

# Community economies in Monsoon Asia: Keywords and key reflections

*Katherine Gibson,<sup>\*</sup> Rini Astuti,<sup>†</sup> Michelle Carnegie,<sup>‡</sup> Alanya Chalernphon,<sup>§</sup> Kelly Dombroski,<sup>¶</sup> Agnes Ririn Haryani,<sup>¶</sup> Ann Hill,<sup>||</sup> Balthasar Kehi,<sup>\*\*</sup> Lisa Law,<sup>††</sup> , Isaac Lyne,<sup>\*</sup> Andrew McGregor,<sup>‡‡</sup> Katharine McKinnon,<sup>§§</sup> Andrew McWilliam,<sup>¶¶</sup> Fiona Miller,<sup>‡‡</sup> , Chanrith Ngin,<sup>||||</sup> Darlene Occeña-Gutierrez,<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Lisa Palmer,<sup>\*\*</sup> Pryor Placino,<sup>\*</sup> Mercy Rampengan,<sup>†††</sup> Wynn Lei Lei Than,<sup>‡‡‡</sup> Nur Isiyana Wianti,<sup>§§§</sup> and Sarah Wright<sup>¶¶¶</sup>*

<sup>\*</sup>Institute for Culture and Society, Western Sydney University, Australia.  
Email: K.Gibson@westernsydney.edu.au

<sup>†</sup>Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

<sup>‡</sup>School of Environmental and Rural Science, University of New England, Australia.

<sup>§</sup>UNICEF, Vientiane, Laos.

<sup>¶</sup>Department of Geography, University of Canterbury Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha, New Zealand.

<sup>||</sup>Faculty of Education, University of Canberra, Australia.

<sup>\*\*</sup>School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, Australia.

<sup>††</sup>College of Science & Engineering, James Cook University, Australia.

<sup>‡‡</sup>Department of Geography and Planning, Macquarie University, Australia.

<sup>§§</sup>School of Humanities and Social Sciences, La Trobe University, Australia.

<sup>¶¶</sup>School of Psychology and Social Science, Western Sydney University, Australia.

<sup>||||</sup>Faculty of Arts, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Department of Geography, University of the Philippines, Philippines.

<sup>†††</sup>Department of Biology, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia.

<sup>‡‡‡</sup>Yezin Agricultural University, Myanmar.

<sup>§§§</sup>Faculty of Agriculture, Haluoleo University, Indonesia.

<sup>¶¶¶</sup>School of Environmental and Life Sciences, The University of Newcastle, Australia.

<sup>|||||</sup>Seeds of Resilience Research Collective.

**Abstract:** *A diversity of place-based community economic practices that enact ethical interdependence has long enabled livelihoods in Monsoon Asia. Managed either democratically or coercively, these culturally inflected practices have survived the rise of a cash economy, albeit in modified form, sometimes being co-opted to state projects. In the modern development imaginary, these practices have been positioned as ‘traditional’, ‘rural’ and largely superseded. But if we read against the grain of modernisation, a largely hidden geography of community economic practices emerges. This paper introduces the project of documenting keywords of place-based community economies in Monsoon Asia. It extends Raymond Williams’s cultural analysis of keywords into a non-western context and situates this discursive approach within a material semiotic framing. The paper has been collaboratively written with co-researchers across Southeast Asia and represents an experimental mode of scholarship that aims to advance a post-development agenda.*

**Keywords:** *community economies, keywords, Monsoon Asia, post-development*

## Introduction

This paper presents an initial output of a collaborative keywords project and invites on-going participation by scholars and activists who are keen to foster post-development imaginaries in Asia.<sup>1</sup> We deploy Raymond Williams’s (1983) path-breaking method of cultural analysis in an experimental mode with the aim of producing a

radically different ‘map’ of Monsoon Asia’s economic geography. The familiar map of South-east Asia’s economic geography is populated by patterns and practices of capital accumulation, urban growth and resource extraction that mark the impact of modernisation. In this paper, we present a selection of practices whose rationalities emanate from ‘other’ place-based world views, or cosmovisions.<sup>2</sup> Our keywords reveal

powerful and persistent practices of interdependence built on a diversity of social, cultural, economic and ecological relations. They are animated by place-based ethics of careful exchange, reciprocity and redistribution. Indeed, these keywords describe a 'geography of absence' populated by shadow practices that have been delegitimised as viable ways of surviving and creating well-being or deprived of their specificity and folded into umbrella economic categories such as 'social capital' that can be harnessed as raw materials of modernisation (Gibson *et al.*, 2017).

Our bold foray is inspired by post-development thinker Boaventura de Sousa Santos's 'sociology of absence' (de Sousa Santos, 2014) which highlights existing knowledges, practices and imaginaries that are occluded by dominant modernist rationality. A geography and sociology of absence sheds light on what has been 'subtracted' from the present by 'a kind of [metonymic] reason that claims to be the only form of rationality' (Santos de Sousa Santos, 2014: 165 insert added). Santos proposes that we must address absence as a necessary prelude to generating a 'sociology of emergence' which has the potential to 'enlarge the present' and provoke 'realistic possibilities and future expectations' (de Sousa Santos, 2014: 184). In light of Santos' proposal, we ask whether a geography of seemingly absent economic practices could reveal emergent community economies that offer different, non-capitalist, otherly rational, post-development pathways. At the centre of this vision of community economies are acts of ethical negotiation between humans, and between humans and non-humans, around what is necessary for survival, what constitutes surplus, how it is distributed and how to care for the natural and social commons that support life (Gibson-Graham, 2006; Gibson-Graham *et al.*, 2013).

The map that might materialise from this exercise is yet to be drawn and its shapes and shades are only vaguely discernible. At this stage of the project, our objective is relatively modest. It is to inventory a set of 'subtracted' practices, to present their workings, to connect their names to embodied know-how, habits, materialities and spiritualities and to see their nuances in both the specificity of place and the shared experience of living in Monsoon Asia.<sup>3</sup>

This experiment with making the discursively absent more present exists in a shared space with other projects of reframing area studies, such as Willem van Schendel's work on revealing how metaphors of 'area' that have privileged 'heartlandism and state-centredness' have produced the invisibility of whole tracts of lands and peoples in Southeast Asia (Van Schendel, 2002:660, 664).

This project is, however, not just an exercise in discursive recovery. We broach the geography of absence in Monsoon Asia with a sensitivity to how language, practice and materiality interact. In this sense, we are taking Williams's method onto the terrain of material semiotics. We have consciously deployed the regional nomenclature of 'Monsoon Asia' rather than the more usual geographic designation of 'South-east Asia'. Monsoon Asia constitutes 'area' in terms of the shared experience of a climatic system in which large-scale winds bring distinct seasons of wet and dry weather. We are keen to explore how, across regions affected by the monsoon, practices of more-than-human interaction and interdependence have evolved in symbiosis with the temporality, excesses and scarcities this weather system brings. In the current context of global warming and increased climate uncertainty, especially in the Asia Pacific region, we are drawn to consider how more-than-human monsoon assemblages might be sites of emergence.<sup>4</sup>

The paper has three sections. The first introduces the collaborative project of tracing words together across Monsoon Asia using the keyword method developed by Williams (1983). The second presents a spectrum of keywords arranged in terms of themes relevant to community economies. The third offers reflections on some of the features of an emerging 'map' of community economies in Monsoon Asia – the imaginary contour lines, if you will, that join diverse place-based practices across space.

### Tracing keywords

Raymond Williams' 1976 book *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (revised in Williams, 1983) marked out a new field of cultural studies in which attention was given to how words came to mean different things at

different times and in different contexts and how certain words became 'key' to particular times. Keyword entries were not scholarly dictionary items but were to describe everyday words in general usage, words that 'brought something significant to "the central processes of our common life"' (Bennett *et al.*, 2005: xviii). This was a path-breaking project that highlighted the 'worlding' powers of language and terminology. As a quintessential artefact of British cultural studies, the original volume traced the often global origins of 'English' words used in Britain.

In more recent times a *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society* volume was produced as a collaborative project led by editors Tony Bennett *et al.* (2005). This volume enrolled multiple authors to update the original selection of words and extended the content to cover words in usage in the wider Western Anglophone context. In subsequent years, scholars have applied the keywords method to non-western cultures and languages other than English, such as Andrew Kipnis' (2006) tracing of the meanings of *suzhi* in China.<sup>5</sup>

Other scholars, informed by a critical post-colonial sensibility, have creatively modified the keywords method. One such project culminated in the book *Words in Motion: Toward a Global Lexicon* edited by Carol Gluck and Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing (2009). This project sought to redress the way that 'stories of globalisation' ignored the 'work of thinkers, writers, scholars, and journalists in the Global South' (Tsing, 2009a: 16). The chapters of *Words in Motion* are each organised around a central Middle Eastern or Asian word chosen for its concreteness, 'whose movement could be traced first across linguistic and cultural borders, then through social and political processes as these changed across time' (Gluck, 2009: 6). The essays on '*adat*' (the Arabic root word for habits or customary practices) and '*chumchon*' (a Thai word for community), are particularly interesting for what they tell us about how the grounded practices we might associate with community economies in Monsoon Asia have become delegitimised.

Mona Abaza discusses how the term custom *ada* or *adat* (plural) travelled alongside *shari'a* 'the law' with Islam to Southeast Asia (2009: 68).

Anna Tsing points out that, while the universal and transcendent framework of *shari'a* law disallowed official legal recognition of local customary practices, they were allowed to coexist so long as they did not contradict the law (2009: 47). In Indonesia, the Dutch colonial administration gave new life to the term *adat* by coining the term *Adatrecht* to refer to *customary law* – particularly laws pertaining to land access and rights. The Dutch were keen to appropriate land from local people and needed to know about local customs in order to negotiate and subjugate. There was also some interest by the western colonisers in containing the spread of Islamic influence, and local land rights could be held up as a front behind which colonial power was exercised (*ibid.*: 48). Thus it was that those customary, indigenous practices (including native spirituality) that bore upon property (i.e. land) relations were more formally recognised (*ibid.*: 55). It follows that other customary practices of community survival relating, for example, to wealth or labour sharing, remained largely unrecognised.<sup>6</sup>

Craig Reynolds traces the movement into Asia of words concerning local practices by looking at the cluster of affinity words that travelled with the term 'community' to Thailand. They include 'self-sufficiency, subsistence economy, and local knowledge, or "native wisdom"' (Reynolds, 2009: 287). According to Reynolds, the Thai term for community, '*chumchon*' (literally the coming together of people), was most likely coined by Prince Wan in the 1930s. He notes that in Thailand the term includes ideas of Othering, of 'an inclusive-exclusive fencing off of outsiders by community members and the feeling of "we-ness" as opposed to "they"' (289). Reynolds locates the prehistory of community/*chumchon* in idealised and static notions of village life and sees the 'lingering lure of community culture ... with its ineffable qualities of shared labour, reciprocity, and resistance to the outside menace of bureaucracy and meddling development workers' as 'romantic, anachronistic' and unable to 'embrace shortcomings' (*ibid.*: 300). For Reynolds, there is little evidence on the ground for qualities such as 'mutual cooperation and generosity' (*ibid.*: 298). Instead the term *chumchon* has been enrolled in various iterations of socialist and statist projects of community development and Gandhian-inspired anti-modernity politics making it a political tool in national level agendas.

Our concern in this paper is not in showing how political terms and affiliations travelled from west to east and came to frame local practices. We are interested in staying with thick descriptions of place-based economic practices and attending to the becoming/negotiating of community, framed here as nothing more or greater than the interdependence that anchors all life. In contrast to Gluck and Tsing's project of 'word-and-world-following' (Reynolds, 2009: 7), our project focuses on word-and-world/place-grounding.

A *Keywords of Community Economies in Monsoon Asia Workshop* provided the initial sharing upon which this paper is built. It brought together researchers based in Australia and New Zealand who have conducted fieldwork in parts of Asia with research partners who are based in the region. Together collaborators documented one keyword that denoted a diverse economic practice that contributes to daily survival and well-being.<sup>7</sup> The keywords and phrases were to be explicitly embedded in place, though they might correspond with practices that go under other names in other places within Monsoon Asia or beyond. We creatively modified the keywords method. We selected terms/practices that are in common usage, that are central to common life in a particular area, and that reflect the ethical commitments associated with distinctive worldviews. But our words are all in different languages. While they do not cumulatively add up to a *common* language, they contribute to a new politics of language that abandons the structures of valuation associated with capitalist economics.

## Keywords

The range of keyword entries included below were the focus of some discussion at the *Keywords of Community Economies in Monsoon Asia Workshop*. An initial brainstorm (Discussion 1) was conducted around emerging themes in the entries. This afforded a host of categories and themes in the mode of grounded theory analysis. A second discussion (Discussion 2) began to identify affinities between practices and connections with the ethical concerns of community economies as discussed in *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming Our Communities*

by J.K. Gibson-Graham *et al.* (2013). Four clusters were identified associated with different ways of supporting livelihoods in Monsoon Asia:

- a. practices of caring for – maintaining, replenishing and growing – the natural and cultural **commons**
- b. individual and collective ways of deploying **labour** to survive together well and equitably
- c. arrangements that gift **surplus** to enrich social and environmental health
- d. **transactions** with others that support interdependent well-being.

The following keyword entries are organised into these clusters and the following section of the paper discusses some of the cross-cutting themes that emerged from Discussion 1.

- a. *Those relating to caring for a commons and living with more than human interdependence*

These keywords and phrases all refer to relationships of care and sensitivity to the more than human world – of rivers, ancestors and specific places from which seeds spring. In each case, the more than human constitutes a commons that is made, shared by and sustains a community of commoners.

**Sống chung với lũ** (*living with the flood*)  
*Vietnam* This phrase is indigenous to the Mekong Delta. It refers to open, adaptive and diverse livelihood strategies that, at heart, seek to accept and benefit from the annual floods that affect the delta. The ethic of adaptation of *sống chung với lũ* contradicts the modernist (state-led) development model that has seen floods framed as a risk and the landscape radically re-engineered for the purposes of intensive production and settlement. The radical implication of *sống chung với lũ* has seen attempts by the state at various times to co-opt the term and, though certain practices associated with *sống chung với lũ* have since ceased, this powerful idea persists. In recent years, in response to deteriorating environmental conditions and agricultural productivity, there has been a rethinking of the logic of controlling floods, with measures now being actively pursued to reintroduce floods onto farmers' fields and to de-intensify rice production. On-going struggles for

more locally-determined approaches to livelihoods continue to express the ethic of *sống chung với lũ* through the insistence on vernacular knowledge claims and resistance to perverse intensification strategies. As such, this keyword reinforces the value of place-based knowledge systems, the protection and maintenance of commons and the regenerative potential of diversity in pursuing more adaptive society–nature relations.

***Hamutu moris hamutu mate*** (*together in life, together in death*) Timor Leste Life-cycle events and commemorations are part of a vibrant complex of practices glossed in the Timorese language of Tetum Terik as the interplay between *hamutu moris hamutu mate* (together in life, together in death). In the process, people across Timor Leste (but also in West Timor) generate densely woven interrelationships of spiritual ecology with ancestors, living relatives, their local environments and the Most Sacred One (*Nai Luli Waik*). Social and spiritual life and livelihoods are enacted and reproduced through careful attention to these relations for the sake of ‘intergenerational well-being’, or a pervasive concern for sustaining and nourishing social and spiritual relations that stretch across the past, present and future. Families of particular lineages are organised around origin groups linked to particular ancestral houses and local spirit ecologies which embed these families in intimate, intergenerational social, spiritual, political and economic relationships with their extended kin from other ancestral houses. The alliances formed include the obligation of members of each ‘house’ to perform particular ritual duties at ceremonies to do with life-cycle events, from birth to death, and assist with house-based associated rituals and agricultural practices which are inseparable from spiritual life.

**बीज *Beej*** (*India-Hindi*); **বীজ *Bija*** (*Bangladesh*); **Binhi** (*Philippines*); **Hạt giống** (*Vietnam*); **Vittanam** (*India-Telugu*) (*seed*) Seed is a more-than-human keyword and actant that underpins diverse economies through Monsoon Asia in emphatically place-based ways. Seeds are sites of struggle in that they are often corporatised, bred, sold and patented by multinationals or

state-owned modernist development actors. Yet they may also be an active agent within alternative development imaginaries and realities. It was in this sense that seed was offered as a keyword by co-researchers and co-authors from India, Vietnam, the Philippines, Bangladesh and Australia.<sup>8</sup> The hundreds of thousands of varieties of rice seed, and other crops throughout Monsoon Asia, may be grown, sown and collected with care, with a place-based knowledge and as part of beyond-capitalist systems in ways that give meaning to life. Traditional varieties that have been handed down in some communities, despite pressures to adopt high yielding, genetically uniform seeds, may be multiplied and shared, and new farmer-bred varieties may be developed through farmer-to-farmer exchanges of information and breeding (such as those initiated by the MASIPAG network of the Philippines, see Bachmann *et al.*, 2009). As such, seeds have the potential to work beyond capitalism and support diverse practices with different kinds of norms. Seeds, then, have the potential to be both a grounded connection to place and a microcosm of relationality, connection and exchange. They spring, literally, from a place and are made by and with the soil, the planting practices, the social norms of harvest and seed selection used, down to the very valley and field that will make and re-make the seed.

*b. Those relating to practices of reciprocal labour that enact interdependence*

These keywords all refer to ways that human bodies and their capacities are offered to others to support survival needs under conditions laid down by community negotiated rules.

***Provas*** (*sharing*) Cambodia In rural Cambodia, *provas* is a traditional form of labour exchange allowing rural households to complete work in the rice fields (*provas dai* – ‘a helping hand’) or rear their livestock (*provas ko* – sharing cattle). Before more than 25 years of conflict and trauma engulfed Cambodia in the late twentieth century, *provas* was often imprecise. The elderly benefited from the labour of the young and different forms of labour were exchanged (Meas, 1995; Krishnamurthy, 1999). Since the late 1980s *provas* has declined. Government land

reform, the advancing market economy, off-farm income and increasing landlessness or diminishing plot sizes have both accelerated the need for paid employment and made *provas* less of a necessity (Van Acker, 2003; Meas and McCullum, 2009; Diepart, 2010). This is not to say *provas* disappeared. Rather, it is a smaller part of livelihood portfolios than it was and tends to be more rigid. Tasks are reciprocated within short time-frames between people of equal skill and strength (the same sex and invariably the same age). Importantly, new hybridities have emerged as *provas* is combined to fit particular circumstances. For example, in the villages, construction teams use *provas* to fit farming into the gaps between jobs, and market vendors draw on *provas* from other vendors if they need to leave their stall and attend to other tasks or when they need to clear their own produce early (Lyne, 2017:104–106).

**Bayanihan** (*being and becoming a hero*) Luzon, Philippines *Bayanihan* comes from the Tagalog root word *bayani* which is roughly translated as ‘hero’ in English, and the suffix *han* which, when added to a root word, creates both a noun and an action word. The concept of *bayani*, however, is more complex than its supposed English translation. While a hero may be viewed to be extraordinary and exceptional, the *bayani* always belongs and speaks for and with her people. The *bayani* is constitutive of  *bayan*, which may refer to multiple scales of places (e.g. country, city, town, province, etc.) and various groups of people (e.g. compatriots, town mates, etc.). In the Philippines, the term  *bayanihan* is mobilised as a form of collectively performed reciprocal labour that is deployed in agriculture, house building and many other urban and rural activities (see also *kamañidungan* below). The following example is drawn from research with informal miners working on the periphery of Metro Manila. When a self-employed, subsistence miner or his family member needs financial help for hospitalisation, his fellow informal miners in the neighbourhood will collectively devote one Sunday to manually crush tuff rubbles and sell them to truckers of construction contractors. The cash gained from this practice is given as a form of sympathy and practical aid (*pagdamay*) for the community member in need. The recipient then owes a

debt of gratitude (*utang na loob*) to his community members and might contribute to the same form of  *bayanihan* when another fellow miner or community member is in a similar situation in the future. Through  *bayanihan*, the informal miners are able to address the need for financial support of a community and help save a life in one way or another. One miner’s accomplishment also becomes a feat for his fellows, and vice versa.

**Kamañidungan** (*reciprocated building labour, a local version of bayanihan*) Batanes, Philippines *Kamañidungan* is a practice of cooperative labour for house building and repairs. It involves skilled and unskilled labourers representing 10 to 20 households gathering together to work on one house, and contributing all the materials, skills and labour needed. In building a traditional *Ivatan* residence, one household may contribute the roofing materials such as *cogon* grass, another the free services of a skilled *cogon* roofer and another the skill of building the limestone walls. Building and repair tasks are prioritised ahead of time, depending on urgency and need, and scheduled roughly once a month, often on a Saturday. Most households contribute to the shared meal, which is an important aspect of the gathering. Typically, one labourer will be assigned the role of lunch overseer. It is their job to tend the fire, cook the rice and organise the *vayan* (the food that accompanies the rice). The owner of the house under construction typically makes sure that there is enough food to go around and enough left over for *kamañidungan* group members to take a family meal home after the day’s work. This redistribution of surplus food to families is one way in which the practice serves to generate and redistribute social surplus. Another way is through the circulation of knowledge of traditional house building and artisan skills and its redistribution beyond the collective work team, among young people, for example.

*c. Those relating to practices of gifting that enact interdependence*

These keywords all refer to ways of sharing goods and wealth within a community by gifting to those with specific needs at specific

times. The gift transaction is associated with distinctive ritual practices or community rules.

**Pha kwan** (*tray of your soul*) *Laos* At times, when families need extra support from the communities around them, that support is called on not just from the people around, but also from the world of spirits. *Pha kwan* are offering trays that are presented by community members to others at ceremonies around birth, marriage, departures and returns and at other key intervals in a person's life, such as after recovery from a severe illness. The 'tray' usually includes an elaborate arrangement of flowers and banana leaves, boiled eggs, fruit, sweets, alcohol, money and candles. The offerings on the tray are for the *kwan* (souls), but once 'consumed' by the soul may be eaten/taken by those involved in the ceremony. At marriage, the *pha kwan* are presented during a ceremonial binding together of the couple's souls. The *pha kwan* are also offered during *baci* ceremonies, which take place following severe illness, travel or childbirth. In Lao (and Sipson Pann, Northern Thai and Isan) culture, people are understood to have multiple souls. The *baci* ceremony calls back a soul that may have gone missing during travel, or fled the body during stressful times of childbirth or illness. The ceremony heals the physical and metaphysical constitution of a person, and their wider community, by restoring balance and strength across both the physical and spiritual realm. Following childbirth and at times of death, community members also offer material support – giving gifts necessary for the new baby, making cash contributions to assist with funeral costs.

**Jimpitan** (*to pinch with the tips of one's fingers*) *Java, Indonesia* *Jimpitan* refers to a practice in which households regularly donate a small portion of rice or money to a community emergency fund. The practice arose in rural Java where daily donations were traditionally hung in cups outside homes for collection by the evening security patrol. The donations are very small – *jimpitan* means to pinch with the tips of one's fingers – emphasising the act of giving over the amount, lessening social divisions and encouraging everyone to be both a 'giver and a receiver'. A community

committee determines how the fund should be used – traditionally to provide support during emergencies, but increasingly for community infrastructure projects, cultural events such as weddings or funerals, or to support families in need. *Jimpitan* remains widely practised in Java, evolving spatially differentiated inflections that reflect particular socio-ecological contexts. In some communities, *jimpitan* systems have become very inclusive, involving women and migrants in decision-making processes for example, while others remain exclusive, potentially limiting their effectiveness in engaging with the full range of community issues. The on-going longevity and popularity of *jimpitan*, which continues to prosper beneath shifts in government regimes and development trends, emphasises its importance to community life.

**Dāna** (*generosity, charity and donation*) *Myanmar (Burma)* The word *dāna* derives from Sanskrit and Pali languages, and is in usage across societies in Monsoon Asia where Theravada Buddhism is practised, referring to donations given to monks or monasteries. Although *dāna* is associated with religious giving in order to gain merit for a better rebirth in one's next life, under the modern Burmese version of Theravada Buddhism there is a belief that if you do good things, you will get good things back and you do not need to wait, you can reap the benefits in this life. Regardless of whether merit is immediate or delayed, or for altruistic purposes or not, a strong 'culture of giving' has been observed in Myanmar society that goes beyond religion. It is common for Burmese, whether Buddhist or non-Buddhist, to give donations for the purpose and intent of social respect, social welfare or social development. The word *dāna* is therefore used more broadly to refer to social donations, initiated by anyone from any religious faith. In Myanmar, social donations are part of an informal system of non-state welfare and they are substantial. They are particularly important in a context where citizens have low levels of trust in the state to redistribute taxes for social welfare purposes. Myanmar's university alumni is one example of elaborate *dāna* networks, where former students give cash donations to their retired

teachers at annual ceremonies. In this cultural context, *dāna* represents a deep respect for teachers, an ethic of care for the elderly and the value of maintaining social ties and lifetime friendships.

*d. Transactional practices of rotating access and seasonal support*

These keywords all refer to ways of distributing access to survival goods in a sequential manner that attends to the temporality of specific needs.

***Mudalolose*** (also *muganti*, *mugagilirang*) and ***Mandusi*** (also *mangemong*, *mamuruh*, *malejung*) North Sulawesi, Indonesia In the volcanic islands of North Sulawesi, Indonesia, smallholder farmers rely on a unique system for harvesting nutmeg that has enabled them to survive well together in their island ecosystem. Nutmeg trees are particularly well suited to the local ecology, where an active volcano produces rich soils for tree growth and gaseous emissions that form a natural pesticide (Rampengan et al., 2016). Harvesting arrangements include *mudalolose* (a form of tree tenure) and *mandusi* (fruit gleaning), practices which stimulate a good harvest while at the same time redistributing wealth. In the absence of an official land titling system, *mudalolose* involves the rotation of tree harvesting rights between different families over time. It is a distinct system of access where trees are divided and distributed between different families over two-year time intervals (i.e. one family has a right to harvest certain trees for two years, while the other families rely on *mandusi* as they wait their turn). Access to tree harvesting can also be exchanged for services, with families giving access to non-family members in exchange for help: historically, it was common for a midwife to be given access rights to a tree for a certain period of time for help with a birth, for example. Families can similarly sell durations of harvesting rights for cash or loans. *Mandusi* is a practice of ground-fruit gleaning which enables non-harvesting family members to collect fallen nutmeg. All village members are able to benefit from gleaning, however, including the landless and school children who collect it on the way to school for pocket money. *Mandusi* thus benefits families without trees as they can earn a

reasonable income from this practice, but it also benefits those with access rights because the gleaners clean the land in the process of collecting fallen nutmeg. Gleaning thus contributes to the health of the crop and the more equitable distribution of income across households. The nutmeg tree and its harvest are enmeshed with multiple types of economic transactions, and *mandalolose* and *mandusi* are community economic practices that distribute surplus to enrich social and environmental health.

***Arisan*** (*rotating savings and credit group*) Indonesia *Arisan* is a rotating credit system that has been present in Indonesia for over one hundred years. In contemporary times, *arisan* involves a regular meeting of a consistent group whereby each member contributes an equal amount of money or goods at each meeting. A draw is held allowing one member to receive the combined sum of contributions. The members may also contribute more and have more than one chance so they can win the draw several times. This rotates around the group until everyone has won according to their contributions. It is customary that the winner will host the following round. *Arisan* provides a social platform for community members to both save money and gather regularly. Trust is an important element of *arisan*: all members need to finish the round, so that every person gets a turn taking home the pot of money. There is no legal agreement in place among the members, but the practice works through social sanctions. Each member must be involved and present for each regular round. If members are unable to bring the amount on the day of the *arisan*, another member can be approached discreetly to pay for them so they are not excluded (and then if they win, they pay back the lenders personally). When difficult occasions arise, such as sudden financial burdens following family death or accident, the winner can give their winning turn to the members most in need and continue joining the draw for another round. This allows people in need to access immediate financial support with no interest.

***Punggawa-Sawi*** (*captain-sailor or patron-client*) Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia Coastal and maritime communities in Southeast Sulawesi,



known as Sama Bajo, use the phrase *punggawa-sawi* to characterise patron–client connections. The phrase has its origins in the distinction between captains and boat crews. These bonds remain fundamental to the conduct of their fishing based livelihoods and the historical reproduction of their sea-based household economies. *Punggawa-sawi* expresses the idea of an economic safety net but also a form of market-based interdependency founded on debt (Pelras, 2000). These days *Punggawa* are usually wealthier traders and residents of local Sama bajo villages. They provide a regular source of credit for *Sawi* crew members to cover household living costs and emergency expenses especially during the southeast monsoon when high winds and big swells limit fishing activity. In return, *Sawi* crews are obliged to sell their catch to *Punggawa* or their agents (*pengumpul*) when the fishing season revives. As a framework and mechanism for social resilience in the face of uncertainty and the vagaries of maritime-based fortunes, the *punggawa-sawi* relationship has proved its value over hundreds of years. But it comes at a cost of autonomy and the freedom to pursue alternative economic choices that might offer more attractive returns.

### Key reflections

The keywords we have presented are just a sample of a vast vocabulary of practices spread across Monsoon Asia and perhaps beyond. Certainly, many of the practices described are engaged in by people all around the world. However, the naming of each and the micro-negotiations that constitute each transaction and ethical commitment are distinct and place specific.

What collectively situates them together on a plane of potentiality is, among other things, their inherent sociality and flexibility, their commitment to human and more than human well-being and their unique temporalities. The enduring value of these various practices, relations and knowledges is reinforced by their persistence, creative adaptability and resistance to total appropriation (despite frequent attempts of

state co-option). These relations, practices and associated knowledges and cosmovisions are by no means isolated, traditional or static, although their historical roots run deep. Rather, these relations and practices reveal the creative negotiation that communities in this interconnected part of the world have long pursued in response to external forces and agents of change (Langton *et al.*, 2006).

We are not yet in a position to offer a definitive answer to the question of whether these community economy practices might offer different ‘post-development’ pathways. But, we can reflect on themes that connect these keyword entries and identify some of the emerging contours of community economies in Monsoon Asia.

### Other temporalities

The keywords describe relations marked by cycles of life and death (*yu kam, pha kwan, hamutu moris hamutu mate, dāna*), and practices that seek to mitigate misfortune through careful opportunities to redistribute risk (*arisan*) and wealth (*jimpitan*) as well as encourage reciprocity (*bayanihan, kamañidungan, provas, dāna*) and mutual obligation (*punggawa-sawi*). Detailed, complex and situated hydro-ecological knowledge (*mudalolose, mandusi, só ng chung vó'i lū*) enables resilience in the face of variability, shocks and stresses. All these activities contribute to collective survival strategies that can be activated when needed, responding to seasonal climatic variations, life cycles and spiritual connections across time.

In this sense they are always situated in multiple time-frames, activating past knowledges, ensuring futures will be secure, attending to the many presents experienced by different community members. They are not governed by the linear time of capital accumulation and the presentist logic of the market (de Sousa Santos, 2007: 72). They are like the diverse seeds that are increasingly being exchanged by people’s organisations that offer a variety of planting and harvesting times, opening up different temporalities to those of genetically modified varieties. These seeds manifest the past, the heritage of peoples, the places that created them and the future, as future harvests. They are thus both a disruptive force to the present logic of capital

and an embodiment of hopeful futures/presents/pasts.

### *Already hybrid*

Community economic practices are responsive to changing technologies, environmental processes and state intervention. They are already hybrid in the sense that they are part of both community economies and global capitalist economies. For generations *punggawa-sawi* (the Indonesian captain-sailor patron-client relationship) has produced marine products that have entered into exploitative global commodity value chains. Other practices have been co-opted by government policies that attempt to turn them into raw materials for modernisation and scale them up into standardised government development initiatives. In the 1960s, former Philippine president and dictator Ferdinand Marcos employed *bayanihan* (reciprocal labour exchange) as a strategy in building his idea of a New Society (*Bagong Lipunan*) to further his political and economic interests (San Juan, 2007). Similarly, under the Suharto New Order regime, Javanese customary institutions such as *jimpitan* (small gifts of rice for social use), *arisan* (small rotating credit groups) and *gotong royong* (community labour activities) were widely disseminated as national programmes of economic development or social protection across the Indonesian archipelago. They often failed to translate effectively into other socio-cultural contexts and more usually simply became a vehicle for misappropriation of government expenditure. In Cambodia in the early 1980s, Heng Samrin sought to enforce *provas*-reliant 'solidarity groups' (*krom samaki*) to make efficient use of farming resources. But more enforced collective labour in the aftermath of traumas experienced under the Khmer Rouge was uncondusive to restoring village life (Meas, 1995). Meanwhile, insofar as these practices pertain to World Bank community-driven development projects enacted with 'social funds', the practices have been instrumentally construed as 'social capital' and selectively used for / channelled into support for linear and unsustainable capitalist economic growth.

But the direction of change is not always set. Provincial and municipal governments on Batan Island in the northern Philippines have incorporated cooperative labour and material sharing in

response to the monetisation and privatisation of cogon grass growing. The communal grass (*cogon*) reserves are being maintained, financed and managed by the government around Ivana and Uyugan. The government has established a scheme whereby community members can access the *cogon* for free so long as they have a low-cost permit and use the *cogon* for roofing. The government scheme is a way of generating an open access *cogon* commons which in turn encourages the preservation of *cogon* roofing skills and the continuation of *kamanidungan* (collective labour practices). The scheme is one example of local agencies working to enable community practices like *kamanidungan* to continue. Overall, recent field observations in Batanes show that *kamanidungan* continues to play an important role, and equally that local institutions are committed to finding ways forward that meld traditional knowledge and practice into present day survival and resilience.

### *Collective care of humans and non-humans*

If care refers to all the work that we do 'maintain, continue and repair our world so we might live in it as well as possible' (Tronto, 1993: 103), a community economy of care is one where negotiations around what it takes to survive well includes negotiations around care for our 'world' – our societies, families, environments, traditional practices and ways of life (Dombroski et al., 2018). In many of the examples of economic activities, care was interwoven into the practice in ways quite different from other forms of capitalist economy. For example, *arisan* members could gift their winning turn to another when times were hard, or indeed, pay for another person's turn if they were short that week. Another example is that care taken in preparing trays and gifts for the *baci* ceremony ending the period of *yu kam* when Lao women give birth. While these forms of exchange are not purely altruistic, they are certainly infused with a form of care that maintains, continues and repairs the world, including the social and spiritual worlds.

The practices of giving and receiving that occur in association with *pha kwan* require an expanded vision of what and who is engaged in the exchanges and transactions that secure individual and community well-being. The life-

cycle rituals and contributions signal the need to take into account an expanded view of what is necessary for surviving well. The health and well-being of individuals, and the communities that they are part of, depend in part on maintaining not just the human members of that community but the unseen spiritual world that they are connected to in life and in death. The gifting of material goods and cash that takes place around these pivotal moments in the life-cycle can be understood as a *distribution of surplus*, yet the surplus is distributed not just to living people, but to flighty souls. Thus, as the same time as the material needs of community members are attended to through the giving of gifts for a new baby, or the collection of cash contributions to funeral costs, emotional and spiritual needs are also cared for. The care given is part of what brings communities into being, through *transactions* that take place between human and non-human elements of both the seen and the unseen worlds.

*Bayanihan* (the practice of reciprocal labour) is a form of collective sociality that, in the case of informal miners, cushions their common economic hardships. There are times when the wife of another miner acts as the collector of contributions and makes a list of the labour performed and amount given by individuals or families. This accounting keeps track of the total sum of collection and, compared with *arisan* in Indonesia and *dāna* in Myanmar, is not used as proof of what amount has to be reciprocated by the recipient. In its more general application among acquaintances or strangers, *bayanihan* is a form of *pakikipagkapwa*, or a way of extending self to others. Some do not even deliberately expect something in return (*kawanggawa*). In this case, *bayanihan* could be seen as a form of volunteering. However, it is always generally anticipated that those who are helped by a *bayanihan* practice will extend the good deed to others (though not necessarily the one who was directly aided) in a similar situation in the future. The good deed may not necessarily be as a form of labour; it could also be in a form of gift or time. The main point is that the ethics of care, compassion and being together is reverberated so that the spirit of *bayanihan* lives on.

As a practice *jimpitan* provides a form of financing for community emergencies, events,

or initiatives. It is a resilient form of financing arising from caring community relations that pursue shared interests and value collective actions. While it is important to note its limited amount, the *jimpitan* fund is more flexible, adaptive and reliable than government support or foreign aid, providing communities with possibilities to pursue projects and support one another in the absence of outside assistance. While most *jimpitan* practices engage with market economies at some level (to raise money for the fund through selling rice for example) the practices of donation and decision-making are rarely market-oriented; instead they seek to improve community life in diverse ways. Financing, for example, has been directed for initiatives such as *Posyandu* health posts to support children and pregnant women, to set up low cost services that make dining and cooking equipment available for cultural events and to fund roads and other infrastructure that external agencies have failed to support. In these, and many other ways, *jimpitan* enlarges the possibilities and opportunities for communities to draw upon local strengths in pursuit of collective goals. For this sort of community financing to be effective and just it is important that representation on *jimpitan* decision-making bodies is inclusive, open and fair. When done well *jimpitan* challenges the dependencies and power relations inherent within conventional top-down financing flows and provides a model of community economic practices that is likely to have value for interested communities far beyond its Javanese origins.

Seeds are being cared for and reclaimed by farmers' networks, Indigenous people, peoples' organisations, farmers and farming families despite capitalist norms of monocultural, high-input agriculture and threats from privatised regimes of intellectual property (Wright, 2005). Seeds, then, do not only reflect place, they help create it. Yet, seeds are also a form of relationality and connectedness. For seeds do not have to be sold, they do not have to be subject to Western, dominant forms of intellectual property. Seeds may be selected and shared in ways that support diverse nourishing life worlds. They may be supported through open source systems, regulated by deep cultural norms, or may be shared freely through diverse systems of

knowledge and ownership that support, and are led by, farmers and Indigenous people beyond corporate and Western control. Seeds, then, are points of connection to place, to each other; even as they are planted by a different person, in a different plot, they become that place too with its own history and present. And in doing so, seeds have the potential to disrupt the conventional regimes of capitalist exchange in a number of ways, as illustrated by the system of seed exchange and farmer-led breeding by MASIPAG in the Philippines. First, for example, the use of *bayanihan* – say one day per month when farmers work on each other's land or support each other in emergency situations – represents both the intentional resuscitation of this deeply held cultural practice under threat from the individualising tendencies of mono-agricultural capital, as well as a non-commodified system of reciprocal, negotiated labour practice. Second, the collection of traditional varieties, the farmer-led breeding of new place-based varieties and the farmer-to-farmer sharing of these varieties of seeds is a deep form of multi-temporal commoning. That is to say, sharing seeds is a form of commoning now (both materially and epistemologically, as the seeds manifest the knowledge-making practices of previous generations), as well as a commoning-to-come in the form of future harvests. In this respect, seeds are not an object practised on, or a privately-owned means of production, but are themselves an active subject in the sustenance of community life, a non-human actor that takes its place in a more-than-human community of care.

### *Sociality and surplus distribution*

A final theme concerns community-based mechanisms for distributing wealth and surplus for either material livelihood benefit or to reduce vulnerability and enhance resilience. But also wrapped up in these mechanisms is sociality. The enactment of social relationships is foregrounded as important, in and of themselves, inherently producing individual and community well-being. Much of the surplus distribution is through non-market transactions, whereby people, groups and communities self-organise, using monetary donations and material gifts to express appreciation and to honour and

acknowledge what has been given or sacrificed in various relationships. The important function of sociality embedded in such transactions is often missed or overlooked, with the focus solely placed on helping to overcome hardship or make households more financially secure.

In Myanmar's higher education sector, through charitable acts of giving donations (*dāna*), alumni members foreground social relationships as important, in and of themselves, inherently producing and reproducing social and economic well-being among extensive alumni communities. Across the entire higher education sector, the surplus of alumni members, measured in thousands of US dollars, is distributed to the country's retired teachers through thousands of self-organised non-market transactions, year after year. No one is forgotten; even those retirees who cannot attend annual ceremonial events on university campuses will be graced with a home visit, no matter where they reside. The donations and gifts are a public expression of appreciation and they honour and acknowledge what has been given or sacrificed in the student–teacher relationship. The cash donations are also meant to help to overcome hardship or make households more financially secure, particularly to supplement government pensions as teachers move into retirement. Teachers are financially supported to help their own ageing parents, and as they themselves age, their alumni communities support them more.

### **Conclusion**

Our collective project of documenting and assembling keywords of community economies aims to challenge the hegemony of a development lexicon that pins progress to modern rationalities and the growth of capitalism. This exercise offers a productive addendum to the critical work of Wolfgang Sachs' *Development Dictionary* (1992) and Andrea Cornwall and Deborah Eade's exposé of development 'buzzwords and fuzzwords' (2010). What these dictionaries lack are alternative lexicons inclusive of words that emerge from place. This paper has drawn attention to keywords for place-based practices that express 'other', non-capitalist rationalities. Our aim is not to pull these words from their localised contexts and launch them

into some idealised realm of inter-cultural understanding (Esteva and Prakash, 2014:118, fn6). It is, instead, to stay with practices in place and explore their productivity within ecologies of surviving well.

The keywords we have collected are ready to begin to populate a different map of the economic geography of Monsoon Asia. They are filling in that sociology of absence that has left community economic practices in the shadows, delegitimised and incapable of offering any viable pathways to a different future. If one of the tasks of imagining and enacting alternatives to development is to multiply possibilities and allow for newly emergent ways of living together and surviving well (Dombroski, 2015), then our keywords project is making an initial contribution.

Our compendium of diversity cannot, however, ignore the 'modern' development project with which community economic practices co-exist. Many practices have been rebadged or changed under colonialism or in post-colonial contexts. In some places where there is knowledge and awareness about what has been lost, old, past practices are being resuscitated. We are just beginning to articulate the distinctive logics of interdependence that shape the community economic practices gathered here. This work involves learning to be affected by difference, appreciating what thick description can do and experimenting with new ways of co-working with others.

We have only just begun the task of inventorying and we invite others to join us.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge funding support from the Australian Research Council (ARC DP 150102285) for the workshop which shaped this paper.

## Notes

- 1 This paper is one output of a workshop on *Keywords of Community Economies in Monsoon Asia* held in September 2017 at Western Sydney University as part of the ARC Discovery Project 150102285 *Strengthening Economic Resilience in Monsoon Asia*. The workshop was organised by Chief Investigators Katherine Gibson, Ann Hill and Lisa Law with assistance from Joanne

McNeill and Isaac Lyne and attended by seven of the authors. A second output is the *Keywords of Monsoon Asia* Website [www.communityeconomiasia.wordpress.com](http://www.communityeconomiasia.wordpress.com). This website provides an on-line focus for communication in which we are testing out the possibilities for a new mode of decolonised scholarship (Chen, 2010).

- 2 The Spanish term 'cosmovision' has emerged in the Latin American context where a strong indigenous presence has mobilised a language to resist the predations of colonialism, capitalism and enlightenment rationalism. *Cosmovision* attempts to grasp the integration of place or territory, history, ecology and spirit within an embodied worldview with its own logics of appropriation and inter-connection (Escobar, 2008: 58).
- 3 The countries from which entries have been compiled for this paper include Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, the Philippines, Indonesia and Timor Leste. This starting point reflects the locations and field experience of the network of scholars convened by our Workshop and thus represents only a portion of the entire region of Monsoon Asia.
- 4 Whether our attempts thus far to bring the materiality and temporality of weather and other more than human elements to bear on the sociality of practices is convincing or not, it remains a guiding motivation for this project. We are interested navigating around the racist and Eurocentric legacies of environmental determinism to understand the specificity of 'tropical community economies' without also suggesting any inherent regional homogeneity, or reinstating the kind of 'trait' geography that van Schendel is critiquing (2002: 658).
- 5 See also Go (2017) who, while not explicitly deploying a keywords approach, interrogates local meanings of the term *waray* (literally 'none' or 'nothing') denoting both the language of people in the Eastern Visayas region of the Philippines and attitudes of 'brinkmanship' and 'ferocity' that comprise the resilience to withstand the ravages of extreme weather events that often leave them with nothing (233).
- 6 Even with recognition, customary practices become known only as 'shadow-space' terms in relation to Islamic law and Western colonial law (Tsing, 2009b: 43).
- 7 This selection of keywords forms the beginning of a larger collaborative compilation (see [www.communityeconomiasia.wordpress.com](http://www.communityeconomiasia.wordpress.com)).
- 8 The Seeds of Resilience Research Collective contributed to the selection of this keyword. They are: Mr Ambuj Soni, Mr Duskar Barik, Prof Madhushree Sekher, Dr Venkata Ramanjaneyulu Gangula, Prof Nimruji Prasad Jammulamadaka, Ms Ma Corazon Jimenez-Tan, Ms Georita Gallano Pitong, Ms Elizabeth Cruzada, Ms Thi Hong Phuc Dinh, Prof Amita Singh, Ms Anlyn Mirano, Ms Emily Cordero-Guara, Mr Adinarayana Kotam, Ms Parboti Singh, Mr Sree Harsha Thanneeru, Dr Jagjit Plahe, Prof Gavin Jack, A/Prof Sarah Wright, Mr J. Emmanuel Yap, Ms Eleanor Lang, Mr Lachlan Gregory and Dr Anna Szava.

## References

- Abaza, M. (2009) *Ada/custom* in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, in C. Gluck and A. Lowenhaupt Tsing (eds.),

- Words in motion: Toward a global lexicon*, pp. 67–82. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Bachmann, L., E. Cruzada and S. Wright (2009) *Food security and farmer empowerment: A study of the impacts of farmer-led sustainable agriculture in the Philippines*. Laguna: MASIPAG. Retrieved October 2016, from Website: <http://masipag.org/downloads>.
- Bennett, T., L. Grossberg and M. Morris (eds.) (2005) *New keywords a revised vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford and Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Chen, K.H. (2010) *Asia as method: Toward deimperialization*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Cornwall, A. and D. Eade (2010) *Deconstructing development discourse: Buzzwords and fuzzwords*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Diepart, J.C. (2010) Cambodian peasant's contribution to rural development: A perspective from Kampong Thom Province, *Biotechnologie, Agronomie, Société et Environnement* 14(2): 321–340.
- Dombroski, K. (2015) Multiplying possibilities: A postdevelopment approach to hygiene and sanitation in Northwest China, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 56(3): 321–334.
- Dombroski, K., S. Healy and K. McKinnon (2018) Care-full community economies, in W. Harcourt and C. Bauhardt (eds.), *Feminist political ecology and the economics of care: In search of economic alternatives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Escobar, A. (2008) *Territories of difference: Place, movements, life, redes*. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Esteva, G. and M.S. Prakash (2014) *Grassroots post-modernism: Remaking the soil of cultures*. London: Zed Books.
- Gibson, K., A. Hill and L. Law (2017) Community economies in Southeast Asia: A hidden economic geography, in A. Macgregor, L. Law and F. Miller (eds.), *Routledge handbook of southeast asian development*. London: Routledge.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) *A postcapitalist politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K., J. Cameron and S. Healy (2013) *Take back the economy: An ethical guide for transforming our communities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gluck, C. (2009) *Words in motion, in words in motion: Toward a global lexicon*, pp. 3–10. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Gluck, C. and A.L. Tsing (eds.) (2009) *Words in motion: Toward a global lexicon*. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Go, C.O. (2017) Women of storm surges: Meaning making as cultural process of social repair for Yolanda survivors, *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* 65(2): 227–256.
- Kipnis, A. (2006) Suzhi: A keyword approach, *The China Quarterly* 186: 295–313.
- Krishnamurthy, V. (1999) *The impact of armed conflict on social capital: A study of two villages in Cambodia*. Phnom Penh: Social Services of Cambodia.
- Langton, M., O. Mazel and L. Palmer (2006) The 'spirit' of the thing: The boundaries of aboriginal economic relations as Australian common law, *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 17(3): 307–321.
- Lyne, I. (2017) Social enterprise and community development: Theory into practice in two Cambodian villages, PhD thesis, Western Sydney University, Australia.
- Meas, N. (1995) *Towards restoring life: Cambodian villages*, 3rd edn. Phnom Penh: JSRC.
- Meas, N. and W. McCallum (2009) *Roads to development: Insights from Sre Ambel District, Southwest Cambodia*. Phnom Penh: American Friends Service Committee – Cambodia Program.
- Pelras, C. (2000) Patron-client ties among the Bugis and Makassarese of South Sulawesi, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 156(3): 393–432.
- Rampengan, M., A. Boedihartono, C. Margules et al. (2016) Agroforestry on an active volcanic small island in Indonesia: Prospering with adversity, *Geographical Research* 54(1): 19–34.
- Reynolds, C. (2009) *Chumchon/Community in Thailand, in words in motion: Toward a global lexicon*, pp. 286–305. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Sachs, W. (1992) *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- San Juan, E. Jr. (2007) *US imperialism and revolution in the Philippines*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- de Sousa Santos B. (2007) Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, pp. 45–89.
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2014) *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Boulder, Colorado and London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Tronto, J. (1993) *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tsing, A.L. (2009a) *Worlds in motion, in Words in Motion: Toward a Global Lexicon*, pp. 11–20. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Tsing, A.L. (2009b) *Adat/indigenous: Indigeneity in motion, in words in motion: Toward a global lexicon*, pp. 40–66. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Van Acker, F. (2003) Cambodia's commons: Changing governance, shifting entitlements?, CAS Discussion paper No 42, Centre for International Management and Development, Antwerp, October 2003.
- Van Schendel, W. (2002) Geographies of knowing, geographies of ignorance: Jumping scale in Southeast Asia, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20(6): 647–668.
- Williams, R. (1983) *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society [Revised edition]*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, S. (2005) Knowing scale: Intellectual property rights, knowledge spaces and the production of the global, *Social and Cultural Geography* 6(6): 903–921.