CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Solidarity, organizing and tactics of resistance in the 21st century: social movements and community development praxis in dialogue
Authors	McCrea, Niamh;Meade, Rosie R.;Shaw, Mae
Publication date	2017
Original Citation	McCrea, N., Meade, R.R. and Shaw, M. (2017) 'Solidarity, organizing and tactics of resistance in the 21st century: social movements and community development praxis in dialogue', Community Development Journal, 52(3), pp. 385–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsx029
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1093/cdj/bsx029
Rights	© 2017, Oxford University Press and Community Development Journal . This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in Community Development Journal following peer review. The version of record is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsx029
Download date	2026-11-03 07:35:27
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/16722

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Citation: McCrea, Niamh, Meade, Rosie and Shaw, Mae (2017) 'Solidarity, organizing and tactics of resistance in the 21st Century: social movements and community development praxis in dialogue', *Community Development Journal*, 52(3):385-404

Final Version

Solidarity, organising and tactics of resistance in the 21st Century: social movements and community development praxis in dialogue

Niamh McCrea, Rosie R. Meade and Mae Shaw

Abstract

This article attempts to identify and explore the convergent features of social movements and community development, arguing that they already share a distinctive, if uneasy, alliance around what might be called the politics of democracy. Exploring connections, as well as points of difference, this article suggests that a critical dialogue between the two might, in the longer term, contribute to a positive realignment between social movements and community development groups. In our view, social movement praxis has much to offer community development in reviving and reasserting its more radical potential, by offering untapped opportunities for building community, forging collective identity and imagining political alternatives. Specifically, the article explores why and how protest tactics matter: their political significance and the dilemmas and possibilities they present both for movement participants and community development practitioners. The article, while recognizing the often complex and constraining contexts within which it is deployed, also identifies particular features of community development that may contribute to the building of more grounded and participatory movements. In highlighting the overlapping and progressive commitment of social movements and community development organisations, we recognize the acute challenges involved in building support and forging solidarity among disenfranchised peoples. In the final section, we highlight and explore potential sources of and approaches to solidarity, assessing their relative merits for a more politically engaged community development practice.

Solidarity, organising and tactics of resistance in the 21st Century: social movements and community development praxis in dialogue

Niamh McCrea, Rosie R. Meade and Mae Shaw

Introduction

The purpose of this Special Issue is to capture the tactical choices, framing devices and organisational forms of a range of communities and movements that are engaged in dissenting politics at the current historical juncture. Typically, academic analyses of such activism are located within the field of social movement studies rather than in mainstream community development literature, with some notable exceptions (e.g. Popple and Shaw, 1997). Even then, as Cox and Flesher Fominaya (2013) note, the academic field of social movement studies does not fully capture the diversity of motivations, theories, ideas, practices, emotions and ontologies percolating in and around social movements: for example, it disproportionately privileges work from the global north and from Anglophone contexts (MacSheoin, 2016). This article is an attempt to identify and explore the convergent features of social movements and community development and to argue that a dialogue between these fields of praxis would be mutually productive. While this is a challenge for both theory and practice, we hope that it may be helpful in signalling and asserting new forms of solidarity and political possibility at a time when, as Mishra (2016, p. n.p.) argues, 'well-worn pairs of rhetorical opposites, often corresponding to the bitter divisions in our societies, [have] once again been put to work'. As authors who are located in Ireland and Scotland, we acknowledge that the following reflections are largely informed by our own distinctive political and social contexts, but we hope that they reflect the concerns, frustrations and aspirations of the CDJ's readership more generally.

The fields of community development and social movements already share a distinctive, though somewhat uneasy, alliance around what might be called *the politics of democracy*. Both reflect on-going efforts by people across the globe to re-shape their economic, social, cultural and political contexts; their goals, values and practices often transgress the norms and conventions of organisation, representation and communication associated with liberal-democracy and institutionalised politics (Alvarez *et al*., 1998); ideologically, tactically and strategically, they face common dilemmas which illuminate the inherent complexity of

forging and sustaining the kinds of *solidaristic politics* to which they are both (at least nominally) committed. Exploring connections, as well as points of difference, and reflecting upon the politics of solidarity more generally, this article suggests that a critical dialogue between the two might, in the longer term, contribute to a positive realignment between social movements and community development groups. In particular, we hope that the following reflections on the organisational politics and claims-making of 21st century movements may resonate with practitioners who are grappling with the demoralising effects of managerialist rationalities on their work or who are seeking counter hegemonic ways of framing and expressing collective identity. Contemporary global conditions and their troubling local consequences may in any case necessitate a reclamation and reinvigoration of the transformational potential of community development if it is not to become largely irrelevant, or even injurious, to the experience of marginalised groups and individuals (Meade, Shaw and Banks, 2015).

Community development, social movements and the politics of democracy

Historically, community development can be seen to be the product of two sets of forces and interests: 'pressure from below, which stems broadly from democratic aspiration, the other from above, reflecting the changing needs of the state and broader political interests' (Cook and Shaw, 1996, p. 1). As Newman and Clarke (2016, p. 36) remind us, community development 'is not a singular set of ideas and practices, but has been aligned to very different political projects.' Across time and place, community development has signified and spoken to divergent interests, and it continues to do so today. Similarly, we cannot assume that all social movements are well-springs of authenticity or progressive politics: indeed, some actively seek to reverse processes of democratisation, redistribution, women's liberation and inter-culturalism. Therefore, even when we are sympathetic to their motivations, we should recognise that movements – like the best-intentioned community development initiatives – may 'fail' or flounder and we must be attentive to how their 'practices' may 'contradict their collective values and goals' (Chollett, 2011, p. 296).

In their most progressive forms, however, community development processes and social movements confront our preconceptions about where and how politics should be conducted, about who does politics, and about what its substance might be. They show that collective organising by ordinary people operates at multiple geographical and political scales. The democratic claims, interests and identities that are validated by large or high profile social movements may inspire or reflect new forms of community building and collective endeavour

at the local level. In other words, micro-level engagements can be provoked and emboldened by the imaginaries, organisation and tactics of macro level movements, adding breadth and range to their repertoire, whilst solid community bases and organizing strategies add depth and credibility to movements that are ostensibly challenging globalised economic forces or making demands of the nation state. For example, Voss and Williams (2012) argue that the organizing work of movements such as *Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra* (MST) in Brazil or the *Justice for Janitors* campaigns in the USA has been critical in building local capacity and deepening community participation within those movements, while also generating new and vibrant democratic spaces beyond the normal channels of decision making. These vital interconnections have also stimulated new forms of community/union affiliation in many places (Mayo *et al.*, 2016).

There are synergies too in how community development and social movements can challenge us to reimagine democratic self-government, participatory decision making or even autonomy. Together, they have in various ways contested and posed alternatives to 'the institutional regime of truth production that has defined the era of development' (Escobar, 1992, p. 28), alerting us to the possible limits of 'neutral' expert or professional knowledge and to the environmental and social contradictions generated by advanced capitalism (Klein, 2015). In so doing, they have amplified the voices and interests of subordinated social groups, while eliciting concrete improvements in people's lives through legislative change, policy delivery and political reform (Hearne and Kenna, 2014). At their best, these are mutually reinforcing processes.

Community development groups and social movements have also left their distinctive marks on everyday discourses, practices and forms of interaction (Dominelli, 1995). Their praxis is essentially 'cultural' in the sense that it shapes and is shaped by 'ordinary' life and 'common meanings' (Williams, 1989, p. 4) but equally in the sense that it may mobilise cultural and artistic practices, such as music or song, in the name of communication and awareness raising (Eyerman and Jamison, 1998; Bisset, 2015). Community and movement mobilisations could be said to embody 'the politics of transforming one's more immediate community and one's self' (Meyer, 2012, p. 399) as they reverse processes of cultural misrecognition or exclusion in order to affirm 'diverse' ways of living and being (Cameron, 2007). And, while rejecting any false opposition between cultural and materialist politics (Moran, 2015), we also contend that the collective action of ordinary people, whether categorised as community development or social movement activity, can reveal and powerfully contest various manifestations of economic inequality, expropriation and exploitation.

Community development in neoliberal times: challenges for democracy, solidarity and dissent

In spite of the history, and enduring presence, of oppositional politics and innovative social critique within community development, we must also acknowledge the compromised, compromising, and increasingly inhospitable environments within which much contemporary practice operates. In fact, it could be argued that the economic and political contexts within which community work is now practised point to diminishing prospects for collective mobilisation, for dissenting politics, and for 'acting in solidarity' (as distinct from 'acting in unison'). As Kolers (2012 p. 368) argues, when 'acting in unison', individuals come together to collectively pursue some ends or means they may happen to share, or have been persuaded to believe they share, based on hegemonic norms. The qualitative difference in *choosing to act in solidarity* is that, in the process, individual interests are necessarily surrendered to the interests of the collective. This presupposes that *acting in solidarity* is dependent upon, or at least profoundly linked with, sustained forms of community building which enable people to learn about and alongside each other and to form human bonds of mutual care and concern. This aspiration clearly has significant implications for the role of the community development practitioner, speaking as it does to a conception of practice which demands collective spaces wherein to engage with communities around their own, often contradictory or negative, experiences of policy rather than constructing those communities as tools or targets of policy delivery.

Arguably, over recent decades, a number of developments have weakened the capacity of community organisations to contribute to such solidarity-building and to a broader collective project of change. Communities have been centrally implicated in the widely noted shift from 'government to governance', whereby 'governing takes place through markets, networks or processes of collaboration among a plurality of agents and agencies' (Newman and Clarke, 2009, p. 46). The 'turn to community' by states, development NGOs (Mueller-Hirth, 2012), global institutions like the World Bank (Gaynor, 2016), and philanthropy (Salamon, 2014), is not a function of neoliberalism alone. The rise of governmental forms such as partnership arrangements 'emerge out of multiple politicized processes' (Larner and Butler, 2005, p. 82), reflecting complex and even contradictory claims and expectations, and generating outcomes that vary in their democratic potential and social effects. Such processes have been influenced by discourses of participatory democracy, by demands for recognition by subordinated groups, by pre-existing communitarian or corporatist logics within the state, and by long-standing

integrationist tendencies among community organisations. Nonetheless governance has, as Brown (2015, p. 122) observes, 'become neoliberalism's primary administrative form'.

While community-based movements have had some successes in challenging and changing policy around welfare, such strategies have become compromised in contexts where self-help and equality have become conflated in a bid to reduce budgets by shifting responsibility downwards (Berner and Phillips, 2005). In the development programmes rolled out under the so-called Post Washington Consensus, for example, it is argued that the mobilisation of community has served as a compensatory mechanism for the social devastation caused by neoliberalised structural readjustment (Gaynor, 2016). Moreover, as community organisations become increasingly tasked with delivering state-defined services, and as state, NGO, and philanthropic funding becomes increasingly hitched to performance criteria, principles of participation and community self-determination have been articulated with, or displaced by, labour-market activation measures and managerialist imperatives (McGrath, 2016; Mueller-Hirth, 2012).

By setting parameters on the goals and scope of democratic participation, these trends risk reducing community development to technocratic, problem-solving approaches which bracket off 'politics, conflict, and deliberation about common values or ends' (Brown, 2015, p. 127). In effect, such funding relationships have tended to prioritise a skills base among community workers and activists that reflects 'their roles as employers and service providers' (Crowley, 2013, p. 154), in turn diminishing and marginalising the disposition and skills required to mobilise communities against policies which adversely affect them. For some, the broad shift from 'government to governance' has granted a status for community development which is welcome, indeed overdue, by creating political opportunities for civil society organisations to participate in policy formulation in local, national and supranational institutions, advancing them 'from being suspicious outsiders to government to being frequently welcomed at negotiating tables in institutional settings' (Lang, 2013, p. 71). However, as Crowley (2013, p. 154) notes, the formalisation and institutionalisation of community development organisations into 'a policy-focused lobby' potentially signals the loss of a key source of their power, namely the 'ability to articulate accurately the concerns of disadvantaged communities and to mobilize local organizations behind their campaigns and policy demands'. This shift has also, he contends, lessened accountability to communities and created an agenda defined by the priorities of policy rather than by the actual experiences of communities. The situation he describes is one where community development organisations,

whether operating nationally or locally, have ceased to deploy more conflictual tactics and strategies as they abandon protest in favour of advocacy.

In light of this highly ambivalent context, we turn to a consideration of why tactics of protest and dissent matter, the political significance they have and the dilemmas they pose. In our view, social movement praxis has much to offer community development in reviving and reasserting its more radical potential, by offering untapped opportunities for building community, forging collective identity and imagining political alternatives.

Taking protest tactics seriously

Protest tactics should be taken seriously because they direct our attention to what people can do, what they are prepared to do and what they think matters. These are not secondary considerations, but are central to addressing the classic dynamic between means and ends. The concept of 'repertoire of contention', developed by Charles Tilly to account for the range of possible means through which movements make 'claims of different kinds on different individuals and groups' (1986, p. 4) hints at the existence of patterns in the deployment of tactics by social movements and at how they are informed by particular logics (Della Porta and Diani, 1999). By extension, community development must negotiate logics associated both with strategic engagement in invited spaces of policy, and those spaces which are created or demanded in pursuit of alternative political expression. This may reconfigure the 'repertoire of contention' available to practitioners in significant ways. Different activist cultures and movement traditions may also need to be negotiated. For example, while recourse to demonstrations, blockades or the carnivalesque are regularly, or even ritually, deployed by social movements, they may be considered suspiciously novel, inappropriate or even counter-productive within mainstream community development practice. At the same time, the opportunity to subvert social norms and to ridicule the powerful can, if introduced skilfully and sensitively, create a laboratory of possibility for those who have become jaded and disillusioned by the limitations of bureaucratic community engagement strategies.

Tactics are crucial to a group or movement's effective communication with itself and its membership *and* to its communication with the wider publics that it seeks to influence. Navigating these divergent responsibilities may beget some sacrifices: political nuance may be ironed out in the interests of broader appeal; reflexivity and self-criticism may be side-lined in the name of rapid responsiveness; internal diversity and conflict may be trivialised to ensure coherence; and the character of the membership may be respectibilised in pursuit of credibility.

Such dilemmas resonate with the competing imperatives and experiences of many community development organisations where there may be perceived trade-offs between the integrity of processes and the delivery of outcomes, or between the adoption of more consensual and more oppositional styles of engagement (Ife, 2013). Like social movements, community development must concern itself with both long and short-term objectives; with process and outcome; with purpose and practice. Drawing on the kind of democratic organising principles and methods associated with contemporary social movements may, in addition, act to confront ritualistic organisational practices of community development, infusing collective engagement with renewed spirit and motivation. In turn, the strategic work of reconnecting horizontal democratic processes with vertical structures of power may be strengthened by increased confidence and commitment (Shaw and Crowther, 2013).

As noted above, social movements are simultaneously concerned with the development of long-term political strategies and with the more immediate business of identifying effective protest tactics (Johnston, 2015). Protest actions are not just the outcrops of 'strategic decision-making' but are informed by members' 'ideological visions', are 'congruent with their collective identities, and embody the cultural schemas that provide meanings, motives and templates for actions' (Taylor and Van Dyke, 2007, p. 277). Movements may consciously seek to align tactics with their longer-term aspirations, regarding them as manifestations of pre-figurative politics, the enactment of egalitarian relationships in the here and now. For example, ontological commitments to non-violence or the erasure of hierarchy may ensure that some tactics or forms of tactical decision-making are consciously privileged over others. Alternatively, and additionally, movements' decision making around tactics may be influenced by pragmatism, local or cultural context, history, timing, available resources, risks and opportunities (Gamson, 1992; Taylor and Van Dyke, 2007). These variables are equally relevant in the context of community development.

Imogen Tyler (2013, p. 213) observes that 'for disenfranchised populations' there are recurring 'critical and ethical questions' about 'what kinds of protest and protestors can be seen and heard' as well as 'what kinds of resistance are imagined as possible'. As in the context of community development, internal value conflicts, power differentials and intra-group hostilities complicate social movements' deliberative processes. Protest actions that attempt to bear witness to the passion, conviction, sense of purpose or urgency felt by movement participants may disturb and alienate those outside the movement's familiar habitus (Chatterton, 2006). When protest either threatens or climaxes in violent confrontations or when it significantly discommodes business as usual, movements may be demonised by media, political opponents and

unsympathetic onlookers (Meade, 2008). Spectacular tactics may invite publicity, and the prospect of a heightened public awareness of the movement's presence and aspirations, but such publicity also runs the risk of stereotypical, partial and counterproductive media representations that offend the sensibilities of potential allies. Alternatively, attempts to keep protest fluffy (i.e. non-violent), good-humoured and non-threatening may be experienced by some movement participants as a form of self-censorship or deference to prevailing constructions of civility and good citizenship.

To outsiders, and in some cases insiders, protest might appear as (empty) symbolism, as a prelude to the 'real' business of negotiation, partnership and compromise. Protest tactics might be regarded as the reflex-responses of those who are, by definition, *outsiders* and thus as a throwback to a time when poor communities were less recognised, less funded and less embedded in public policy – a retrograde step in the evolution of community development as a professional practice. Against that, we would argue that protest, particularly mass protest, offers a more muscular response to those versions of community development which have become sclerotic or self-serving. Writing in 1968, John Berger described the mass demonstration as an 'assembly which challenges what is given by the mere fact of its coming together' and therefore as a 'rehearsal[s] of revolutionary awareness';

> [They] interrupt the regular life of the streets they march through or of the open spaces they fill. They cut off these areas, and, not yet having the power to occupy them permanently, they transform them into a temporary stage on which they dramatise the power they still lack (Berger, 1968 p. n.p.).

Direct action can be regarded as a 'rehearsal', in the sense that protesters deliberately transgress social, political or legal conventions in preparation for and in performance of future contestations of power and authority. Ostensibly, Berger (1968) observes, demonstrations are congregations of people who serve as a barometer of public opinion, which may explain why authorities tend to talk down the numbers in attendance. However, the importance of demonstrations for protesters themselves at least partly resides in what they bring into being and sustain in the here and now of protest: collective forms of protest give material substance and physical embodiment to what was in effect, until that very moment an 'abstraction' (Berger, 1968, p. n.p.). Ideas like class, community or collectivity are rendered patently tangible. Furthermore, the psychic and emotional power of mass action, particularly for first-time participants, should not be under-estimated. Crucially, people's sense of collective identity and possibility is forged *through*, and not only before or after, protest is done. Based on their

experiences of taking over or taking back public space, demonstrators are also, to use the parlance of community development, *empowered* to imagine alternative futures which they may co-create:

> The demonstrators' view of the city surrounding their stage also changes. By demonstrating, they manifest a greater freedom and independence – a greater creativity, even although the product is only symbolic – than they can ever achieve individually or collectively when pursuing their regular lives. In their regular pursuits they only modify circumstances; by demonstrating they symbolically oppose their very existence to circumstances. (Berger, 1986, p. n.p.)

It is by extending the democratic imaginary in such ways that social movements might offer vital inspiration to community development practices which may have become institutionalised or dull.

We want to emphasise that, no more than ownership of community development can be ceded to professionals or policy experts, protest or activism cannot be abandoned to a cadre of specialists. Social movement related activism and protest tactics may demand significant investments of courage, risk-taking and fortitude, particularly when confrontations with police, military or other repressive forces are likely. We appreciate that this may, ironically, result in an increased sense of social distance between 'real activists' and publics. Consequently, reflexive movement participants and writers (Andrew X , 1999/2009; Bobel, 2007; Chatterton, 2006) have warned against reifying an 'activist identity', which is embodied by a specialised class of social movement personnel who make key decisions and are at the frontline of movement activities. This may cause the (unwitting) imposition of a 'perfect standard' of activist conduct in terms of commitment, skill and dedication (Bobel, 2007). Against such a standard, we contend that activism is something everyone can do (see Andrew X, 1999/2009, Bobel, 2007).

The question is to what extent can mainstream community development that is increasingly filtered through individualised encounters with 'clients', ritualised engagements with 'community representatives', or the statistics and demographics of quarterly returns, create moments of political possibility such as those described by Berger (1968)? Or indeed are there any features that are specific to community development practice which might support the development of community-based movements? And (how) is it possible to transcend the reified categories of 'activist', 'professional', 'community' and 'movement' as we practise collective action? In her work on labour organising, McAlevey (2016, pp.27-29) usefully distinguishes between, 'mobilizing' among people already within activist networks, on the one hand, and deeper forms of 'organizing', which place 'the agency for success with a continually

expanding base of ordinary people … who don't consider themselves activists at all', on the other. She argues that the most successful and transformational union campaigns are those whose organising methods are 'deeply embedded in, and reliant on, an understanding of workers in relation to the communities in which they live.' Organising which strategically and systematically marshals workers' community networks, and which strives to 'merge workplace and non-workplace issues', she argues, has mounted the most effective push back against corporate power, securing real and lasting gains. This approach echoes a longstanding though somewhat muffled debate within community development about the appropriate relationship between pedagogical approach and political purpose. For example, an 'activist' strategy which targets 'those already active in their community around social and/or political issues' has historically been advocated by some as a means of accelerating and embedding an explicitly political approach to community development; whilst for others a broader 'network model' seeks to engage with the 'whole community' in order to create spaces in which 'raw' experience can be collectivised and politicised (Shaw and Crowther, 2013). In addition, there is a largely-forgotten, but once influential, historical trace of collaboration between trade unions and community development organisations in support of common interests which is gaining renewed interest (Mayo *et al*., 2016).

As a relationally defined practice, community workers traverse the space between people's intimate and 'private' concerns and the public enactment of community politics. Moreover, and despite their reconfiguration through various forms of performativity and managerialism, community development organisations remain key resources in and for communities. This sustained and deep presence means that community workers continue to carry a legitimacy within poor communities that 'activists' seldom command. Arguably, therefore, the context in which community development takes place – its very *embeddedness* within communities – offers unique potential for forms of 'deep organising' which move beyond invited spaces of participation or officially sanctioned tactics towards a more strategic and effective engagement with the politics of solidarity.

Building solidarity: sources, approaches and challenges

In highlighting the overlapping and progressive commitment of social movements and community development organisations, and in our celebration of the inherent rewards of protest and dissent, we should not underestimate the difficulties involved in building support and forging solidarity among disenfranchised peoples. Thinking about solidarity as an active social

and political process raises critical questions for community development and social movements about the politics of 'representational power': who speaks and who is silenced; what are defined as legitimate and illegitimate sources of solidarity; which collectivities are recognised and which are unknown or excluded; and what is the nature of agency for those involved? These questions have particular resonance for the politics of 'community', which can famously be deployed as easily to reinforce unequal existing relations of power as to promote solidarity in challenging inequality (Shaw, 2008). Arguably, these on-going discursive and political tensions over which struggles really count have generated a more diffuse and variegated conception of solidarity. Whilst this might be seen as an inevitable, even healthy, reflection of the current state of contentious politics, it leaves the concept of solidarity vulnerable to appropriation whereby, like community, it becomes instrumentalised; as likely to reconcile as to challenge incommensurable relationships of power. In this section, we turn to consideration of potential *sources* of and *approaches* to solidarity and assess their relative merits for a more politically engaged community development practice.

In considering solidarity as a political value, attention is generally directed to the zones and hierarchies of inclusion and exclusion it implies. As Kip (2016) argues, the concept of solidarity assumes 'shared opposition to a common, excluded enemy to whom solidarity cannot be extended'. This process of naming the enemy has been central to the success of those totemic struggles memorialized in various parts of the world (Von Kotze and Walters, 2017), and in myriad local and domestic contexts. However, there is now a palpable sense of anxiety, not to say disagreement, about who or what is the common enemy and who might (or should) be excluded from solidarity's sheltering embrace. For example, as we write, the fall-out from the Brexit vote in the UK and the election to the US Presidency of Donald Trump continues apace. These events and allied political developments, such as the resurgence of far-right politics across Europe, and internecine struggles in diverse places, point to a fracturing of solidarity between citizens, particularly in regard to shared norms and values. They suggest that the grievances of many of those disadvantaged by neoliberal restructuring have not been channelled in egalitarian directions. Rather, they have been captured by a pseudo anti-elitism that is 'emptied … of real class politics' (Parenti, 2016, p. n.p.) and which fosters and exploits racial, religious and other resentments. In addition, at both local and global levels 'we live in a world of intensified encounters with difference' through 'displacement, movement and violence' (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2012, p. 42) and these give rise both to socially divisive forms of solidarity and to those based on humane support and succour. In this febrile and disturbing atmosphere, the appeal to diverse meanings of solidarity can be seen to express

profound existential crises as to who the 'real' enemy is, even as solidarity becomes itself an existential necessity if unaccountable sources of power are to be exposed, named and challenged.

In reviewing the broad sociological literature on solidarity, Oosterlynck et al (2016) identity four separate, but not mutually exclusive, *sources* of solidarity, a typology that we find helpful in thinking about the contemporary politics of solidarity and democratic engagement.

Interdependence (see Oosterlynck *et al*., 2016, p. 766) is not simply a statement of the obvious – that we are in a profound sense 'all in it together', as is clear from the most cursory analysis of the catastrophic effects of climate change (Klein, 2015) – but also a statement of intent which is common to both community development and social movement aspirations. Solidarity here derives not only from objective self-interest, but also from the active building of trust in other humans with whom we are existentially interdependent. This raises critical questions about who constitutes such 'others', and how these discriminations can come to constitute 'otherness' in ways that can also be unjust or socially divisive, as disability activists in particular have taught us (Oliver, 1996). In particular, it raises questions for how we enact critical agency within globalised structural relations of power that increasingly enforce competitive individualism and commodified forms of interdependence, the consequences of which are now threatening those citizenship rights won over time through sustained social and political struggle (see Lynch *et al.*, 2009).

Shared norms and values suggests a more communitarian conception of solidarity, 'grounded in notions of reciprocity, shared beliefs, common values, joint practices and collective histories' (Oosterlynck *et al*., 2016, p. 766). This largely Durkheimian version has informed both support for welfare states (where solidarity is notionally and practically expressed through universalism) and the anti-statism of many welfare societies, which integrate the free market with a theory of social solidarity based on hierarchy and voluntarism (Beresford, 2016). We would argue that attention should be given to how hegemonic norms and values are formed, circulated and internalised, thus leaving many people isolated and discontented, but still alienated from potential sources of solidarity (Moran, 2015). Such a critical engagement with the presumption of shared norms and values is fertile territory for a form of community development with a social movement consciousness that seeks to make power visible and thereby negotiable.

Struggle emerges chiefly from Marxian and Weberian traditions, and combines both instrumental and normative aspects '[forging] the meeting of shared objective interests with common values of comradeship that are nurtured in the process' (Oosterlynck *et al*., 2016, p.

768) – or 'the movement' – so that symbolic identification with 'the struggle' often remains, even when objective conditions alter. Whilst deep identification of this kind has unarguably been decisive in maintaining an egalitarian imaginary in desperate contexts of disenfranchisement, dispossession or abuse, for those who are less familiar or do not identify with this traditional notion of 'the struggle', such unconditional allegiance can be experienced as outdated or even exclusionary. Negotiating 'the tension between unity and difference' is a key dynamic for newer generations of activists, particularly in contexts where once-heroic movements may have become compromised by the realities of political power (Cooper and Luckett, 2017; Geddes, 2016).

Encounter refers to 'the more contingent forms of human action, conscious or unconscious, that bind people together' (Oosterlynck *et al*., 2016, p. 768) and is particularly productive ground for enacting dialogue between community development and social movements. The possibilities for solidarity here are highly dependent on the conditions that enable or impede collective identification in the moment of encounter. For example, a social welfare system in which diversity is supported as a public good, itself often a positive outcome of social movement struggles past and present, facilitates what Phillips (1998) calls a 'politics of presence' through which encounter with 'the other' can potentially expand, complement or challenge existing sources of solidarity. Similarly, legislation which 'promotes' social inclusion, however limited in scope, can create the conditions in which 'difference' is mutually encountered – on the bus, in the park, in the workplace – thereby potentially expanding the community of equals in mundane but authentic ways. Alternatively, a politics of absence made visible by social movement arguments and tactics can create a narrative appeal which generates wider support and, in the process, reframe welfare subjects as social and political agents (Cameron, 2007). As Cooper and Luckett (2017, p. 16) show from their work in South Africa, 'encounters of solidarity entail acts of trust, risking one's future and well-being with strangers, as well as tensions between unity and difference, universalism and particularism'. The very process of collectively negotiating these tensions can in itself strengthen the solidaristic potential of such encounters if handled with skill, respect and sensitivity. The creative dialectic between 'policy' and 'politics' intrinsic to community development can provide a significant space for such a process of negotiation.

As already established, the tactics or repertoires of action chosen by movements and community development groups are critical in advocating, amplifying, enacting and (potentially) animating the politics of solidarity. To this we can add the insights of Gaztambide-Fernandez (2012), who usefully identifies three *approaches* to solidarity which may also be

useful in challenging and enlivening contemporary community development practice, and it is to these that we now turn.

A commitment to *relational solidarity* underscores a deliberative and purposeful commitment to interdependence and reciprocity which resonates with the moral orientations of both community development and social movements, in theory at least. This involves an understanding that 'individual subjects do not *enter* into relationships, but rather subjects are *made in* and through relationships' (Gaztimbide-Fernandez, 2012, p. 52). To echo John Berger (1968) solidarity is made by acting in solidarity. This has implications for community development in creating the 'conditions of possibility' that both stimulate challenging encounters, and offer convivial spaces for making relationships, building collective support, common identity and solidarity.

Transitive solidarity (Gaztimbide-Fernandez, 2012, p. 54-56) is about taking sides *with*, alongside, in empathetic and respectful ways. This may pose a particular challenge for practitioners who are constrained by their conditions of employment; who may even be expected to 'deliver' instrumental versions of solidarity as a proxy for addressing the real sources of inequality. The capacity to practise a strategic politics of translation between policy and politics could be decisive for practitioners to 'hear and amplify those voices speaking to the moment, and to deep concerns and dissatisfactions' (Shaw, 2017 forthcoming). Such strategic spaces are also vital for protecting the autonomy of local groups to take sides in their own interests, in situations where practitioners may be professionally constrained or compromised.

The notion of *creative solidarity* suggests both process and outcome. To express oneself creatively with others is intrinsically solidaristic because it demands both collective imagination and discipline. At the same time, outcomes cannot be pre-determined precisely because there is always a transcendent dimension which 'might rearrange the symbolic content of human exchanges' in unforeseen and astonishing ways (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2012, p. 56). Creative solidarity requires a view of culture as unsettled, a site of action, exchange and contention, and it speaks to a view of praxis, for both community development and social movements, that is concerned with working together to unleash our own and each other's creative potential.

Conclusion

Together, these sources of and approaches to solidarity offer a framework for thinking about the relationship between solidarity, organising and tactics of resistance in the twenty first

century. However, given the ambivalent history and contested nature of community development, we would suggest that a fourth approach to solidarity will be required if opportunities to pursue the first three (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2012) are to be realised in any significant way. We would argue that a sense of *reflexive solidarity* – to always be prepared to see community development and social movement activity as potentially part of the problem, as much as part of the solution, for democratic life – is necessary to place creative and constructive doubt at the centre of processes of collective action. This orientation would ensure that ongoing personal and political critique forms part of collective action's ontological basis. Apart from anything else, reflexivity may help to resist bogus claims about the 'medicinal properties' of community development, or the populist hype of social movement success, whilst under-delivering on genuine democratic engagement. Creating and retaining a critical distance, even from movements and organisations to which we are committed, is a pre-requisite for expanding the potential for democratic and solidaristic practice whilst limiting its negative potential; for drawing on and nurturing the capacity for solidarity in hard times.

An openness to realigning with social movements in new and interesting ways could reclaim, for a new generation, an approach to community development which would meaningfully reconfigure the parameters of professional and practitioner agency for a 21st century context. We are convinced that, because the praxis of community development *and* social movements ultimately reflects enduring efforts by marginalised people across the world to understand, analyse, challenge and change disempowering and demeaning conditions, there is much to be gained from a deeper and more sustained dialogue between them.

References

Alvarez, S., Dagnino, E., and Escobar, A. (1998) The cultural and the political in Latin American social movements, in S. Alvarez, E. Dagnino, E. and A. Escobar, eds, *Culture of Politics, Politics of Cultures*, Boulder, Westview Press, pp. 1-32.

Andrew X (1999/2009) *Give up Activism*, accessed at: https://www.scribd.com/document/93823339/Andrew-X-Give-Up-Activism-Letter (27 September 2016).

Berger, J. (1968) The nature of mass demonstrations, *New Society*, 23 May, reprinted in *International Socialis*m, **34** (Autumn), accessed at:

https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/isj/1968/no034/berger.htm (12 January 2017).

Berner, E. and Phillips, B. (2005) Left to their own devices? Community self-help between alternative development and neo-liberalism, *Community Development Journal*, **40** (1), 17– 29.

Bisset, J. (2015) Defiance and hope: austerity and the community sector in the Republic of Ireland, in C. Coulter and A. Nagle, eds, *Ireland under Austerity: Neoliberal Crisis, Neoliberal Solutions,* Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp. 171-191.

Bobel, C. (2007) 'I'm not an activist, though I've done a lot of it': Doing activism, being activist and the 'perfect standard' in a contemporary movement, *Social Movement Studies*, **6** (2), 147-159.

Cameron, C. (2007) Whose problem? Disability narratives and available identities, *Community Development Journal*, **42** (4), 501-511.

Chatterton, P. (2006) 'Give up activism' and change the world in unknown ways. Or, learning to walk with others on uncommon ground, *Antipode*, **38** (2), 259-282.

Chollett, D (2011) 'Like an ox yoke': challenging the intrinsic virtuousness of a grassroots social movement', *Critique of Anthropology*, **31** (4), 293–311.

Cooke, I and Shaw, M (1996) *Radical Community Work: Perspectives from Practice in Scotland*, Moray House Publications, Edinburgh.

Cooper, L. and Luckett, T. (2017) Past and present intersections. Legacies of popular education in the 1970s and 1980s, in A. von Kotze and S. Walters, eds, *Forging Solidarity. Popular Education at Work*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei, pp. 15-26.

Cox, L. and Flesher Fominaya, C. (2013) European social movements and social theory: a richer narrative? in C. Flesher Fominaya and L. Cox, eds, *Understanding European Movements: New Social Movements, Global Justice Struggles, Anti-austerity Protest*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 7-29.

Crowley, N. (2013) Lost in austerity: rethinking the community sector, *Community Development Journal*, **48** (1), 151-157.

Della Porta, D. and Diani, M (1999) *Social Movements: An Introduction*, Wiley, Oxford.

Dominelli, L. (1995) Women in the community: feminist principles and organising in community work, *Community Development Journal,* **30** (2), 133-143.

Escobar, A. (1992) Imagining a Post-Development era? Critical thought, development and social movements, *Social Text*, **31/32**, 20-56.

Eyerman, R. and Jamison, A. (1998) *Music and Social Movements,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gamson, W. (1992) The social psychology of collective action, in A.D. Morris and C. McClurg Mueller, eds, *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, Yale University Press, New Haven, pp. 53-76.

Gaynor, N. (2016) The politics of democracy and the global institutions: lessons and challenges for community development, in R.R. Meade, M. Shaw and S. Banks, eds, *Politics, Power and Community Development*, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 179-198.

Gaztambide-Fernandez, R.A. (2012) Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity, *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* **1** (1), 41-67.

Geddes, M. (2016) What happens when community organisers move into government? Recent experience in Bolivia, in M. Shaw and M. Mayo, eds, *Class, Inequality and Community Development*, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 121-136.

Hearne, R. and Kenna, P. (2014) Using the human rights based approach to tackle housing deprivation in an Irish urban housing estate, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 6 (1), 1-25.

Ife, J. (2013) *Community Development in an Uncertain World*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Klandermans, B. (2007) The demand and supply of participation: social-psychological correlates of participation in social movements, in DA. Snow, SA. Sould and H. Krieisi, eds, *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements,* Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 360-379

Klein, N. (2015) *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*, Simon & Schuster, London.

Kolers, A.H. (2012) Dynamics of solidarity, *Journal of Political Philosophy* **20** (4), 365-383.

Lang, S. (2013) *NGOs, Civil Society and the Public Sphere,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Larner, W. and Butler, M. (2005) Governmentalities of local partnerships: the rise of a 'partnering state' in New Zealand, *Studies in Political Economy,* 75 (Spring), 79-101.

Lynch, K., Baker, J., Lyons, M., Feeley, M., Hanlon, N., O'Brien, M., Walsh, J. and Cantillon, S. (2009) *Affective Equality: Love, Care and Injustice,* Palgrave Macmillan, London.

MacSheoin, T. (2016) The world according to social movement journals: a preliminary mapping, *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements*, **8** (1), 181-204.

Mayo, M., Tucker, P and Danaher, M. (2016) Community unionism: looking backwards, looking forwards, in M. Shaw and M. Mayo, eds, *Class, Inequality and Community Development*, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 235-250.

McAlevey, J. (2016) *No Shortcuts: Organizing for Power in the New Gilded Age,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

McGrath, B. (2016) Reflecting on 'evidence' and documentation devices in 'translating' community intervention, *Community Development Journal,* **51** (2), 179-174.

Meade, R.R., Shaw, M., Banks, S. (2016) Politics, power and community development: An introductory essay, in R.R. Meade, M. Shaw and S. Banks, eds, *Politics, Power and Community Development,* Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 1–27.

Meade, R. (2008) Mayday, Mayday! Newspaper framing anti-globalizers!, *Journalism*, **9** (3), 330-352.

Mueller-Hirth, N. (2012) If you don't count, you don't count: Monitoring and evaluation in South African NGOs, *Development and Change*, **43** (3), 649-70.

Meyer, D. (2012) Protest and political process, in E. Amenta, K. Nash and A. Scott, eds, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*, Blackwell, London, pp. 397-407.

Mishra, P. (2016) Welcome to the age of anger, *The Guardian*, 8 December, accessed at: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/dec/08/welcome-age-anger-brexit-trump (4 April 2017)

Moran, M. (2015) *Identity and Capitalism*, Sage, London.

Newman, J. and Clarke, J. (2009) *Publics, Politics and Power: Remaking the Public in Public Services,* Sage, London.

Newman, J. and Clarke, J. (2016) The politics of deploying community, in R.R. Meade, M. Shaw and S. Banks, eds, *Politics, Power and Community Development*, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 31-46.

Oosterlynck, S., Loopmans, M., Schuermans, N. , Vandenabeele, J. and Zemni, S. (2016) Putting flesh to the bone: Looking for solidarity in diversity, here and now, *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* **39** (5), 764-782.

Parenti, C. (2016) Listening to Trump, *Nonsite.org,* 17 November, 2016, accessed at: http://nonsite.org/editorial/listening-to-trump, (6 January 2017).

Phillips, A. (1995) *The Politics of Presence*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Popple, K. and Shaw, M. (1997) Social Movements: re-asserting 'community', *Community Development Journal*, **32** (3), 191-197.

Salamon, L.M., ed, (2014) *New Frontiers of Philanthropy: A Guide to the New Tools and Actors Reshaping Global Philanthropy and Social Investing*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Shaw, M. (2017 forthcoming) Community development: Reviving critical agency in times of crisis, in R. Phillips, S. Kenny, and B. McGrath, eds, *The Routledge Handbook of Community Development*, Routledge, London.

Shaw, M. and Crowther, J. (2014) 'Adult education, community development and democracy: renegotiating the terms of engagement', *Community Development Journal*, **49** (3), 390-406.

Taylor, V. and Van Dyke, N. (2007) 'Get up, Stand Up': tactical repertoires of social movements, in D.A. Snow, S.A. Sould and H. Krieisi, eds, *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 262-293.

Tilly, C. (1986) *The Contentious French*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Tyler, I. (2013) Naked Protest: the maternal politics of citizenship and revolt, *Citizenship Studies*, **17** (2), 211–226

Voss, K. and Williams, M. (2012) The local in the global: rethinking social movements in the new millennium, *Democratization*, **19** (2), 352-377.

Williams, R. (1989) *Resources of Hope,* Verso, London.