very nice man. Very nice. He had lived in Toronto for almost ten years but his comprehension was quite low. I guess his kids were the ones who were helping him out with his English and it wasn’t until he was in a group- with us here- that he really came out of his shell. I mean, when he’s with other people, learning the same thing and practicing his speaking he had a great gift for telling stories. When it came to use his English for employability he got together with the other people in the group…. Through social time he found that a lot of them were dealing with poor working conditions and then he hooked up with the Workers’ Action Centre. Became quite active in doing community animation work, activist work and being on the real front lines. This is a success story for sure. He was really a leader for community will. Really one of the people who took his interests and ran with it. (Marie, Settlement House Worker).

In the above instance, this resident was gathered in non-formal education and learned both literacy skills but also, informally, learned about what he enjoyed and what he was good at.

Through reading aloud and speaking with others who faced similar barriers he found comfort in practicing his natural inclination towards public speaking. A safe environment was created where he built interpersonal connections with fellow community members. Those relationships developed into knowing and caring about their concerns about workplace safety and working
conditions. Through these experiences, he emerged as a mobilizer; he approached the Workers’ Action Centre and became active in a cause that was important to him and he used the skills that had built his initial confidence. This cycle of learning, practicing, reflecting and acting transformed the way he interacted in the world and, in turn creates a progressive impact.

The difference between a social service provision standpoint and an advocacy standpoint is also made clear through the above example. Where the staff member describes the literacy program as being about “employability,” the reality is that synergies are created all the time with the right combination of people. People have the chance to become active by gaining skills and learning about their own competencies through relationship building. Individuals become inspired by their own efficacy to work on behalf of the relationships they build within programs. Meeting like minded people in a similar situation, such as a literacy group, became a significant step in actualizing activism.

Community members embody in their practice the skills to mobilize. Through informal learning they learn to read interpersonal situations, community problems and the political climate and become accustom to using dialogical thinking and externalizing political will through an active output. Community members become active campaign participants in their everyday lives and they develop their critical consciousness skills through doing something for and with the community. Their experiences at DPNC transform how they think and reflect upon the world and both DPNC staff and community members engage in the world differently; they act on the world differently. DPNC is currently developing its capacity to develop popular education projects and to help people actualize their inherent skills as community mobilizers. This is a process that will take time and involve a “re-routinization” of the mind and body. An embodied learning is necessary to retrain social workers and residents to work and organize in a way that
supports a culture of organic intellectualism. Collectively and over time, learning, practicing, reflecting and acting will become the progressive action that will transform traditional social service work to social change work.

Conclusion

As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production. (Karl Marx, 1845, *The German Ideology*, quoted in Desfor Edles & Appelrouth, 2009, p 33).

Philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it (Karl Marx 1845, Thesis 11).

Liberation is a praxis: the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it (Paulo Freire, 1970, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, p. 79).

Material deprivation and reducing alienation are enabling circumstances for social movement education and creating for environment to foster a culture of organic intellectualism. In *The German Ideology*, Marx describes how people are, themselves produced; people are a product. People are a produced of what they produce and how they produce it. While Marx is traditionally interpreted through economic determinism to be talking about wage labour, his Humanist interpreters view him as talking about the philosophy of how people work on the world and change it in everyday life. If we work on the world the same, through the same ideology we reproduce it. On the other hand, if we work on the world differently and we if we work to transform our ideologies so we can utilize a different logic for social change, we will transform it. DPNC and settlement workers enable transformative action by giving the community access to material resources to change improve their material circumstances and enable the mobilization of communities of interest to learn and raise consciousness in and through peer learning.
People are what they produce. Through the settlement house model, DPNC staff get to produce more than just social services for the poor. Staff are able to produce dialogue, learning, collective interests and facilitate the production of ideas for social change. Community members are also engaged to “produce” differently. Their employment circumstances become more flexible through the services DPNC provides. Further, community members find opportunities to work on the world differently after they find relief, support and opportunities to learn and engage through their experiences at DPNC. Restructuring work to alter alienating work in human social service SECDO alters the way people build relationships and interact to produce change.

People are how they produce. Relationship building is a strong theme within DPNC’s work. Building relationships with community members is both an enduring quality of settlement work and one that DPNC wants to maintain as they lead in doing transformative SECDO work. In DPNC they build a culture of producing through building relationships and learning. Relationship building builds “community” but it does not stop at the goal of building social capital. DPNC utilizes those relationships to continually mobilize knowledge about what people are experiencing, what issues they are facing and are the venue for building collectives of citizens that want to take action.

Within the settlement house venue, staff members become catalysts by the way they are allowed to work in model DPNC is promoting. DPNC staff are flexible holistic workers that can form spontaneous working groups that address common problems. Staff work together with community members to not only provide acute service provision but extend their involvement within all-round support throughout the lifecycle of a problem. Finally, Staff also engage in learning and education with community members to learn about the people accessing service at
DPNC and to better provide service and help people access networks beyond DPNC. Staff members become more than gatekeepers of services and, rather, become part of a network of people trying to make change.

Community members are given the opportunity to produce the world differently. Service provision gives them access to improve their material lives. Within the same interaction within DPNC they also get access to programs that engage their ability to learn and think critically about poverty and politicized engagement. The combination of improving material circumstances for people and allowing people to engage in learning circles where they connect their real world experiences to socio-political circumstances it allows people to practice organic intellectualism. People are given the opportunity to learn, reflect upon their experiences and become mobilizers within their own communities. Through the settlement house model, DPNC and community members are building a culture of organic intellectualism. Staff practice a different type of community development by providing holistic service provision. They encourage non-formal learning groups and informal interaction that allow people to change the way they interact within the world. DPNC staff and community are transforming the way they practice welfare. They are changing the relationships within service provision so that people can become aware of their agency and change the way they work and produce within the world.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Discussion, Recommendations for Future Research and Conclusion

Introduction

Modern human social service provision has been altered and defined by the neoliberal welfare state. The popularization of SECDOs as being a bastion for human social service provision is problematic when we consider how this subset of SECDOs are created in and through roll-out neoliberal ideology. While the public welfare state is rolled-back by an entrepreneurial neoliberal agenda, SECDOs become the entities that fill-in the gaps. With fewer resources and less access to power, SECDOs find themselves as alienated service providers. SECDOs are constituted by the roll-out neoliberal ideology where responsive poverty alleviation becomes the only solutions to hegemonic relationships of inequity. The role of community development has increasingly become about responding to the experience of poverty through service provision, rather than questioning the systems of power which create poverty and inequality in the first place.

Re-conceptualizing the social economy has the ability to reveal how SECDOs may challenge the roll-out neoliberal welfare state. Through the idea of the transformative social economy, SECDOs may re-organize to accomplish productive anti-poverty work that leads to social transformation rather than social reproduction. The transformative social economy relies on the idea and practice of public governance to democratize power and renegotiate the limits of power. Stressing the transformative social economy is an emancipatory way to reconceptualize traditional practices of CED and social inclusion which offered only reform and “gap-filling” techniques to community development work. With a focus on people’s power to act on the world and change it, the power of governance may trump the symbolic leadership roles of
government. Through individual agency and collective action, SECDOs can give people access to resources and collective inspiration to be the governance.

SECDOs can become transformative when they enable counter-hegemonic action for an anti-poverty agenda. SECDOs address the reality of material deprivation and social exclusion by providing social services and recreational community programs for underserviced communities. Transformative SECDOs take that work and go further to enable social movement education to encourage public governance. Social movement education is the basis for teaching and learning dynamics of power, agency and how to participate to be the governance that creates change. Through the case study of Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre, a settlement house in Toronto, this research demonstrated how the settlement house model, staff and communities are transforming everyday experiences to raise consciousness; engage in mutual interest and collective struggle; and engage within the world to affect change.

8.1 DPNC’s organizational development into SECDOs

The correct method lies in dialogue. The conviction of the oppressed that they must fight in their liberation is not a gift bestowed by the revolutionary leadership, but the result of their own conscientização (Freire, 1970, p.67).

SECDOs are introduced as a model for transformative social change in service provision organizations. SECDOs combine elements of the governance and values of social economy organizations; the grassroots orientation and coherent goal structures of community development organizations; and the elements of popular education and engagement from social movement organizations. All three elements produce a hybrid organization that launches transformative social economy values and organizing from the ground up. By organizing people and producing an environment where people continually question power and realize their own capacity to be an active part of civil city governance, people are changing the world as they re-learn how to act on
it. With social change at the forefront of DPNC’s mission, they demonstrate a new way of combining traditional welfare state service provision and advocacy and grassroots activism to democratize power.

DPNC is working towards realizing social economy values of social investment and democratic governance in and through their work. DPNC’s mission is more than to invest resources in the community but, rather, invest their time towards relationship building, capacity building and creating a foundation for collective agency and action. DPNC follows the settlement house model which embeds the organization as a durable part of the community. DPNC, as an organization and staff, are neighbours who interact with community members. They have reciprocal relationships of care and build trust for the purpose of energizing a sense of agency and collective power. DPNC’s work does not end at service provision but, rather begins at it. DPNC’s community development work transcends social capital building and ignites the social movement teaching and learning that engages people’s right to affect governance.

The model DPNC is working on, however, is still in development. Staff members work collaboratively in flexible teams to work with each other and the community to understand how to better bridge social services and advocacy. More research is required to assess how all settlement houses can develop this model and communicate with one another. The capacity of neighbourhood based hubs of poverty alleviation and anti-poverty action is powerful. DPNC provides a good case study because they are working on their own organization as well as work within a network of spatially-based organizations. Settlement houses are located across Canada and the settlement house model is flourishing as organizations learn the importance of combining social services, advocacy and education. Settlement houses are well-networked amongst common interest groups and other organizations within the social economy.
development industries and social movements. Taking advantage of a network of organizations embedded within communities of people who strive for change is a powerful way to learn and practice collective action and transform structures of governance.

In future research, it is necessary to refine transformative SECDO work and what it looks like through a longitudinal organizational development study. Due to the short research period, the case study and development of DPNC’s work will continue to develop and there will be a need to continue to document it. DPNC is working on their internal ability to track their own organizational changes, which is a result of double-loop learning; governance within DPNC has decided that furthering organizational development is an ongoing process of internal accountability to their own goals for social justice and social change. While interviews with settlement workers were informative, the sample consisting of only paid staff was a limitation to the research. Further work is necessary to engage the standpoint of other participants, especially the people who are engaged with and using settlement services and programs. Engaging a wider sample of participants, such as community members and other participants who are closely networked through organizational or policy connections, will enrich our understanding of transformative SECDO work.

8.2 Fostering a culture of organic intellectualism

One must speak for a struggle for a new culture, that is, for a new moral life that cannot but be intimately connected to a new intuition of life, until it becomes a new way of feeling and seeing reality (Gramsci, 1985, p. 98).

DPNC is developing their organization to foster a culture of organic intellectualism. Organic intellectuals are leaders, mobilizers and active participants in guiding an anti-poverty movement; organic intellectuals are leaders from the community, for the community. However, not all organizations who do poverty alleviation or community development work attempt to
foster organic intellectualism. Social service social economy organizations have non-profit boards that highly structure the ability to do social movement education. Grassroots community development is typically more participatory, however it still does not encourage everyone’s natural capacity for organic intellectualism and, rather, identifies existing leaders in the community. Finally, social movement organizations may have the ability to promote popular education through non-formal mobilizations and informal learning, however they need to be linked back to satellites of social services that will also address the common elements of why people do not participate in activism in the first place, which include material deprivation and social exclusion.

Sustaining a culture of organic intellectualism over time will actualize social change. People become active in governance only through enabling structures. Fostering a culture of organic intellectualism requires addressing material deprivation, social exclusion and then the challenge of collecting and identifying common interests and realities that people want to alter, change and affect. In DPNC, a culture of organic intellectualism is beyond identifying leadership of a few, but rather identifying the consciousness and agency in everyone. Re-negotiating relationships and work in SECDOs creates a new culture that develops emergent ways of feeling and seeing reality.

More research is necessary on popular education in SECDOs, particularly regarding the problem –posing education model which transforms people’s consciousness and increases their sense of efficacy.

Problem-posing education affirms men and women as beings in the process of becoming. In problem-posing education, people develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation (Freire, 1970, p. 83).
The next steps for research are to engage community members and learn how to better develop problem posing education. Experiences from community members can reveal the process that transformative SECDOs need to support.

8.3 Conclusion: Supporting the transformative social economy for anti-poverty


Revolutions are the locomotives of history (Karl Marx, The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850, quoted in Friedrich, 2007, p. 222).

The social economy is often lauded as the sector that will restore social equality and encourage community development through Third sector support. However, this research has argued for a stricter direction of the social economy. Further, the social economy should be understood as a movement and one that promotes a process of transformation and social justice for the disenfranchised and impoverished. Social economy organizations, that serve as “gap-filling” and responsive to poverty (rather than counter to), are deemed constitutive of the roll-out neoliberal welfare state. While filling gaps and poverty alleviation are legitimate actions, social economy actors must ensure that that is the beginning of the social economy movement and, certainly, not the end goal. The transformative social economy is a focus on transforming ideology, practices and re-defining the limits of power to include public governance. To attain public governance, poor and disenfranchised people must be at the centre of governance and at the forefront of concern when accessing and transforming power structures.

The case study of DPNC demonstrated that social economy community development organizations can be on the path to becoming transformative SECDOs. Through social service provision and social movement education, these organizations can reignite citizenship and help community members realize their own power to be the governance that creates change. By
addressing alienation as a large part of how human social services become myopic of anti-poverty and social transformation, DPNC is able to create a culture of organic intellectualism by practising social movement education. By building a culture of organic intellectualism people can connect their issues to the social world; they can “love without illusion” and fight against “becoming disillusioned”. Organic intellectualism reveals oppressive hegemonic ideologies.

Transformative SECDOs are at the forefront of fostering a culture of organic intellectualism. Transformative SECDOs raise people’s consciousness of hegemonic ideologies and work to re-engage groups of people to re-conceptualize how they want to act and how they can act to change their collective circumstances. Once exposed, hegemonic ideologies can be transformed into people’s ideas of how the world should work and what work needs to be done to accomplish social change. Through fostering a culture of organic intellectualism, SECDOs are helping to make disenfranchised people hegemonic. Ideology, or what Gramsci termed “common sense”, can be transformed in the favour of public governance. The bloc created by praxis of consciousness, or learning and action is the process of rolling-out the transformative social economy.
APPENDIX A

Copy of Letter for Administrative Consent

Date February 9, 2009.

From Researcher: Melissa Fong

Dear DPNC Administration,

This letter is to confirm that DPNC has recruited the researcher, Melissa Fong to conduct this project that has been internally identified by DPNC. As per our agreement, I will conduct a program evaluation whereby I will be exploring how Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood Centre (DPNC) can address the root causes of poverty by expanding their capacity to practice systemic advocacy. This letter is also to inform you that I will be using this opportunity to conduct research as a graduate student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) in the Department of Adult Education and Community Development under the supervision of Professor Daniel Schugurensky.

The purpose of this letter is also to provide you with information that you will need to understand what I am doing, and to decide whether or not to give permission for me to conduct my research at your organization. Participation is completely voluntary, and participants will be free to withdraw at any time without consequence, or refuse to answer any questions. You will be given a summary report of my findings and also be informed of any major aspects of the research through ongoing discussion.

The name of this research project is “Anti-poverty aperture: Expanding advocacy for anti-poverty in service provision.” The nature and purpose of the research is to find out how organizations that have operated primarily within a service-provision model, may incorporate greater capacity for advocacy that complements their everyday work. I want to conduct a program evaluation of DPNC and find out how greater capacity for advocacy can be incorporated within the organization.

To accomplish this, I am interviewing 4-8 participants from DPNC. Participants will include people who work at all levels of your organization (i.e. executives, coordinators, and staff in various departments).

What, essentially, I am doing is interviewing people about what type of information is currently collected about users of DPNC's services and the community which it serves. I am interested in assessing what information is formally and informally collected. I am also interested in assisting DPNC in determining what type of information they should be collecting to learn more about the
community they serve and the issues specific of poverty they face. I want to both assist DPNC through this process of incorporating more systemic advocacy as well as document this process as it is an important case study for other organizations who wish to take on a similar ambitious task.

What the participants are doing is providing me with information on what types of information is already collected and how the information is collected. They may also share with me recommendations on what information they wish would be more systematically collected. They may also provide me with information on how best to collect that information in a way that complements their work.

What I am asking from you or your organization is to allow me to conduct this research with DPNC. I am also asking permission to access to any reports or documents, that DPNC has, that will help me profile the Davenport-Perth community and the community which uses DPNC’s services. Additionally, I am requesting any forms that will help me understand the procedures of the organization.

To provide you with further details please find the information on program evaluation below.

What I propose to do is:
- Examine documents
- Interview select participants from whom I have received written informed consent

I will make a copy of any documents that you supply and return the originals to you by December 31, 2009. The raw data will be kept under double lock and key in my office at OISE/UT. Only my supervisor, Professor Daniel Schugurensky and I will have access to it. I will eliminate the raw data collected no later than December 31, 2009. Where interviews are occurring, they will take place at DPNC during the time period from February 9, 2009 to December 31, 2009.

It is understood that there will be no clandestine observation, that all people in the program will know who I am and that this program evaluation is occurring. My purpose is to evaluate the program, not individuals within the program.

In my written observations, pseudonyms will be used and other identifiable information will be eliminated insofar as possible. Should the research be published, you should know that there are limitations to anonymity and confidentiality, which include:

- The public nature of the program evaluation within DPNC
- The specific characteristics of the neighbourhood and the agency which will be a defining feature of the research and cannot be concealed through pseudonyms
- The manner in which interviewees are being sampled (referrals)
- The public and front-line nature of the work at DPNC, that will inhibit the anonymity of individuals
Because anonymity and confidentiality is not guaranteed, I will inform you as well as all those interviewed that no confidential or non-public data should be revealed if they should not want it to be publishable. Additionally, any raw data (documents or audio tapes) will be vetted by participants and any part or all can be withdrawn any time prior to the summary of the report, which all participants will be provided a copy.

While there is no compensation, there are potential benefits to participants and the organization. Executive and coordinators at DPNC will benefit by achieving their self-identified goals of increasing organizational capacity to increase systemic advocacy to address the root causes of poverty. Staff members involved will have the benefit of shaping the process by which they can create better institutions for their community as well as be active in advocacy for the betterment of their workplace and community.

Potential harm to the participants is minimal. No new or potentially harmful information will be given to the participants; all the information will come from their own reflections and perceptions. Potential harm to your organization is minimal. DPNC should keep in mind that your organization is not guaranteed to be anonymous should this research be published. Additionally, any documents revealed or vetted interview transcripts are not confidential.

If you have any questions about your rights as research participants please contact the ethics review office at 416-946-5763 or by email at ethics.review@utoronto.ca. Additionally, if you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact my supervisor Professor Daniel Schugurensky at <contact information>.

Enclosed with this letter is a copy of the letter to participants that I am providing for information purposes. Below, there is a place for you to sign to give administrative consent. If you decide to participate, you should also check one box below to state whether or not you would like your information to be used exclusively for internal research at DPNC or if you also consent to its use for research at OISE/UT. There is also a place to add any stipulations. Should you decide to give your consent, please return one signed and dated copy to me and keep the other for your reference.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melissa Fong
<contact information>
To Be Completed by Administrator Providing Permission

☐ I agree that Melissa Fong may use any information I give to be used for the purposes of DPNC’s internal program evaluation. I do not want the information given to be used for Melissa Fong’s research at OISE/UT.

☐ I agree that Melissa Fong may use any information I give to be used for the purposes of DPNC’s internal program evaluation. I also give consent to the information being used in Melissa Fong’s research at OISE/UT.

I understand what is being asked. I am satisfied with the explanations provide, **I have the authority to give the administrative consent requested**, and am giving it. If I am making any exceptions or stipulations, these are

__________________________________ (Signature)

__________________________________ (Printed Name)

__________________________________ (Date)
APPENDIX B

Copy of recruitment letter

<Recruitment letter for non-DPNC interviews>

Dear <insert name>,

Hi, my name is Melissa Fong. I am a graduate student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am currently conducting research on the disjuncture between service provision and advocacy in anti-poverty work. I am currently looking for volunteers to be participants.

- If referral: I have received your name and email contact from ________________________.

- If identified by criteria: The reason I have contacted you is because you are connected with <insert name of organization> and I believe you may have insight into the struggles into combining service provision and advocacy in anti-poverty work.

The name of this research project is “Anti-poverty aperture: Expanding advocacy for anti-poverty in service provision.”

Participation in this study will take approximately 30-60 minutes of your time in a conversation style dialogue, followed by informal follow up conversations.

Although your participation is voluntary and I cannot offer you incentives to participate, reimbursement for bus tokens and food can be provided.

**Participation is completely voluntary, and, should you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without consequence.**

If you are interested in participating and volunteering your time, please do contact me at <contact information> where further details about participation may be given.

Thank you for your time,

Melissa Fong
<contact information>
APPENDIX C

Interview schedule

1. What is unique about neighbourhood centres, settlement houses?
2. How do you define anti-poverty? (Is it your preferred term?)
3. What type of anti-poverty activities is your organization involved in?
4. How does your organization decide on these activities/services/programs?
5. Broadly or specifically, what is the core activity at your organization? In your opinion-narrow it down to one or two programs or activities.
6. What are the barriers to undertaking anti-poverty work in your organization? What is the role of politics?
7. Describe the different inter-organizational networks (or groups you tend to meet with to do your work).
8. Have your social networks changed since becoming involved in the anti-poverty strategic direction?
9. What spaces or places are most important for anti-poverty education? Organizing?
10. Do you think it is your organization’s role to help transform residents’ thinking about personal problems (i.e. changing their perspective into a more social one)?
11. Be reflective. Do you feel your own practice as a community development worker has changed throughout organizing and education efforts? What is your approach? How have you developed that approach?
12. Describe the most important thing you feel community members learn since becoming involved in your programming.
13. What has been your experience of popular education efforts related to your anti-poverty activities?

Not all questions were asked for each participant. Questions varied to the individual research participant. Questions were created for the initial organizational development research. Additional questions were added to the list and former questions changed as the research progressed. This above reflects a cumulative list.
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