

## **Contested Community Knowledge Mobilizations: Producing Knowledge for Social Transformation**

**By Gary Kinsman with the assistance of Andrew Preston <sup>1</sup>**

*“the more radical the person is, the more fully he or she enters into reality so that, knowing it better, he or she can better transform it.”<sup>2</sup>*

### **‘Asking We Walk’ or ‘Walking we ask questions’ ...**

In discussing how to move forward together in research and organizing against poverty, homelessness and forced migration, I draw upon a saying from the Zapatistas which is variously rendered as ‘asking we walk’ or ‘walking we ask questions.’ The Zapatistas are a movement against oppression, neoliberalism and capitalism based among indigenous Mayan people in Chiapas, Mexico who have developed a fusion/synthesis of Mayan, Mexican revolutionary, marxist and anarchist insights and traditions.<sup>3</sup> We ask questions as we walk together since it is only by moving together against poverty and oppression that the questions we need to address become clearer and possible solutions become visible. Asking the way in this sense is a crucial part of any radical research process. This is about developing a dialogical<sup>4</sup> or question and discussion based form of research based on learning from people, and not a monological relation with the researchers as the ‘experts’ telling people what it is they are supposed to know.<sup>5</sup> This is also based on the understanding from Antonio Gramsci that everyone is already a researcher and theorist in their everyday worlds and the task of critical research and theory is to assist in developing these capacities more critically and systematically.<sup>6</sup>

### **Community Based Participatory Action Research (CBPAR) and Decolonizing Methodologies**

This paper is rooted in conversations already begun in the research project on Poverty, Homelessness, and Migration on CBPAR and decolonizing methodologies and what this means. In our proposal to CURA (Community University Research Alliances) we wrote that this research project is “guided by the principles of community based PAR [participatory action research], feminist research and decolonizing methodologies.”<sup>7</sup> But what exactly we mean by this is not always clear and requires further discussion so that it becomes more deeply rooted in our research and activist practice. This is what I address in this exploration of these questions.

Some key features of CBPAR (Community Based Participatory Action Research is used here but a number of different names are used in different contexts including feminist action research and community action research) at its best are that this social inquiry/research approach is a form of critical and radical pedagogy inspired by the work of Paulo Freire (who I come back to later on in this paper); that it is a movement from social passivity to an engaged social literacy that has roots in feminism and the politics of decolonization; that it entails a two way dialogue between scholars and community activists creating awareness and capacities among oppressed groups as to how they can liberate themselves<sup>8</sup>; and that it often includes consciousness raising and empowerment.<sup>9</sup> It involves the full participation of community activists and organizers, a dialogical educational process and means of taking action for change, the democratizing of

knowledge and the erosion of boundaries between knowledge and action, and researchers and actors.<sup>10</sup> CBPAR can include grass-roots activists being directly engaged in all phases of the research from developing the research questions to elaborating methods, from conducting and participating in interviews to validating findings, and from disseminating findings within the academic milieu to creating tools for change.

But participatory action research can also have a more mixed and troubled heritage since it has been and can be accommodated to social regulation, and forms of oppression and ruling relations through the use of the techniques of focus groups, and processes of consultation and participation for mainstream political parties, for the marketing of consumer commodities, and for corporate public relations.<sup>11</sup> This trend within some participatory research moves it in the direction of producing knowledge from above for ruling and managing people's lives. This can be further reinforced if this is tied together with forms of community knowledge mobilization from above that I discuss later.

Given the specific engagement of this research project with indigenous peoples and their concerns and struggles with poverty, homelessness and forced migration, we also need to look at decolonizing methodologies and what this means for us.<sup>12</sup> In my view this commitment needs to be deepened and extended. In relation to decolonizing methodologies I situate myself as a white settler in the context of the relations of social/historical power of colonization and in the context of the need for nation to nation relations with indigenous peoples based on respect and recognition of indigenous social, political and historical rights.<sup>13</sup> This requires developing a politics of responsibility that moves far beyond questions of cultural sensitivity to engage with fighting the social practices of colonialism in our own lives and research practices. For me this entails challenging these practices and my engagement with them from my own location within these ruling relations -- and embarking on a journey of attempting to become an ally for indigenous struggles. This involves learning from and being transformed by indigenous peoples and their struggles.<sup>14</sup> For me this learning is still in progress. This requires a consistent attempt to challenge settler assumptions and acting to try to get settler societies to critique and transcend colonialism, including in research practices. As Taiaiake Alfred puts it –

if we are to move beyond the charitable racism of current policies or paternalist progressivism of liberal reconciliation models, justice must become a *duty* of, and not a *gift* from, the Settler. And for this to happen, Settler society must be forced into a reckoning with its past, its present, its future and itself. White people who are not yet decolonized must come to admit that they were and are wrong. They must admit that... [indigenous peoples] have rights that are collective and inherent to their indigeneity and that are autonomous from the Settler society – rights to land, to culture, and to community.<sup>15</sup>

These discussions regarding CBPAR and decolonizing methodologies also occur in the context of an important revival of broader discussions of activist and militant forms of critical research in social movements and radical community organizing from which there is also a lot to learn.<sup>16</sup>

### **Troubling Community?**

Central terms for SSHRC (the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the major funding body for social science and humanities research within the Canadian state) and CURA,

are community and especially ‘community knowledge mobilization.’ But first we need to ask a critical question about what community is. In my view we need to trouble community and not simply take it for granted.

Clearly notions of community and community-based research and politics can be very useful. They provide a way of locating people in specific communities, providing an important way for naming people’s experiences of social difference and social exclusion, and this can be an important basis for social research and mobilization. Making research accountable to and defined by community activists/organizers is crucial. But at the same time certain uses of community can also make it ahistorical, asocial, and essentialized. As Himani Bannerji points out, in her work on the silencing around violence against women in communities of colour, community is not a natural object but a social and historical creation.

we cannot begin by taking the concept of “community” for granted. We need to remember that it is a political and cultural-ideological formation reliant upon social relations which are the base of social life, and not a spontaneous or natural association of people. This constructed and contingent nature of the concept of community is important to keep in mind, since it is becoming increasingly common in social sciences to treat this concept ... as a natural, almost an instinctive, form of social and cultural association... But if instead of naturalizing “community,” we see it as a formation, an ideological, that is, cultural and political practice, it becomes possible for us to develop a critique of the social organization, social relations, and moral regulations which go into the making of it ... We can say, therefore, that there is nothing natural about communities. In fact they are contested grounds of socio-cultural definitions and political agencies.<sup>17</sup>

Concepts of community can operate to conceal class, gendered, racialized, sexualized and other social differences and struggles within these communities. These can be hidden behind the appearance of the unitary character of ‘community.’ This deployment of community can also be associated with an ahistorical construction of identity abstracted away from the social and historical relations it is produced within.<sup>18</sup> ‘Community’ can be used in a geographical sense (as in the community in a specific city) to group together social service agencies/the anti-poverty industry and people living in poverty who have very different interests and relations to social power where social agencies make and implement decisions that can hurt people living in poverty and homeless people. Settlers and indigenous peoples can be grouped together in cities as part of the same ‘community’ and this construction of ‘community’ can also lead to viewing band councils as the representatives of the ‘community’ in indigenous communities where there may be other forms of organizing and leadership.

How does SSHRC refer to community? In CURA texts they seem to divide “community organizations” into two basic groups: institutions, including government departments and paragovernmental agencies; and Non-Governmental Organizations, or NGOs, consisting of not-for-profit and community-based agencies. About two-thirds of all community organizations reportedly involved with CURAs as partners are NGOs while about one-third are institutions.<sup>19</sup> On the CURA webpage community refers -- “to either a geographic focus or an issue/interest focus.” (para. 1 of the Applicants subsection of the Eligibility section).<sup>20</sup>

In this use of community organization SSHRC conflates together state agencies with more community-based agencies and at times they define community in a 'geographic' sense. As mentioned above these groups can have very different and often conflicting social interests. It is also not clear whether much more activist organizations are included as part of this notion of community for SSHRC or not. They are certainly not explicitly mentioned among the community organizations alliances are to be constructed with.

Community is also often separated from class and other social relations, and class and other social struggles. As George Smith pointed out -- "the "community" that is systematically left out of these arrangements is working class people as such."<sup>21</sup> People living in poverty are part of the working class in a broad sense<sup>22</sup> but this is lost in most academic and social service agency work on poverty which tries to address poverty as if it can be separated or violently abstracted away from class relations and struggles in the context of capitalist social relations. Instead we need to see poverty as always being mediated, or mutually constructed, through class relations and struggles, as well as colonizing, racializing, gender and other relations.<sup>23</sup> In this regard the suggestive formulation of "intentional colonial poverty" in relation to indigenous peoples allows us to begin to see how poverty, colonization, racialization and state relations are constructed in and through each other.<sup>24</sup>

George Smith also writes in his work on the social organization of the policing of sex between men on 'community' as a form of management/regulation. He uses the term "regime" to refer to political/administrative institutions within ruling relations.

Regimes legitimate cadres of local leaders as 'representatives' of various local community organizations. In this process, community groups often end up functioning as the local extension of the management system of government, at least to the extent that government makes them party to its policies and funds their activities. The concept of "community" should not be understood as a geographical area ... Rather, it operates as a conceptual device used to coordinate political relations among local groups and between these groups and a regime...<sup>25</sup>

Coming at it from the rather different direction of Foucauldian (people inspired by the work of Michel Foucault) work on contemporary forms of neoliberal governance Nikolas Rose writes that "community is actually instituted in its contemporary form as a *sector* for government."<sup>26</sup> Communities have become "zones to be investigated, mapped, classified, documented, interpreted, their vectors explained..."<sup>27</sup> The broader context of this as Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller have pointed out in the context of neoliberalism is the cutting back of direct forms of state funding and the forms of social surveillance of community groups associated with them.<sup>28</sup> Even the Durkheimian sense of social solidarity that can be established through social programs linking people together is undermined in neoliberal capitalism.<sup>29</sup> In this context "community" can get mobilized in relation to neoliberalism and the attacks on the 'welfare-state' as a new form of social surveillance, regulation and governance. In this context research and research funding can become a form of governance and this is important to think through in relation to SSHRC and CURA.

## **What is Community Knowledge Mobilization? Whose Community Knowledge Mobilization?**

Given the contested character of community what then is community knowledge mobilization? As feminist sociologist Dorothy E. Smith reminds us in her work on the importance of social standpoint as a starting place for critical social analysis a crucial question we need to ask is from whose social standpoint is community knowledge being mobilized and which community or communities are having their knowledge mobilized and for what ends?<sup>30</sup> I would suggest that despite the contradictory and shifting language that is used in various SSHRC/CURA documents that this community knowledge mobilization is a mobilization of community knowledge from above – appropriating community-based knowledge for ruling and managing people’s lives. In contrast community knowledge from below is defined and oriented around the needs and concerns of community activists and social movements for social transformation – it is knowledge for liberation and social justice. Notions of from ‘above’ and from ‘below’ are always imperfect but they do give us a clearer sense of the direction of these social mobilizations.<sup>31</sup>

The Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) program was launched by SSHRC in 1999. As the Council states on the CURA Web page, “Alliances between community organizations and postsecondary institutions will foster new knowledge, tools, and methods to develop the best strategies for diverse aspects of intervention, action research, program delivery and policy development that will be appropriate for our rapidly changing times.”<sup>32</sup> SSHRC in describing the CURA program suggests that the social challenges facing Canada can be “best addressed by postsecondary institutions working closely with groups that represent particular communities of interest”<sup>33</sup> Given this it is not hard to see how CURA can be seen as an extension of, or sector of, government/state relations.

The CURA program is based on the assumption that useful knowledge (useful knowledge for whom?), that is knowledge that they define as able to respond to social, economic and political challenges, is premised on “stronger alliances between community organizations and postsecondary institutions.”<sup>34</sup> Mobilizing university researchers and community organizations together is seen as a solution to some of the challenges faced within neo-liberal globalized capitalism which is what seems to be referenced by “our rapidly changing times”

In this regard SSHRC's Community-University Research Alliances webpage<sup>35</sup> provides a rather sanitized account of problems we now face as part of the neoliberal/globalization project:

As globalization, the communications revolution and other forces continue to reshape the world, our communities are presented with an increasingly complex mix of opportunities and challenges with multiple social, economic and cultural dimensions. The phenomena transforming the lives of individuals and communities alike include changing patterns of employment and demands for skills in a knowledge-based economy, poverty and homelessness, an increasingly diverse social fabric, transformations in family life, changing values, young people entering the workforce, new constraints on organizations and public services, both urbanization and

depopulation of rural areas and new rules of business competitiveness. (para. 1 of Context section)<sup>36</sup>

Community organizations are seen in this perspective as possessing valuable information about substantive issues which needs to be accessed while university based researchers are seen as having the skills and capacities to produce ‘valid’ and ‘legitimate’ knowledge. This is the context in which community knowledge mobilization gets deployed in SSHRC and CURA documents. In surveying a range of these documents<sup>37</sup> the use of knowledge mobilization ranges from the narrow sense of dissemination of research results beyond the academic world to notions of community knowledge mobilization through a broader sense of community/university alliances that will have an impact on knowledge and social policy formation. Most often it is used to describe a flow of knowledge among multiple agents leading to an intellectual, social and/or economic impact.<sup>38</sup> In this sense it is unlike the unidirectional “producer-consumer” implications of concepts such as knowledge and technology transfer.<sup>39</sup> In some of their texts SSHRC refers to communities as 'knowledge users' involved in a process of the 'co-creation' of knowledge. These are concepts with earlier roots that are also now used in business literature articulated with neo-liberalism, including the use of ‘knowledge users,’ and 'co-opting competence' which gets developed into 'co-creation'.<sup>40</sup>

This version of community knowledge mobilization is aimed at producing research that meets the accepted standards of ‘excellence’ and ‘scientific’ productivity in the academic world while responding to ‘community’ concerns and needs. The polarities to be avoided are too much dedication and commitment to grass roots community and especially activist concerns on the one hand and being bound up too much within the building of academic careers and disciplinary relations in the university world on the other.<sup>41</sup>

The SSHRC Northern Communities webpage<sup>42</sup> makes visible the intended beneficiaries of knowledge mobilization:

SSHRC actively supports networking, disseminating, exchanging and co-creating knowledge to meet the needs of Canadian society. The aim is to ensure that people who stand to benefit from research results— policy-makers, business leaders, community groups, educators and the media, as well as academics in various fields— have the knowledge they need, when they need it, in useful forms. (para. 2 of Context section)<sup>43</sup>

It is important to note that here and elsewhere policy makers are listed first and that business leaders are prominently mentioned. There is also the use of a unitary “Canadian society” that hides from our view that this is a class, racially and gender divided society. The implication is that this community knowledge mobilization is often directed at producing knowledge for state, business and professional groups. This is what I describe as community knowledge mobilization from above. It is therefore not intended to produce knowledge that will allow community activists to facilitate the mobilization and organizing of people for progressive social transformation.

The SSHRC Northern Communities special call is also directly articulated with the federal government's northern vision and strategy whose priority areas include sovereignty and governance as well as social and economic development and environmental protection.<sup>44</sup> In this regard we see how SSHRC and CURA are bound up with strategies of Canadian state formation.<sup>45</sup>

Community knowledge mobilization can, from this perspective, be seen as new ways of accessing and appropriating community based knowledge for state and academic relations. It can be seen as the extension of neoliberal governance to community-based groups through these university partnerships. This form of research regulation is less clearly state-defined and less visible than direct state regulation and it seems to be at a greater distance from state relations than earlier more direct forms of state funding and regulation. It can therefore be easier for hegemonic relations<sup>46</sup> to be maintained since it is hard not to be in support of 'research,' and 'community-based research' especially. This appears to be kind of 'neutral' knowledge that state agencies can then use from an apparent distance and their regulation of the production of this knowledge is hidden through academic and SSHRC funding and accountability arrangements.

The objective seems to be to produce new forms of 'relevant' and 'credible' interdisciplinary knowledge based on developing new forms of relationships between community groups and university researchers in which community groups get governed through academic and professional relations mediated through SSHRC regulations. While university researchers expertise and the power/knowledge relations<sup>47</sup> in which this expertise is embedded has been undermined from below by activists in social movements this 'expertise' has also been challenged from above for no longer producing the knowledge that is needed within ruling relations. At times CURA can even appear to be a certain form of response to demands for the democratizing of expertise. But central planks of this community knowledge from above are collaborative linkages between community-based groups and the academic expertise (yes still expertise!) of university researchers. It is these university based power/knowledge relations that CURA partially modifies but also actively builds upon and reinforces.

In this context the reformulation of regulation takes the form of community knowledge mobilization as a form of governance. Regulation of community organizing and research takes place through connections with academic institutional relations which are subordinated to forms of state research regulation. Community knowledge mobilization from above relies quite centrally on the power/knowledge relations and expertise of academic researchers. This privileging of academic forms of research expertise can even be seen in the application forms where "Research Contributions" seems to refer to published forms of research, including especially in academic locations. This operates to alienate many community activists and organizers from these forms that are constructed in an academic, professional, and bureaucratic fashion.

CURA and the production of 'useful knowledge' demands a 'reform of academia' and the different cultures between communities and universities. Technical measures to accomplish this include establishing "community advisory boards" for these research projects. This incorporates community groups with diverse characteristics into a new set of relations with academic researchers and institutions governed by the policies and regulations of SSHRC.

This is perhaps most clearly seen in relation to questions of who the research project is accountable to. It is far more accountable (especially in the neoliberal sense) to SSHRC than to community-based activists. We begin to see how ‘collaboration’ becomes a form of governance. This is not a neutral production of knowledge but can be seen as a way of activating and engaging academic expertise through community.

Regarding interdisciplinarity there was the generation of an interdisciplinarity ‘from below’ that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s out of the confrontations between social movements and the social exclusions they encountered within disciplinary knowledges. This saw the feminist movement create the basis for Women’s Studies, indigenous organizing create the basis for Native Studies, union activism leading to Labour Studies, and queer movements leading to the emergence of Lesbian and Gay Studies. There is now also an interdisciplinarity ‘from above’ which often views the existing disciplines, especially in the social sciences and humanities, as impediments to the knowledge that neo-liberal and globalized capitalism requires, and even at times as sources for resistance to neo-liberal capitalism. Notions of the need for social solidarity in sociology and social work can be seen as obstacles to the progress of neoliberal forms of knowledge and policy. Disciplines based historically on the emergence and production of the social are not that useful for ruling relations when central to their neoliberal project is weakening and hacking apart fundamental aspects of ‘the social.’ From above this perspective argues that new interdisciplinary forms of knowledge are required since the disciplines are no longer always producing useful knowledge for ruling relations.<sup>48</sup> SSHRC and CURA are articulated to this ‘from above’ view of interdisciplinarity. In contrast developing community knowledge mobilization from below draws upon interdisciplinarity from below and how this emerged out of confrontations between academic power/knowledge relations and social movements.

### **How to pursue community knowledge mobilization from below?**

Given that SSHRC/CURA regulations lead in the direction of community knowledge mobilization from above this poses major dilemmas for those of us wishing to pursue the development of community knowledge mobilization from below through engaging with and learning from social movement and community activists and developing a praxis from below. How can we access funds for needed forms of community-based research while at the same time avoiding getting captured within these regulatory strategies from above?<sup>49</sup> How can we navigate and negotiate these sets of relations and shift them in a from below direction?

Here I suggest some preliminary ways of beginning to work through these questions. One way to clarify this is through a return to and an exploration of the previously mentioned work of Paulo Freire. In the uses of Freire’s work there is an integral relation to community-based action research and to decolonizing methodologies. This also begins to clarify what community knowledge mobilization from below is all about.

### **Learning Again from Paulo Freire: Not the Banking Method but Active Producer’s Knowledge.**

Paulo Freire was a Brazilian literacy and popular educator who played a major role in developing critical pedagogy and popular education which has a major impact on CBAR. His most



important contribution is *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.<sup>50</sup> He realized through teaching formal literacy to peasants that the banking method based on memorization and regurgitation which is still the hegemonic pedagogical strategy did not work. This pedagogical method did not relate to their lives and worlds. For Freire the best way to grasp learning, knowledge formation and by extension research is not as a banking system (numbers or words to be collected in order to be memorized and regurgitated back to the teacher or person in authority) but an active process of thinking, reflecting and producing knowledge that challenges oppression and relates to people's social experiences. He found that successful literacy programs were rooted in producing knowledge for oppressed people themselves based on their own naming of their worlds and beginning to transform their worlds. This was making knowledge that was simultaneously about understanding, analyzing and transforming the world. This linked together theory and practice in an intimate fashion. Naming the world in this sense is an active relation to the social world and can also be seen as an important form of research and knowledge creation. This was also developing greater social and cultural literacy and rather than social passivity, greater social activity and activism. This is what community knowledge mobilization from below is all about. Knowledge is produced in order to both understand and to transform the world.

This perspective also crucially shapes how we do research and produce knowledge. Following this perspective we need to alter the relations of standard research and knowledge production that are based on hierarchical relations and academic power/knowledge relations, the banking method and from above methods. Research methods must instead be based on producing knowledge from below through an active producer's form of knowledge. Research strategies must also be proposed by activists and organizers in movements and communities, according to their own needs and knowledge base. Building relationships is emphasized in this critical way of thinking in similar ways to how relationship building is prioritized in decolonizing methodologies.

### **Transforming the social relations of research**

Research is always itself a social relationship between people -- research relations are social relations. In my view critical research is always about establishing, building, maintaining and expanding relationships. But there are social relationships that have very different characteristics and the hegemonic social relation of research produces relations of hierarchy and disempowerment for oppressed peoples. In doing community knowledge mobilization from below we have to transform the standard/mainstream research relation in which knowledge is produced from above by experts and professionals and community members get constructed as passive 'research fodder' or as 'research objects.' These hegemonic forms of the social relations of research are tied into dominant forms of knowledge production. Dominant knowledge is for those with social power and privilege -- those whose practices produce the social relations of poverty, racism, class exploitation, forced migration, and homelessness. Community knowledge mobilization from above is only a partial and limited modification of these relations which holds these basic hegemonic relations of knowledge production and research in place. If we are interested in challenging these relations we have to develop very different social relations of research defined by facilitating an active producer's knowledge and much more participatory and community and movement based approaches that allow grass roots people to become the active subjects defining this research and knowledge production.

For those of us who are university-based researchers this poses major questions and challenges. These hegemonic relations of research and knowledge production shape how university based research has most often been done and this is reinforced through funding regulations and even through Research Ethics Boards.<sup>51</sup> And we need to remember that universities were historically set up to produce knowledge for ruling relations in this society and to train people for specific positions and for labouring within capitalist and oppressive social relations.<sup>52</sup> Even the relative autonomy of the limited spaces for critical research and knowledge in the universities are now being narrowed through neoliberal practices of governance. University based research is all too often about appropriating community based knowledge and basing research on the idea that people are tools or objects of research. CURA modifies this but also extends this in developing community knowledge mobilization and interdisciplinarity from above.

In hegemonic social relations of research this has often led to the academic appropriation of community knowledge and wisdom and the transformation of people into the objects of research. This has been central to the colonizing, racializing, gendered and class projects of university research. Some groups of people can come to quite understandably feel that they have been studied to death and that even though they have participated in various research projects they have got nothing out of it and that this research has instead been used for building academic careers and to assist state and bureaucratic agencies.

One area that has been highly researched in relation to poverty and homelessness is the Downtown East Side in Vancouver.<sup>53</sup> Here and elsewhere there are many studies of homelessness that use various techniques to count the homeless. These studies basically take the homeless as their object. They can be useful in showing us that homelessness is a pervasive social problem (if we did not already know this) and can even begin to help us identify some of the roots of the problem and some of the reasons why individuals report being homeless. At the same time, these studies cannot explicate the social organization of homelessness and forced migration or campaigns of social cleansing. These studies can and have been used to construct the homeless themselves as the problem. For instance on the basis of some of these studies, social policy analysts and government officials have argued that the homeless are largely people who are 'mentally ill' or are associated with deviance and criminality. Many of these studies deny agency to the homeless and portray them as in need of other people's 'help.' The social relations of 'help' can be another site of oppression and marginalization systematically disempowering people living in poverty.

Mainstream studies, as mentioned earlier, are often used to separate homelessness from the broader social relations through which homelessness is socially organized, and especially to separate questions of homelessness from class relations and struggles. These studies do not produce knowledge *for* the homeless or for groups like the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP) that are organizing people living in poverty as a social movement.<sup>54</sup> They do not begin to map out the social relations of struggle so that activists/organizers can sort out where to exert pressure to get results in addressing the needs of the homeless.<sup>55</sup>

To resist these pressures and to transform these relations of research we need to actively struggle against these professional, disciplinary, and funding regulations by starting from and building vibrant and direct connections with communities and movements. In relation to communities given the previous discussion we need to relate to the most oppressed groups within communities

and to community activists and organizers and not fall into relating only to ‘community leaders’ or those who stand in an administrative relation to their communities able to speak *for* these ‘communities.’ We need to have our research grounded and defined from within networks of activists and organizers. Central to this is a continuous struggle against the standard ‘from above’ relations of research and knowledge production.

### **Towards new relations of research collaboration/participation**

This requires the development of community-based forms of knowledge through catalyzing, facilitating and nurturing its development. Community activists and organizers (some of whom will also be activist university based researchers) need to become the active subjects and definers of this research. A major focus must be on developing their skills and capacities in a fashion autonomous from university-based research.

This involves actively resisting the practices of academic institutionalization which while they are modified are also extended in the SSHRC/CURA research relation. This research is not merely academic and this requires challenging the class, professional, and disciplinary practices of the academic world, and the ways this is tied into state relations.<sup>56</sup> Instead this requires developing relationships of respect, dignity, accountability and responsibility between university based researchers and community and movement based researchers, activists and organizers. For university-based researchers this involves giving up our positions as the ‘experts’ and requires learning a research politics of listening and learning and asking questions (a dialogical research practice) with a constant openness to being transformed by our encounters with people in these communities and movements.

### **Research, organizing and activism**

Community knowledge mobilization from below rejects the standard separation of theory and practice. It is research that is about practice or action and not just ideas or theory. It is attempting to mobilize knowledge to change the world – in this situation challenging homelessness, poverty and colonization. It is in organizing for change that we learn more about how the social relations through which these problems are put together are organized and how they can be transformed.<sup>57</sup> Greater knowledge of how the problems we are up against are socially organized leads to more grounded and effective forms of activism and organizing. This is an activist practice of research and theory generation, that is it is research that is at the very same time organizing and activism. This way of doing research is at the very same time about actively fighting poverty, homelessness, and racism. It therefore involves supporting the raise the social assistance and minimum wage rates campaign, opposing the slashing of the special diet supplement for people on social assistance,<sup>58</sup> supporting campaigns for quality and non-stigmatizing social housing, and support for the Treaty and land rights and other struggles of the indigenous peoples.

### **One possible objective: research/action teams in each community for community based knowledge production and organizing.**

Along with the various forms of research and organizing that will come out of the research project on Poverty, Homelessness and Migration it is important that we commit ourselves to

producing in all the communities we are working with and connected to community-based research/action teams that will continue to exist after the research project is over. Their objective will be to produce knowledge and organizing for communities and movements and not for the university world. This will develop the skills and capacities for continuing community knowledge mobilization from below and create the basis for continuing resistance to research based regulation and appropriation from above coming from the university world and such bodies as SSHRC. This builds on and magnifies the already existing research capacities and knowledge formation in many communities that needs to be extended. This will create better conditions for community-based activists and organizers to continue to produce knowledge for naming and understanding their social worlds which is at the same time the transformation of these social worlds.

In concluding as Marx once wrote about the need to bring theory and practice together: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it.”<sup>59</sup>

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Preston assisted in particular with a survey and analysis of SSHRC/CURA documents and in working on the sections of this article on these topics. Laurel O’Gorman also provided assistance in working on this paper and I received helpful comments and critiques from Laura Hall and Tyler Horton. None of them, however, are responsible for what is written here. This paper is an expanded and elaborated version of a presentation called “Community Knowledge Mobilization: Producing Knowledge for Social Transformation,” given at the First Annual Conference of the Poverty, Homelessness and Migration project, Timmins, Ontario, Nov. 13, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York and London: Continuum, 2006), p. 39. Radical here refers to getting to the root of the problem. On this see Judy Rebick, *Imagine Democracy*, (Toronto: Stoddart, 2000). This quote resonates with major aspects of Marx’s “Theses on Feuerbach,” which is in a number of collections including in *Karl Marx, Early Writings*, (Introduced by Lucio Colletti), (New York: Vintage, 1975).

<sup>3</sup> On the Zapatistas see Alex Khasnabish, *Zapatistas: Rebellion from the Grassroots to the Global*, (London: Zed Press, 2010), and John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power, The Meaning of Revolution Today*, New Edition (London/Ann Arbor, Michigan, Pluto Press, 2005). The reference to asking we walk is on p. 215. Also see John Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*, (London: Pluto Press, 2010), especially p. 13, and pp. 255-256.

<sup>4</sup> On dialogical relations see M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogical Imagination* (edited by Michael Holquist), (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981). Also see David McNally, *Bodies of Meaning, Studies of Language, Labor, and Liberation*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001) and Dorothy E. Smith, “Telling the Truth After Postmodernism,” in her *Writing the Social, Critique, Theory and Investigations*, (Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 1999), pp. 96-130 for their use of Bakhtin’s work.

<sup>5</sup> On this see John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power, The Meaning of Revolution Today*, New Edition (London/Ann Arbor, Michigan, Pluto Press, 2005) and his *Crack Capitalism*, (London: Pluto Press, 2010).

<sup>6</sup> On this see Alan Sears and James Cairns, *A Good Book In Theory, Making Sense Through Inquiry*, (Second Edition), (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), pp. 13-14. Also see Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, (Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), (New York: International, 1971).

<sup>7</sup> Carol Kauppi, Detailed Description, “Research Activities and Methodology,” application to CURA, 2009. A workshop called “What is community based research/participatory action research?” was also held at the at the First Annual Conference of the Poverty, Homelessness and Migration project, Timmins, Ontario, Nov. 14, 2010.

<sup>8</sup> This is not the will to empower of experts and professionals that Barbara Cruikshank critiques in “The Will to Empower: Technologies of Citizenship and the War on Poverty,” *Socialist Review*, V. 23, No. 4, 1994, 29-56.

<sup>9</sup> On community-based participatory action research see William K. Carrol, ed., *Critical Strategies for Social Research*, (Toronto: Canadian Scholar’s Press, 2004), pp. 276- 337.

<sup>10</sup> See William K. Carrol, ed., *Critical Strategies for Social Research*, (Toronto: Canadian Scholar’s Press, 2004).

<sup>11</sup> See William K. Carrol, ed., *Critical Strategies for Social Research*, (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2004) On problems with strategies of consultation and partnership also see Gary Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing: 'Consultation,' 'Partnership,' and Responsibility'As Strategies of Regulation," in the second edition of William Carrol, ed., *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*, (Toronto :Garamond, 1997), pp. 213-239.

<sup>12</sup> See the interactive panel and presentations on Decolonizing Methodologies given by Kevin Fitzmaurice, Laura Hall, and Schuyler Webster at the First Annual Conference of the Poverty, Homelessness and Migration project, Timmins, Ontario, Nov. 13, 2010. Also see Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, New York: Zed Press, 1999, and Shawn Wilson, *Research is Ceremony* (Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2008). It is important to note that Laura Smith's important and influential work was written specifically for indigenous researchers.

<sup>13</sup> Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasase, indigenous pathways of action and freedom*, (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2005).

<sup>14</sup> See the work of Edward Said on becoming and being transformed by the other. Including in the video *Edward Said - On Orientalism*, Executive Producer Sut Jhally, Media Education Foundation, 1998.

<sup>15</sup> Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasase, indigenous pathways of action and freedom*, (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2005, p. 113.

<sup>16</sup> On this see among others Aziz Choudry and Dip Kapoor (eds.), *Learning from the Ground Up Global Perspectives on Social Movements and Knowledge Production* (Palgrave/Macmillan, 2010); Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek, eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), Erika Biddle, Stephen Shukaitis, and David Graeber (eds), *Constituent Imagination, Militant Investigations, Collective Theorization*, (Edinburgh, Oakland, Baltimore: AK Press, 2007); Team Colors Collective (eds.), *Uses of a Whirlwind, Movement, Movements, and Contemporary Radical Currents in the United States*, (Edinburgh, Oakland, Baltimore: AK Press, 2009); Team Colors Collective, *Winds From Below, Radical Community Organizing to Make a Revolution Possible*, (Team Colors in Association with Eberhardt Press, 2011). There were also sessions held on activist research at the North American Anarchist Studies conference held in Toronto in January, 15-16<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

<sup>17</sup> Himani Bannerji, "A Question of Silence: Reflections on Violence Against Women in Communities of Colour," in Himani Bannerji, *The Dark Side of the Nation, Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*, (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2000), pp. 154, 157.

<sup>18</sup> On this see Himani Bannerji, "The Passion of Naming: Identity, Difference and Politics of Class," in Himani Bannerji, *Thinking Through, Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism*, (Toronto: Women's Press, 1995, pp. 17-40.

<sup>19</sup> Natalie Kishchuk, "Performance Report: Phase 1 of the Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) Program" at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/publications/cura\\_e.pdf](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/cura_e.pdf) (2003, p. 7).

<sup>20</sup> SSHRC, "Community-University Research Alliances" at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programmes-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx> (2011, para. 1 of the Applicants subsection of the Eligibility section).

<sup>21</sup> George Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer," in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek, eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), p. 59.

<sup>22</sup> Here I am using a broader autonomist marxist feminist notion of class as a social relation that is not simply about whether someone directly sells their capacity to labour to a capitalist but also includes unpaid domestic and reproductive labour. See Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James, *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*, (Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1972 and Harry Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically*, (Oakland: AK Press/Antetheses, 2000), especially pp. 71-73..

<sup>23</sup> On this use of mediation see Himani Bannerji, "But Who Speaks for Us? In Bannerji, *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism*, (Toronto: Women's Press, 1995).

<sup>24</sup> See Steven W. Koptie with editorial assistance of Cynthia Wesley-Esquimaux, “Inferiorizing Indigenous Communities and Intentional Colonial Poverty,” in *First Peoples Child and Family Review*, V. 5, No. 2, 2010, pp. 96-106.

<sup>25</sup> George Smith, “Political Activist as Ethnographer,” in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek, eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), p. 59.

<sup>26</sup> . Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, (Combridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 176. Emphasis in original.

<sup>27</sup> Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, (Combridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 175.

<sup>28</sup> See Nikolas Rose and Peter Miller, “Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government,” *The British Journal of Sociology*, Number 43, 1992, pp. 173-205.

<sup>29</sup> Emile Durkheim was one of the founders of sociology as a discipline. He outlined the importance of social solidarity that would tie people together and give them common interests. It is these forms of programs and solidarities that neo-liberalism has centrally attacked.

<sup>30</sup> See Dorothy E. Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic, A Feminist Sociology*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987) and her *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*, (Lanham, NY: Alta Mira, 2005).

<sup>31</sup> The expression from below comes from the important work of E. P. Thompson on developing history from below. See E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968).

<sup>32</sup> SSHRC, “Community-University Research Alliances” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx> (2011, para. 3 of Context section).

<sup>33</sup> SSHRC, “Community-University Research Alliances” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx> (2011, para. 2 of Context section).

<sup>34</sup> SSHRC, “Community-University Research Alliances” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx> (2011, para. 2 of Context section) [ibid.].

<sup>35</sup> SSHRC, “Community-University Research Alliances” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx>.

<sup>36</sup> SSHRC, “Community-University Research Alliances” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx> (n.d., para. 1 of Context section)

<sup>37</sup> SSHRC, “SSHRC’s Knowledge Mobilization Strategy” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/publications/KMbPI\\_FinalE.pdf](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/KMbPI_FinalE.pdf) (2011); Natalie Kishchuk, “Performance Report: Phase 1 of the Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) Program” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/publications/cura\\_e.pdf](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/cura_e.pdf) (2003); SSHRC, “Community Engagement” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/community-communite/index-eng.aspx> (2010); SSHRC, “Community-University Research Alliances” at <http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx> (2011); SSHRC, “Scholarship in Action: Knowledge Mobilization and the Academic Process” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/newsletter-bulletin/summer-ete/2008/knowledge\\_mobilization-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/newsletter-bulletin/summer-ete/2008/knowledge_mobilization-eng.aspx) (2010); SSHRC, “Grant Holder’s Guide: Knowledge Impact in Society (KIS)”

at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/using-utiliser/grant\\_regulations-reglement\\_subventions/knowledge\\_impact\\_society-impact\\_savoir\\_societe-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/using-utiliser/grant_regulations-reglement_subventions/knowledge_impact_society-impact_savoir_societe-eng.aspx) (2011); SSHRC, “Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity—Special Call: Community University Research Alliances (CURAs)” at

[http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern\\_cura-nord\\_aruc-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern_cura-nord_aruc-eng.aspx) (2011); SSHRC, “Funding Opportunities: Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity—Special Call” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern\\_public\\_outreach-nord\\_sensibilisation\\_public-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern_public_outreach-nord_sensibilisation_public-eng.aspx) (2011); SSHRC, “How to Apply: Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity—Special Call” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/background-renseignements/special\\_call\\_northern-appel\\_unique\\_Nord-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/background-renseignements/special_call_northern-appel_unique_Nord-eng.aspx) (2011); SSHRC, “Public Outreach Grants: Dissemination – November 2010 Competition” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/public\\_outreach-sensibilisation\\_public/dissemination-diffusion-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/public_outreach-sensibilisation_public/dissemination-diffusion-eng.aspx) (2011); SSHRC, “Public Outreach Grants: Workshops and Conferences – November 2010 Competition” at

[http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/public\\_outreach-sensibilisation\\_public/workshops-ateliers-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/public_outreach-sensibilisation_public/workshops-ateliers-eng.aspx) (2011).

<sup>38</sup> SSHRC, “SSHRC’s Knowledge Mobilization Strategy” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/publications/KMbPI\\_FinalE.pdf](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/KMbPI_FinalE.pdf) (2011, p. 4).

<sup>39</sup> SSHRC, “SSHRC’s Knowledge Mobilization Strategy” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/publications/KMbPI\\_FinalE.pdf](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/KMbPI_FinalE.pdf) (2011, p. 5).

<sup>40</sup> More generally on these points see Nick Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx, Cycles and Circuits of Struggle on High-Technology Capitalism*, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999), especially Chapter 2 “Revolutions” and p. 17 in particular. Prahalad and Ramaswamy write about ‘co-opting competence’ in “Co-opting Customer Competence” at [http://www.sld.cu/galerias/pdf/sitios/infodir/coopting\\_customer\\_competence.pdf](http://www.sld.cu/galerias/pdf/sitios/infodir/coopting_customer_competence.pdf) (2000), which they later developed as ‘co-creation’ in “The Co-creation Connection” at [http://www.tantum.com/tantum/pdfs/2009/2\\_the\\_co\\_creation\\_connection.pdf](http://www.tantum.com/tantum/pdfs/2009/2_the_co_creation_connection.pdf) (2002).

<sup>41</sup> Natalie Kishchuk, “Performance Report: Phase 1 of the Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) Program” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au\\_sujet/publications/cura\\_e.pdf](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/cura_e.pdf) (2003, p. 20).

<sup>42</sup> SSHRC, “Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity— Special Call” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern\\_cura-nord\\_aruc-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern_cura-nord_aruc-eng.aspx) (2011).

<sup>43</sup> SSHRC, “Funding Opportunities: Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity— Special Call” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern\\_public\\_outreach-nord\\_sensibilisation\\_public-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/northern_public_outreach-nord_sensibilisation_public-eng.aspx) (2011, para. 2 of Context section).

<sup>44</sup> SSHRC, “How to Apply: Northern Communities: Towards Social and Economic Prosperity—Special Call” at [http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/background-reseignements/special\\_call\\_northern-appel\\_unique\\_Nord-eng.aspx](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/apply-demande/background-reseignements/special_call_northern-appel_unique_Nord-eng.aspx) (2011).

<sup>45</sup> On state formation see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch, English State Formation as Cultural Revolution*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985).

<sup>46</sup> On hegemony which unites coercion and consent in the process of ruling see the work of Antonio Gramsci including Gramsci *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, (Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), (New York: International, 1971).

<sup>47</sup> Power/knowledge relations comes from the work of Michel Foucault and explicates the ways in which power and knowledge get bound up together in forms of disciplinary power. See Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (New York: Vintage, 1979) and *The History of Sexuality, Volume One, An Introduction*, (New York: Vintage, 1980).

<sup>48</sup> Presentation by Gary Kinsman on “Disciplining Knowledge, Capitalist Globalization, and Trans-Disciplinarity From Below,” Feb. 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2006 a panel discussion on Interdisciplinarity at Laurentian University.

<sup>49</sup> For some similar analysis of research funding and Research Ethics Boards as sites of regulation of research see Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, A.K. Thompson, and Kate Tilleczek, “New Directions for Activist Research,” in Caelie Frampton, *et.al.* eds. *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax, Fernwood Publishing, 2006), pp. 246-271.

<sup>50</sup> Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York and London: Continuum, 2006). On Freire and political activist research also see AK Thompson, “Direct Action, Pedagogy of the Oppressed,” in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), pp. 99-118.

<sup>51</sup> Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek, “Afterword: New Directions for Activist Research,” in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), pp. 246-271.

<sup>52</sup> On the capitalist character of schooling and the university see Alan Sears, *Re-Tooling the Mind Factory: Education in a Lean State*, (Aurora, Ontario, Garamond Press, 1990); Harry Cleaver, “On School Work and the Struggle Against it,” at <https://webpace.utexas.edu/hcleaver/www/OnSchoolwork200606.pdf>. Also see the work of Dorothy E. Smith, including “Contradictions for Feminist Social Scientists,” in her *Writing the Social*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), pp. 15-28.

<sup>53</sup> On this see Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek, “Afterword: New Directions for Activist Research,” in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczek eds., *Sociology for*

---

*Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), pp. 254- 255. On some of this in relation to the Downtown East Side see Erin Bentley, “(No)Where to Go: Street-Involved Queer, Lesbian, and Bisexual Young Womern and ‘Relations of Ruling,’” MA Thesis, Sociology, UBC, Vancouver, 2004.

<sup>54</sup> On the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty see John Clarke, “Researching for Resistance: OCAP, Housing, Struggles, and Activist Research,” in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczeck eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), pp. 119-132; and the OCAP website at <http://www.ocap.ca/>

<sup>55</sup> On mapping social relations of struggle see Gary Kinsman, “Mapping Social Relations of Struggle: Activism, Ethnography, Social Organization,” in Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczeck eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006), pp. 133-156.

<sup>56</sup> See Dorothy E. Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987) and her *Writing the Social*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

<sup>57</sup> On this see Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, Kate Tilleczeck eds., *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2006),

<sup>58</sup> On the raise the rates campaign and the slashing of the special diet supplement which allowed some people on social assistance to get funding for more nutritious and health sustaining foods see the OCAP website at <http://www.ocap.ca/>

<sup>59</sup> Karl Marx. “Theses on Feuerbach,” which is in a number of collections including in *Karl Marx, Early Writings*, (Introduced by Lucio Colletti), (New York: Vintage, 1975).